

ter and the Secretary of State for External Affairs (Mr. Sharp) to refer this matter to the external affairs committee of this House of Commons for the purpose of study, and hearing from the minister and officials of the department the uniting international reasons that make this representation necessary.

Mr. Speaker, I close the way I started. I welcome the Prime Minister home. With many others in this house and across the country, I am deeply disappointed about his non-representation at the conference so far as Canada is concerned.

[Translation]

Mr. René Matte (Champlain): Mr. Speaker, I will not repeat the remarks, very accurate for the most part, of the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Stanfield), as well as those of the leader of the New Democratic party (Mr. Lewis). Allow me, however, to express our views on that recent journey.

First, the London reporters were disappointed with the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) as we all have been since last June 25. Nevertheless, I congratulate the Prime Minister for being aware of it, since he said, in his opening remarks, that there had been disappointment. Of course, we have been disappointed, but why? Canada would have been proud to see the Prime Minister assert himself as one of the leaders of the 24 heads of government who gathered in London, in order to meet the aspirations of all those people and justify the trust put in him.

But the reaction was entirely different.

It is true that nobody expected that concrete solutions would come out of this conference, but neither was it expected—nor hoped for—that his sliding down banisters, his escapades and his sensational doings would be the main topics discussed about his participation to the conference. This is unfortunate, and one does not know whether to laugh or cry. That is the reaction in our areas. In fact, that is the actual thinking of the people, who are of course awfully disappointed.

The Prime Minister seems to have linked together recognizing both the Vatican and Communist China. In Quebec particularly, people have made the connection. His visit to the Vatican seemed to be one way of making the recognition of China easier to accept.

Of course, we are in favour of the establishment of diplomatic relations with the Vatican, and we have been for years. When

Statement on Commonwealth Conference

I was still a child, members of Parliament were already advocating it in the house. If finally that takes place in 1969, it would be a very normal thing, in my opinion; the Prime Minister could then be commended for it. But if it is a political play to make something else more palatable, such means is, to my mind, somewhat despicable.

Of all the Prime Minister's escapades, I would like to recall the one which impressed me the most, and which was told to me by some government members. We sympathize with the few Liberal members who were given a good beating by the Prime Minister in London itself. We are wondering—and some pointed it out to me—who are the members concerned? We are anxious to hear from the Prime Minister the names of those "undesirables", as he said. According to him, undesirable people found their way into the Liberal party at the time of the election and he added, very candidly, that fortunately, most of them had not been elected. By using the expression "most of them", he meant undoubtedly that some of them were elected.

Therefore we sympathize with those unfortunate members who not only have a sword of Damocles hanging over their head but who are wondering whether they are among that group of undesirables or, more precisely, "bums", as the newspapers reported, and which could be translated freely in French by the word "undesirables". For all these reasons, I sympathize with the Liberals.

Many questions are cropping up after this conference. However, we are happy about the return of the Prime Minister because the way things were going, we were wondering how low the reputation of Canada would sink.

[English]

QUESTIONS ON THE ORDER PAPER

(Questions answered orally are indicated by an asterisk.)

PAYMENTS UNDER MUNICIPAL GRANTS ACT

Question No. 418—Mr. Fortin:

1. For each of the last five years, what were, by province, the amounts paid under the Municipal Grants Act, R.S.C., 1952, c. 182?

2. Has the government issued instructions concerning the payment of municipal and school taxes by Crown corporations and, if so (a) on what date (b) what is the nature of such instructions?