

*Interim Supply*

course, revenue does come out of taxes. It is a matter of using a balanced judgment in all the circumstances and of reaching a decision as best one can.

I can assure the hon. member that this Alberni situation did receive, as I well know, long and careful consideration and that all the factors entering into a decision were carefully thought out and discussed at some length. There has been no attempt to minimize the significance of the loss to the persons concerned—I think 55 families lost their homes. In any event, the matter was carefully considered and the best conclusion which could be reached was that the sum of \$250,000 was appropriate in all the circumstances, bearing in mind the degree of responsibility of the federal government. It is a matter of regret that it was not sufficiently large to be satisfactory to hon. members and to the persons in that area.

**Mr. Barnett:** I certainly did not intend to imply in the course of my remarks that newspaper headlines always give a fair summary of the feeling in the country on various issues. I did something which I do not ordinarily do. I quoted these headlines and said at the time that I was doing so because I felt they did accurately summarize the reaction. I drew attention to them because, as I had said earlier, this is not the ordinary reaction of Canadian citizens when a grant is made from the federal treasury.

With regard to what the minister had to say about increasing taxes, this is one of the axioms which I believe all members of this house realize and accept. But I should like to point out, if this has not already been drawn to the attention of the minister and the committee, that in effect if funds are provided for purposes of re-establishment and reconstruction it is simply using our taxing mechanism for providing a pool against loss, because the loss figures which were released following the appraisal are based upon the loss that was uninsurable. I have gone into this matter and it becomes apparent that a disaster such as a tidal wave, because it is a risk that will affect only people in certain limited areas of the country, is not something which in the ordinary way insurance companies would insure against, except through charging absolutely prohibitive premiums. Therefore I do not think that the minister's argument in respect to the increase of taxes, and so on, to deal with this kind of situation is really applicable in this case.

I certainly was not inviting the minister to comment upon or to agree or disagree with my own assessment of the actions of the government of the province of British

[Mr. McIlraith.]

Columbia. I felt free to make my own assessment because, after all, I am a citizen of British Columbia and have a vote in provincial elections, in addition to being a representative of the people of that particular area of the province. What I was trying to do in making that assessment was draw to the attention of the government and the house that there did in fact exist a gap in the finances available for dealing with this disaster situation, and I felt I should offer my own explanation, on my own responsibility, as to some of the reasons for the existence of that gap.

What I was trying to point out was that in view of the long period of uncertainty which these people have had, I was convinced that the more proper and appropriate thing for the government to have done would have been to make a grant on a scale that was sufficient to close that gap, and then follow through with dealing expeditiously with some more satisfactory and better established arrangements for future situations.

I was glad to hear the President of the Privy Council express to the committee his interest in taking action along those lines; but I still maintain—and I think members of the house will appreciate my position—that assurances of that kind are not really very helpful in dealing with the problem that is immediately facing these people, who are receiving considerably less than the net depreciated value of their loss, let alone any consideration toward receiving something that bears a proper relationship to replacement costs in this situation.

[Translation]

**Mr. Marcoux:** Mr. Chairman, I just want to give you a little assistance. Earlier, when the motion of the hon. member for Lapointe (Mr. Grégoire) was ruled out of order, three reasons were given, one of which was the fact that Bill No. C-64 was now figuring on the order paper. However, I see that Bill No. C-64 is an act to provide for a Canadian national anthem, while Bill No. C-41 is an act respecting a national flag and a national anthem of Canada. The latter would have been a better argument than the former.

[Text]

**The Chairman:** Shall the resolution carry?

**Mr. Peters:** Before the resolution carries, Mr. Chairman, I would like to avail myself of the opportunity of saying something about the business and the operation of the house. An editorial appeared the other day in the *Montreal Gazette* under the heading, "Better house management needed". It went on to speak of the presentation made by the Prime