

Inquiries of the Ministry

to answer that question without advice, but I am going to get advice from the Board of Transport Commissioners and will endeavour to answer the question tomorrow.

Mr. Heward Graffey (Brome-Missisquoi): Mr. Speaker, I should like to ask the minister a supplementary question. Can the minister now inform the house whether in the past the appropriate authorities have made representations to the Board of Transport Commissioners for overpass or underpass facilities at this crossing?

Mr. Pickersgill: No, Mr. Speaker, but I will be glad to make inquiries on that point.

POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT**MONTREAL—REPORTED THEFT OF MAIL
FROM AIRPORT**

On the orders of the day:

Mr. L. R. Sherman (Winnipeg South): Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the Postmaster General. Can the minister advise the house whether he has any details in connection with the reported theft of 15 bags of mail today from the mailroom of the Montreal international airport involving an estimated \$1 million?

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. I wonder whether this is the type of incident about which a question should be asked at this time. I suggest to the hon. member that, the deed having been done, perhaps the question should not be asked at this time. If the hon. member thinks there is an aspect of urgency in his question I would suggest that it be discussed in the adjournment debate.

Mr. Langlois (Chicoutimi): On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, that question would have been very urgent yesterday.

Mr. Graffey: Explain.

GRAIN**REQUEST FOR INCREASED SHIPMENTS
THROUGH CHURCHILL**

On the orders of the day:

Mr. Robert Simpson (Churchill): Mr. Speaker, I should like to direct a question to the Minister of Transport. In view of the fact that we now have on record some measure of support from the Vancouver area for increased shipments through the port of Churchill, would the minister take the appropriate steps to encourage his colleagues from the lakehead and Montreal areas to give the same support to increased shipments from Churchill?

[Mr. Pickersgill.]

Hon. J. W. Pickersgill (Minister of Transport): Mr. Speaker, I am sure I have the support of my colleagues from every part of Canada to do everything it is possible to do to facilitate the export of the maximum quantity of wheat from this country, and as much from Churchill as it is possible to put through that port.

Mr. Simpson: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Is the minister aware that several statements have been made recently by the shipping authorities in Montreal to the effect that everything possible will be done to see that Churchill shipments are not increased?

Mr. Pickersgill: I will consider the hon. gentleman's representation, Mr. Speaker.

HEALTH AND WELFARE**MEDICARE—AUTHORIZATION OF CONTRIBUTIONS TOWARD COST OF INSURED MEDICAL CARE**

Hon. A. J. MacEachen (Minister of National Health and Welfare) moved the second reading of Bill No. C-227, to authorize the payment of contributions by Canada toward the cost of insured medical care services incurred by provinces pursuant to provincial medical care insurance plans.

He said: Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to move second reading of this bill. In the interim since this bill was presented for second reading members will have had an opportunity to study its provisions carefully and, I am sure, constructively. The medical care bill is a short but significant piece of legislation. It has only nine clauses and in this respect is identical with the Hospital Insurance and Diagnostic Services Act passed by this parliament in 1956. I mention this parallel simply to show that good things may come in small packages, for surely we have all lived very happily with our hospital insurance legislation and I doubt that any member of the house would want to see it dismantled.

There are a number of other parallels between the bill we are considering today and the hospital insurance legislation—in the definition of “resident” and “population”, for example. Similarly, both statutes require that insured services be provided under uniform terms and conditions to all residents of the province. Again, a similarity will be found in the provision relating to waiting periods for benefits. Although the approach in the statutes differs, the effect is to limit these to three months.