Inquiries of the Ministry

be referred to the committee on broadcasting, films and assistance to the arts.

Hon. Judy V. LaMarsh (Secretary of State): That is really a matter for the leader of the house. I understand that for some weeks he has been exploring, with members opposite, the possibility of having it referred to the committee without the necessity of debating the motion, but he cannot get any co-operation from that side.

[Translation]

BRIDGES

CHAMPLAIN BRIDGE, MONTREAL—REQUEST FOR REMOVAL OF TOLLS

On the orders of the day:

Mr. Maurice Allard (Sherbrooke): Mr. Speaker, I should like to put a question to the hon. Minister of Transport (Mr. Pickersgill) further to the question I put to him last week on the temporary removal of tolls on Champlain bridge.

Has the hon. minister had the opportunity to check the assumptions arising out of my question; would he agree to make a favourable recommendation to the National Harbours Board?

[English]

Hon. J. W. Pickersgill (Minister of Transport): I am very happy to say that the work on the Jacques Cartier bridge was completed this morning, and that it is therefore unnecessary for me to study the question further.

FINANCE

MANNER OF SEEKING LEGAL OPINION RE-SPECTING SUPPLY ALLOCATIONS

On the orders of the day:

Mr. D. V. Pugh (Okanagan Boundary): My question is directed to the Minister of National Revenue. When the house was considering motions, the minister tabled a legal opinion. My question is: Was the request for this legal opinion made by the minister in writing or was it made orally.

Hon. E. J. Benson (Minister of National Revenue and President of the Treasury Board): As I indicated yesterday in the house, the legal opinion was both requested and obtained orally, first of all. At the same time as it was obtained orally a request was made that it be put into writing. This was done, and I have tabled the reply.

Mr. Pugh: The minister has tabled the reply. Would he consider tabling the written request?

[Mr. Fairweather.]

Mr. Benson: As I have indicated, there was no written request made. My deputy minister, the secretary of the Treasury Board, telephoned and asked for an opinion on Thursday morning. As indicated in the letter, the opinion was given to him orally. Then he asked that it be transcribed into writing, and I have tabled that opinion in writing.

FARM MACHINERY

REPLIES FROM COMPANIES RESPECTING PRICE INCREASE

On the orders of the day:

Mr. C. S. Smallwood (Battle River-Camrose): I have a question for the Minister of Agriculture. I wish to assure him and the Prime Minister that I am not trying to embarrass the government with regard to the price of farm machinery.

An hon. Member: Oh, oh.

Mr. Smallwood: Oh, quiet, Hubert.

Mr. Speaker: Will the hon. member kindly ask his question?

Mr. Smallwood: Yes, if those yahoos would keep quiet, and I could get a chance.

As hon. members may know, the price of farm machinery is being increased by 5 per cent as of November 1. The Prime Minister told us yesterday that he will take this matter up, and I should like to know what action the minister intends to take to protect the farmers of Canada against this increase.

Hon. J. J. Greene (Minister of Agriculture): I have no doubt that the hon. member is not seeking to embarrass the government and I am therefore pleased to tell him that I have written to all the machinery companies and have now received replies, I think from all of them, with respect to the increase. I shall be considering those replies and taking any action which I feel it is possible to take under our legislative authority very shortly.

Right Hon. J. G. Diefenbaker (Leader of the Opposition): Would the minister tell us whether in those replies it was revealed that the percentage of increase imposed by the various implement companies was the same and, if so, is consideration being given to an investigation under the Combines Investigation Act to see whether the Canadian people, and in particular the farmers, will be mulcted as a result of this increase?

9904