

Census Debate Requested

An hon. Member: Why replace them?

Mr. Grégoire:—two days for the examination of the new commissioners; one day to choose a new commissioner; two days to send him the necessary literature and two days enable him to learn his work and to prepare himself. That makes a total of 13 days out of 20 days. There are 3 Saturdays, 3 Sundays and one holiday, May 21, the Queen's birthday.

This means that if we do not discuss it this very day, tomorrow will be too late, for there will not be time to replace all the commissioners. It is important, it is urgent and it must be done. They must be replaced, not by people selected through patronage by the Liberal organization, but since we are in the middle of the summer—

Mr. Sauv : What you are saying is false.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh.

Mr. Gr goire: You do not have to shout like that.

Mr. Sauv : It is false, you do not know what you are talking about.

Mr. Speaker: Order. May I suggest to the hon. member that he has stated his case quite comprehensively. I can hardly imagine what new arguments he could bring in support of his proposal and I call on other members who may wish to do so, to comment on the urgency of the debate.

Mr. Gr goire: Very well, Mr. Speaker; I have completed my remarks on this. I wanted to find a solution. I note that my remarks have been quite cogent and that it is now obvious a debate is necessary.

Hon. Th og ne Ricard (Saint-Hyacinthe-Bagot): Mr. Speaker, in view of all the explanations just given by the hon. member for Lapointe (Mr. Gr goire) I would suggest that we postpone consideration of his motion until the day after tomorrow.

[English]

Hon. G. J. McIlraith (Minister of Public Works): Mr. Speaker, I find it a little difficult to understand precisely the question sought to be raised.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh.

Mr. McIlraith: If I understood the rather lengthy argument advanced, it seemed to be a complaint that one of the census commissioners, having had a background of training that

would give him a thorough knowledge of the constituency, was thereby disbarred from doing this job that requires a thorough knowledge of the constituency. I have the greatest doubt that the matter raised could form the subject matter of a motion under standing order 26.

Mr. Starr: Why don't you appoint the Cr ditistes as a reward for voting for you?

Mr. McIlraith: In any event, the point I wish to raise now, and I will try to do it very briefly, is simply this. The type of motion that can be raised under standing order 26 must involve a matter that is of recent occurrence, and must be so urgent that the proceedings of the house should be halted so that it may be discussed. That is according to that part of citation 100 of Beauchesne's fourth edition, page 89, to be found at the bottom of the page.

As to the first point, about the matter being so urgent, the matter has been before the house for about one week now as will appear from question No. 1432 on today's order paper. There are other questions on this subject, indicating that it is not something that has just arisen today, suddenly.

The second point, to do with lack of urgency, is that there is other opportunity for discussing this. It is a matter that might better be discussed with the minister when his estimates are up for consideration. Those estimates, now before the committee, were referred to it on March 22. If this is a matter that the hon. member wishes to pursue, he might well pursue it there.

The subject matter the hon. member raises is not of a nature which should form the basis of a motion under standing order 26. Nor is there any urgency, within the meaning of the requirement for urgency of debate, under that order.

• (3:10 p.m.)

Mr. David Lewis (York South): I rise to support the suggestion that this matter should be placed before the house as one of urgency, requiring immediate debate.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh.

Mr. Lewis: About a week ago, say ten days ago, I questioned the Minister of Trade and Commerce on precisely this point. I respectfully suggest to hon. members opposite that we have reached a time in Canada when patronage of any sort is not a matter for cynical laughter, and that this house has a