

Inquiries of the Ministry

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh.

Mr. Drury: Let me qualify that by adding, promises of that nature.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh.

Mr. Drury: This form is in the process of being reviewed at the present time and it is hoped that in the not too distant future the results of that review will be made known. I am unable to answer the question as to why so many employees have been asked to fill out this form without knowing either the names or specific instances in which this has been done in an apparently unrelated way. If the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre will furnish me with names on which I can check I will be very glad to do so.

Mr. R. Gordon L. Fairweather (Royal): I have a supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. I would ask the Minister of Defence Production whether the ideological beliefs of uncles and aunts are taken into consideration when security clearances are given for these employees.

Mr. Drury: Mr. Speaker, as this question regarding ideology relates more to security in general, perhaps the Minister of Justice might respond to it.

Hon. Lionel Chevrier (Minister of Justice): Mr. Speaker, I do not think the supplementary question deserves a reply—

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh.

An hon. Member: Arrogance, again.

Mr. Chevrier:—but in any event I would remind the hon. member that anything having to do with uncles and aunts in a particular case to which the hon. member has reference was in 1960 or 1961, long before this government ever took office.

Mr. Knowles: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. When this form is being reviewed, will regard be had to the human rights legislation in the provinces and to the Canadian Bill of Rights, so that questions regarding race will not be included?

Mr. Drury: Mr. Speaker, I think I can give the assurance that in this review all the appropriate legislation will be taken into account.

PENSIONS**QUEBEC—REPORTED LEGISLATION RESPECTING PORTABLE PENSIONS**

On the orders of the day:

Mr. R. Gordon L. Fairweather (Royal): Mr. Speaker, I wonder whether the Prime Minister would answer the question about portable

[Mr. Drury.]

pensions that I put to him yesterday, which he asked to take as notice, and which has now been given widespread newspaper publicity.

Right Hon. L. B. Pearson (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, I apologize to the hon. gentleman. I had hoped to discuss this matter with the minister in question but she is out of town. I will deal with it tomorrow.

LABOUR RELATIONS**NORRIS COMMISSION—INQUIRY AS TO REPORT**

On the orders of the day:

Hon. Michael Starr (Ontario): Mr. Speaker, I would like to address a question to the Minister of Labour and ask whether he has yet received the Norris inquiry commission report and, if so, is he able to table it?

Hon. A. J. MacEachen (Minister of Labour): Mr. Speaker, I have not received this report yet, and I regret that the information I gave my hon. friend last week turned out to be a bad forecast. The report has not been delivered, and it will be tabled at the earliest possible moment after it is delivered.

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE**REQUEST FOR APPOINTMENT OF STANDING COMMITTEES**

On the orders of the day:

Mr. Stanley Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Mr. Speaker, this time I am addressing my question to the Secretary of State. In view of the fact that this house has already referred a number of items to standing committees and in view of promises that have been made that other matters will be referred to standing committees, can the Secretary of State say when the standing committees of the house will be established?

Hon. J. W. Pickersgill (Secretary of State): It is my hope, Mr. Speaker, that it will be possible for the chief whip to convene a meeting of the striking committee on the first occasion the six members of that committee can find time to meet together for the purpose of settling the party quotients on the committees, and as soon after as names are supplied a motion will be made to establish the committees.

I regret, and I know the hon. member who asked the question regrets, the fact that the efforts made to reduce the size of these committees and make them more manageable, which were acceptable to three of the four parties in the house were not acceptable to the fourth. The committees would have been