

*The Address—Mr. Michaud*

**Some hon. Members:** Carry on.

**Mr. Deputy Speaker:** Is there unanimous consent?

**Some hon. Members:** Yes.

**Some hon. Members:** No.

**Mr. Deputy Speaker:** There does not seem to be unanimous consent.

**Mr. Denis:** You are afraid.

**Mr. Pigeon:** No, sir.

**Mr. Sevigny:** Mr. Speaker, I shall be delighted to answer the question the hon. member wishes to ask.

**Mr. Deputy Speaker:** As there now appears to be unanimous consent I would ask the hon. member for Vancouver East to ask the question.

**Mr. Winch:** In view of the remarks of the previous speaker I should like to ask him, in his position as Associate Minister of National Defence, whether there has been a decision on nuclear weapons in Canada or beyond.

**Mr. Sevigny:** Mr. Speaker, this question has been asked repeatedly by hon. members of the opposition during the last few days and before that. I have nothing to add to what has already been said on this matter by those to whom the questions have been directed.

**Mr. Winch:** No answer.

**Mr. Pigeon:** Ask Mr. Argue.

(Translation):

**Mr. H. J. Michaud (Kent, N.B.):** Mr. Speaker, it is with deep emotion that I rise today to pay tribute to the man who for 13 consecutive years represented my riding in this house, the late Senator Aurele D. Leger who passed on last December 28. No one knows more than I do how much he deserved the testimonies of appreciation and sympathy which have been given since his passing. Never did he fail to give me his wise advice when I sought his opinion. He was always a sincere friend to me and can never be replaced.

A loyal and convinced politician, the late Senator Leger will not be forgotten by the people of the riding of Kent whom he served generously for many years and by all those who knew him.

[Mr. Winch.]

In this respect, may I now quote a few lines from an article published on the day following his death in *L'Évangéline*, the national daily newspaper of the Acadians:

Senator Leger was actively concerned with the interests of his county. When he was a member, he dealt with all the problems submitted to him by his constituents.

He was a man of high standards who had only friends, even among his political opponents.

He took an active interest in all aspects of the Acadian cause and, in Ottawa, where he performed his task in a discrete and steadfast way, he was the spokesman of all the Acadian people.

Mr. Speaker, the crowd which attended Senator Leger to his last resting place on the day of his funeral, including many prominent citizens from all parts of the country, was a silent but moving tribute which showed the very high esteem in which the deceased was held.

In the name of the constituents of the county of Kent, in the name of his friends and in my own name, I offer our deepest feelings of sympathy to the widow and the family of the regretted Senator Aurele Leger. May God, who has called him back, reward him for the good he has done by granting him everlasting life.

Mr. Speaker, I should like to stress a point in the course of this debate: unemployment insurance for fishermen. In order, no doubt, to test public opinion on the matter, the merits of unemployment insurance allowances to our fishermen have been questioned for some time, as we have noticed.

I do not know what are the real motives behind this stand, but I say it would be unfair to attempt to deprive of this social security measure as deserving a sector of our population as that of our fishermen.

I also want to take violent exception to the other measure, concerning help to Newfoundland fishermen, which the government recently adopted, but neglected to apply to the fishermen of my own area, although they needed it more than anybody.

The fishermen of my constituency, in particular, had a very bad year in 1961. They could have taken advantage of a measure similar to the one adopted for Newfoundland fishermen. A bare majority of them were eligible to the benefits of the seasonal unemployment insurance plan. Consequently, you can imagine the plight of those fishermen at this time, if they did not get their insurance benefits.

On top of that, we should not now consider depriving them of the benefits of unemployment insurance. That would be a discriminatory measure toward those people