

of the government to have the Divorce Act proclaimed and in force as soon as this can be done. However, in any event this cannot be before May 2 in view of section 27 of the act. There are a number of matters that have to be dealt with, including the ironing out of these rules and the establishment of exchequer courts where required. These matters are well in hand and we are very optimistic that we will be able to proclaim the act as soon as possible.

Mr. Bell (Carleton): Is the minister indicating that the government expects to be able to proclaim the act on May 2?

Mr. Trudeau: I am indicating that this is the date we are aiming for. I cannot, of course, promise that it will be absolutely fulfilled on that date. The law is out of our hands now, and it really depends on whether the chief justices can work out rules to ensure sufficient uniformity within that time. As I say, we are quite optimistic about it.

LABOUR CONDITIONS

NORTH SYDNEY, N.S.—REQUEST FOR ASSISTANCE FOR DOCK WORKERS

On the orders of the day:

Mr. Robert Muir (Cape Breton North and Victoria): My question is for the Prime Minister. Some days ago I asked what the government proposes to do about the large scale lay-off of dock workers at the port of North Sydney. I also asked him to make a statement on government policy indicating what will be done to assist those who will be affected. May I ask if he or the Minister of Manpower and Immigration is in a position to make a statement now? The reason I am raising this matter is that we may be leaving here shortly, and who knows if we shall return.

Right Hon. L. B. Pearson (Prime Minister): I might be able to make that statement, or perhaps the minister concerned will make it tomorrow. I think we shall be here tomorrow, Mr. Speaker.

EXTERNAL AFFAIRS

VIET NAM—INQUIRY AS TO CANADIAN EFFORTS TO END WAR

On the orders of the day:

Right Hon. J. G. Diefenbaker (Prince Albert): Thirteen days ago I asked the Prime Minister about representations made to the

Inquiries of the Ministry
United States relative to the cessation of bombing. I also placed before him the suggestion that to give support, sinew and muscle to the government's views, this house might consider a resolution respecting the cessation of bombing.

Can the Prime Minister now say whether the government has given these suggestions consideration? Also, when replying, will he say what if any advance has been made in achieving that objective as the result of representations to the Department of State of the United States?

Right Hon. L. B. Pearson (Prime Minister): As to the latter part of the question, I cannot say that any advance has been made in recent weeks in bringing about the cessation of bombing of the north. So far as a resolution of the house is concerned, I have given serious consideration to its possibility and, indeed, its desirability. It seems to me that if a resolution were to be of value it ought to be carried virtually unanimously by the house. It seems to me also, from the parliamentary discussions that have taken place on this matter in this last week or two, that a resolution of an effective kind would not get such unanimity; and if there were division on the type of resolution put forward I should think more harm than good would be done.

Mr. Diefenbaker: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Is the Prime Minister suggesting that he does not think the country as a whole agrees with the stand taken by his government?

Mr. Pearson: No, Mr. Speaker, but I suggest the right hon. gentleman should read some of the discussions that took place in the house in the external affairs debate.

Mr. T. C. Douglas (Burnaby-Coquitlam): A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Would the Prime Minister consider the possibility of having either the house leader or the parliamentary committee on external affairs draft a resolution that would win almost unanimous acceptance?

Mr. Pearson: I would be glad to take that up with the house leader and he will probably get in touch with the other house leaders. If that could be done in an effective way I should be very much in favour of it; but I would not be in favour of a resolution which would underline division rather than unity in the house.