

Inquiries of the Ministry

Gazette, which I understand will appear on Friday or Saturday. I would hope that the house might be adjourned before that time, but speaking generally I may say that the position of revenues and expenditures continues to be satisfactory.

Mr. Macdonnell (Greenwood): Would the minister state whether the figures are made up on the same basis as they were a year ago, or whether any different principle is used? It might be useful to the public to have that information in calculating the size of the surplus.

Mr. Abbott: I think I indicated when my hon. friend asked me a question some time ago that we are endeavouring to pro-rate in the figures this year some charges such as annual debt charges, contributions to the superannuation fund and so on, which are paid intermittently through the year. However, similar adjustments will be made with respect to last year's figures so that a comparison of this year's figures with last year's figures will be a comparison of like with like.

IRRIGATION

**SOUTH SASKATCHEWAN RIVER COMMISSION—
REQUEST FOR PUBLIC HEARINGS**

On the orders of the day:

Mr. J. G. Diefenbaker (Lake Centre): Mr. Speaker, I should like to direct a question to the Prime Minister and I will preface my question in the same way as did the leader of the Social Credit group. Some discussion took place the other night with regard to the South Saskatchewan river dam and irrigation project. Since that time I have received three or four communications from municipal authorities in central Saskatchewan asking whether the government would direct the commission to hold public meetings before a decision is arrived at so that full representations might be made as to the necessity and the feasibility of that project.

These municipal authorities have had no opportunity to make representations and they feel they should be entitled to do so. Would the Prime Minister, on behalf of the government, direct that public hearings be held so that a full presentation of the situation from their point of view may be made to the commission?

Right Hon. L. S. St. Laurent (Prime Minister): I would not like to undertake to give any directions to the commission in view of what I understand to be the facts. I will bring to their attention the remarks the hon. gentleman has made this morning, but I think these municipalities would be well advised to channel their requests through the

provincial government of Saskatchewan to which I understand the commission has given an undertaking that if they wanted public hearings, public hearings would be arranged. I will bring the hon. gentleman's remarks to the attention of the commission together with the reply that I am making, and I think it might be in the interests of the municipal authorities who wish to have a public hearing to make that fact known to the government of Saskatchewan which I am sure will be disposed to do whatever would appear to be in the general interest of those making the representations.

CANADIAN PEACE CONGRESS

ACTIVITIES OF DR. ENDICOTT AND ASSOCIATES

On the orders of the day:

Mr. George A. Drew (Leader of the Opposition): I wish to refer to one subject which has been before the house at different times, and which it seems to me appropriate should be raised again in view of the fact that all members probably have seen the further distribution of material from the so-called Canadian peace congress. On June 25 the Minister of Justice, in response to questions that had been asked by the hon. member for Lake Centre on different occasions earlier in the session, gave an explanation as to the position of the government in connection with the possibility of prosecuting a man named Endicott. The question that had been asked on a number of occasions was whether the Department of Justice had reached a decision with respect to whether Endicott's actions constituted a breach under the Criminal Code either in its original form or in the form as amended last session.

I am prompted to direct the attention of the government to the explanation that was given in view of the further activities of this organization. In explaining the reason why the government had decided not to prosecute Endicott the Minister of Justice said that it might give publicity and might give Endicott and others the appearance of martyrs. He said it probably would not embarrass the communists if Endicott were prosecuted. Then he went on to explain that the freedom of speech which we all cherish and are all seeking to preserve, and which is being abused by Endicott and others associated with him, should be protected and held inviolate. That sounds like a very desirable course to follow but, Mr. Speaker, I suggest there is one aspect of this problem that has not been touched upon in any explanation given by the Minister of Justice. The Minister of Justice, neither on the 25th nor again on the 27th of June when he referred to this matter,