

Inquiries of the Ministry

government was in power. My point of privilege was that it did not seem to me to be appropriate that persons who had violated the law should be appointed to certain positions. I referred to defeated candidates who had failed to file their expense returns. The Secretary of State supported my point of privilege and felt that these people, like other citizens, should obey the law.

In view of that fact I wonder if the Secretary of State would call to the attention of his colleague, the Postmaster General, sessional paper No. 1B, which the Secretary of State tabled on October 1, 1963, and which lists a number of people who failed to comply with the law by not filing their return. Because a number of these people are on the Postmaster General's list of consultants, would he not suggest they should be excluded from that list?

Hon. J. W. Pickersgill (Secretary of State): I think the hearing of the Postmaster General is just as good as mine.

Mr. Knowles: Why do we get this difference in attitude on the part of the Secretary of State when he is on that side of the house as compared with when he was on this side of the house?

REQUEST FOR INVESTIGATION INTO CHARGES OF PATRONAGE

On the orders of the day:

Mr. G. H. Aiken (Parry Sound-Muskoka): I should like to direct a question to the Prime Minister. In view of the various charges relating to the unusual patronage in the Post Office Department, will he look into the matter and inform the house whether there is such a policy of Liberal preference over a veteran's preference?

Mr. Speaker: I do not believe that question is in order. If the hon. member wishes to make a charge he should make it and not put a question in that form.

Mr. Aiken: On the point you have raised, Mr. Speaker, we have spent a good deal of time on questions of the Postmaster General, and if these charges are well founded surely the Prime Minister could clear it up. If they are unfounded, then he could tell us that there is no such patronage in the Post Office Department.

INDUSTRY

TRENTON, N.S.—REQUEST FOR ORDER FOR RAILWAY CARS

On the orders of the day:

Mr. H. Russell MacEwan (Pictou): I have a question for the Minister of Labour. In view of the extreme urgency and importance of

this matter to my constituents and to the whole area, may I ask the hon. gentleman whether he has received a communication from the annual clergy conference of the diocese of Antigonish held at East Bay, Cape Breton, requesting a railway car order for the Eastern Car plant at Trenton, Nova Scotia? If so, will the minister advise the house what action the government will take on this pressing matter.

Hon. A. J. MacEachen (Minister of Labour): I do not recall receiving any such communication, but I will check and let the hon. member know.

NOVA SCOTIA—ESTABLISHMENT OF HEAVY WATER PLANT

On the orders of the day:

Mr. Robert Muir (Cape Breton North and Victoria): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for either the Minister of Labour or the Prime Minister. Has the Prime Minister or the Minister of Labour received an urgent communication from a congress of the clergy of the diocese of Antigonish in reference to the location of a heavy water plant in Cape Breton?

Right Hon. L. B. Pearson (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, I will have to look into that. I have received a good many communications on this matter, but I am not sure whether this is among them.

ADMINISTRATION OF JUSTICE

REVIEW OF SECURITY PROCEDURES—INQUIRY AS TO RETROACTIVITY

On the orders of the day:

Mr. David Orlikow (Winnipeg North): I wish to address a question to the Prime Minister. Did the statement he made on Friday night with regard to security procedures apply to members of the armed forces as well as to those employed in government departments? If so, can people who have already been the subject of adverse decisions now ask for a review of their cases under the new regulations? I am thinking of the Petersen case.

Right Hon. L. B. Pearson (Prime Minister): The statement did apply to members of the armed forces, but it is my view that it would be undesirable to make this procedure retroactive. The cases which have been decided under the procedure which applied when the decisions were taken should be regarded as closed. To go back and reopen any particular case would involve, surely, the risk of having to reopen them all, and the situation in this respect might become altogether impossible.