

Interim Supply

in a matter of two days, a task beyond any probability of achievement. This is one more example of the degree to which a great majority will abdicate from parliamentary procedure in the interests of a strong and powerful cabinet.

I am not going into particulars, because I do not intend to speak at length; but even at this session we have been denied over and over again information to which the Canadian people are entitled. Sometimes with a smirk, sometimes with a smile of triumph, ministers look upon our right to ask for information to which the Canadian people are entitled as though we are under their control when they decide it is not in their interests to reveal this information. I say again what I said a few moments ago, that one has only to read the debates in parliament during the days of Laurier, Borden, Meighen, Bennett and King to see how far parliament has departed from its traditional role and has become merely a puppet in the hands of a cabinet which today vouchsafes to parliament such information as, in its magnanimity, it desires to give.

A moment ago, sir, I mentioned some of the matters connected with pensions which should have been brought before the house. We believe that many of our senior citizens, who today are dependent upon old age security payments, are suffering untold hardships as a result of the increased cost of living. We believe the Canadian people as a whole demand that there be reasonable and proper increases; that the amount of the proposed increases does not meet the situation in any way, and does not meet the aroused conscience of the Canadian people. In saying that, I must add that I do not believe in promising tremendous increases such as have been suggested, of \$35 per month. I do believe that the government of Saskatchewan, in its wisdom, placed a limitation on what old age pensions might reasonably become when they stated they were prepared to make the necessary contributions to raise old age assistance payments to \$60 per month.

I will say, too, that the Disabled Persons Act needs to be reviewed. The interpretation of the qualifications under the regulations needs to be reconsidered. I know recent changes have been made or recommended, but I believe many hundreds, if not thousands, of citizens of this country who should be entitled to receive disabled pensions are being denied them today because of the degree to which the regulations have changed the qualifications which parliament intended should exist. The question of pensions will be further dealt with by my hon. friends, and I am not making extended reference to

it. The same thing applies to war veterans pensions. The war veterans allowance should have been extended to provide for payments to those who, in the first great war, served for a period of at least one year in England. This recommendation was made by the Canadian Legion, and I think Canadians as a whole would have accepted with pleasure an increase to that extent.

I come now to one other matter dealing with national development. We are coming to the end of the session. Some slight changes were made in the general taxation situation in this country, but nothing has been done to remove the inequities and unfairness that today prevail, which give to United States people coming into Canada to engage in extractive industry an advantage over Canadian investors. Over and over again we have asked for action in that connection.

I am not going into particulars today concerning the extent to which some of our great extractive industries are becoming more and more the property of United States citizens. We have welcomed, and intend to welcome, foreign investment in this country. We believe, however, that foreign investment should not enjoy a taxation advantage over Canadians. If we allow an advantage to United States business over Canadians in this regard, we turn over to a foreign country the control of our vast resources which are so necessary to the world today. Our vast mineral resources, our oil resources and those things without which freedom cannot march have come and are coming, as a result of the policy of this government, under the control of another country.

We believe in foreign investment, but we also believe that investment in Canada should provide for Canadian considerations first.

We have had an example of that in the last few days. For the last several years we have been saying that Canada should take a firm stand in regard to the intrusion of the United States into Canadian affairs. I am not going to deal with the Norman case in that connection, but I point out that in 1951, when the allegations were first made by the subcommittee of the Senate of the United States, instead of the Canadian government standing up and asking for proof rather than suspicion it took the action of transferring Mr. Norman from the United Nations in New York to far-off New Zealand. That was not the course of courage; that was not the course that should have been taken, if the United States committee was to be made to realize that Canadians believe that the responsibility of looking after Canadians and their interests is for Canadians alone.

I mentioned those tax laws. Why they are not changed I cannot understand. They are