

HOUSE OF COMMONS

Monday, May 2, 1966

The house met at 2.30 p.m.

[Translation]

FINANCE, TRADE AND ECONOMIC AFFAIRS

FIFTH REPORT OF STANDING COMMITTEE

Mr. H. E. Gray (Essex West) presented the fifth report of the standing committee on finance, trade and economic affairs, in both French and English.

[Note: Text of the foregoing report appears in today's Votes and Proceedings.]

[English]

HOUSE OF COMMONS

PRESENCE IN GALLERY OF MINISTER OF ECONOMIC PLANNING FOR INDIA

Hon. Mitchell Sharp (Minister of Finance): Mr. Speaker, may I call your attention and the attention of hon. members to the presence in the Speaker's gallery of the Minister of Economic Planning for the government of India, Mr. Ashoka Mehta.

● (2:40 p.m.)

COMMITTEES OF THE HOUSE

MOTIONS FOR CONCURRENCE IN REPORTS

On the order:

Mr. Cameron (High Park) (chairman of the standing committee on justice and legal affairs):

That the first report of the standing committee on justice and legal affairs, presented to the house on Tuesday, April 26, 1966, be now concurred in.

Mr. Stanbury: In the absence of the member for High Park may I ask that the motion in his name stand.

Mr. Speaker: Is it agreed?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

On the order:

Mr. Hales (chairman of the standing committee on public accounts):

That the first report of the standing committee on public accounts presented to the house on Wednesday, April 27, 1966, be now concurred in.

Mr. Hales: May I ask that this motion appearing in my name be allowed to stand.

Mr. Winch: May I ask why these motions are being allowed to stand? The public accounts committee is being called into session tomorrow. Twice now we have not been able to function because of a lack of a quorum. Why, after all these days, are we being asked to stand this motion?

[Translation]

BROADCASTING, FILMS AND ASSISTANCE TO THE ARTS

CONCURRENCE IN FOURTH REPORT OF STANDING COMMITTEE

Mr. Gérard Pelletier (Hochelaga) moved that the fourth report of the standing committee on broadcasting, films and assistance to the arts, presented to the house on Friday, April 29, 1966, be now concurred in.

Mr. Gilles Grégoire (Lapointe): Before the committee report is concurred in, I wish to point out that this committee is being required to sit this week at the same time as the house. Since the committee's mandate is a limited one, we have no objection.

I should like to take this opportunity to point out that an irregularity took place over the weekend. While a committee of the house has been set up to look into the matters relating to arts, broadcasting and films and this committee is now considering the matter concerning the program "This Hour Has Seven Days", as well as the renewal of the contract of Messrs. Watson and LaPierre, the Prime Minister (Mr. Pearson) has appointed a mediator between the parties concerned.

Therefore, it means that the Prime Minister is appointing someone to arbitrate a dispute already before a parliamentary committee. I wonder what part this parliamentary committee can play, since the Prime Minister has appointed another person to study and analyse the matter and report thereon. Is this not a typical example of contempt for parliamentary committees? If parliamentary committees were shown due respect, this committee would have been allowed to study the problems brought before it. Somebody is now appointed in addition to this committee, in order to perform exactly the same work. Such a situation is quite unusual and indicates utter contempt for the committee on broadcasting, films and assistance to the arts.