

*Combines Investigation Act*

end the threat of an offending growth in the body. On the contrary the established practice, as the Minister of National Revenue so well knows from his own experience, is to use medical experience and surgical skill to remove the growth which is causing concern. I suggest that what is being done here is an attempt to cure a growth, to which there is certainly objection if it is injuring the body of our national life; but the answer is not to shoot the patient, which is what is recommended in this bill.

We are suggesting that the more commonly accepted practice be employed, and that there be an opportunity to examine this problem from the point of view of the general welfare of our people. I know it will be said that there was a commission on this subject some years ago, and there was a committee. It will be pointed out that we now have the MacQuarrie committee, and also that a committee of the house was appointed to examine the report of that MacQuarrie committee. All the results of these investigations are before us, and we have the advantage of their recommendation. I hope that, at this stage of the session and at this stage of the discussion, no hon. member of this house including the minister who is putting this measure forward will suggest that there has been complete, adequate and impartial inquiry into the facts. In his brief remarks today concerning this measure the Prime Minister (Mr. St. Laurent) said he thought we should await a further report of the MacQuarrie committee before adopting other legislation, but that in the meantime section 498A could be employed to deal with any abuses that might occur.

I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that what the Prime Minister has pointed out is that there was only an interim report, and that the interim report was examined by a hobbled committee. The hobbled committee brought in the report which it was directed to bring in, and we have before us now no real evidence on which to form an opinion as to what should be done in the interests of the people of Canada. It is the people of Canada whose welfare is under consideration in this case. We have been urging that this measure should stand. We introduced a motion that would call for six months' delay in the consideration of this measure. I am still convinced that would be the wisest course, and I am satisfied there are a great many hon. members on the other side of the house who are satisfied that would be the wisest course. I would point out that we have had speeches by Liberal members, and that three of those

speeches indicated real opposition to the provisions in this bill. I grant that there have not been as many speeches from the Liberal ranks as might have appeared appropriate in relation to a measure as important as this.

I heard some discussion about the number of speeches that had been made, as though there was some ground for criticism in that fact. Some emphasis was placed upon the number of Conservative members who have spoken in this debate. Mr. Speaker, this is parliament. The word itself indicates what this is supposed to be. The word is derived from the French *parler*, to speak. This is a place where members are supposed to express their opinions in the hope that others might be persuaded to change their views, and to come to a conclusion which will be related to a genuine exchange of ideas. The moment it becomes an accepted proposition that opinions are not changed by arguments in this house we might just as well stop having members come here; simply put a dummy in each chair, with a particular colour to identify the party to which he belongs; then just have one person, representative of each party, who on each particular occasion will indicate how the dummies will be called upon to express their votes in relation to any measure that is before the house. That is, in effect, what we say the moment it is even suggested that speeches are not desirable in this house and that no opinions are changed by the speeches that are made.

This is not intended to be a chamber of silence. This is intended to be a place where the business of the country is done by informal and free debate about the merits of the various measures that are introduced. It would be a great deal better if we had heard from most of the Liberal members, because this is something that affects every community; it affects every part of this vast country. But I would point out that by far the most effective speeches made by the Liberal members, including that of the minister who introduced the measure, were the three speeches made in opposition to this bill. There was the speech of the hon. member for St. James (Mr. Beaudry) who coined an expression which on this day, getting close to Christmas, I shall not repeat—at least not today. Then there was that of the hon. member for Comox-Alberni (Mr. Gibson) and that of the junior member for Halifax (Mr. Balcom) who indicated quite clearly why he did not think this was a good measure. But there have been only a few speeches from other Liberal members in regard to this subject. However, Mr. Speaker, those speeches which were made—