

Supply—Finance

It precludes however expensive Canadian equipment being sent abroad and then being admitted duty free. If one piece of equipment is so much as bolted on to a United States component the full duty is charged on the Canadian equipment when it is returned to Canada. I gave an example. I said that in Canada we are making front end loaders to be mounted on tractors. The tractors are admitted free to Canada but if the front end loader is sent to the United States for one-third of the business, the Canadian buyer has to pay \$133 duty on each unit coming into Canada. There would be a duty on the Canadian made part of the unit but not on the United States made tractor.

The Deputy Chairman: I am sorry to interrupt the hon. member but his time has expired.

An hon. Member: Do go on.

The Deputy Chairman: Is it the wish of the committee that by unanimous consent the hon. member be allowed to continue?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Mr. McMillan: It occurred to me that if suitable arrangements could be made it would save Canadian buyers \$133 per unit, it would help Canadian business in the United States to the extent of \$1½ million a year, it would help secondary industry, particularly steel; and it would give employment to some 40 men. I would therefore appeal to the minister to keep this matter in mind if and when he prepares his next budget.

Mr. Chevrier: There is one matter which I can dispose of briefly if I could have the attention of the committee. It has to do with the statement made by the Prime Minister yesterday and it has to do, also, with a matter which falls under the jurisdiction of the Minister of Finance. Yesterday, prior to the announcement of business for the next day, the Prime Minister entered the house and in dealing with an item on the order paper, namely, an amendment to Bill No. C-72, an act to amend the Customs Tariff, he had this to say as reported at page 9022 of *Hansard*. Referring to the bill he said "they"—meaning the opposition and the Liberals in the Senate—

—must accept the blame for the thousands of jobs which, because of the action they have taken, will remain uncreated.

I wish to say that this statement is not only ridiculous but it is inaccurate and it is untrue. I think it can easily be refuted. In the first place, it can be refuted by the fact that if the Prime Minister and those associated with him were so anxious to have this

[Mr. McMillan.]

matter go through, and if it was as important as they indicated it was, the government would not have dawdled over this measure from the month of November until the month of April before getting the bill through the house. If the committee wants to have the chronology I can put it on the record, because I have it here and can substantiate what I am saying. There is no doubt that this measure was delayed for weeks and months—

An hon. Member: By the opposition.

Mr. Chevrier:—so it ill becomes anyone, particularly the Prime Minister, to make such a statement as he made yesterday.

If the government really believes that this measure would have provided so much employment, they should have agreed to the conference which was suggested by the Senate and which would have brought the bill into operation a long time ago. Moreover, if this bill means all the jobs which the Prime Minister has in mind, why did he not call the Senate and the house together? Why did he not do that before he made the announcement yesterday and ask them either to amend the measure or come to some understanding with reference to this so called important legislation which was to provide so much employment for the people of Canada? The right hon. gentleman did not do that because, I am convinced, the statement he made was inaccurate. This bill will not provide jobs on that scale, or any jobs for that matter. The real point is that the government realizes it has made an awful boob and is glad the Senate has taken them off the hook.

Mr. Benidickson: We are dealing still with the first item in the minister's estimates. I regret it, but I feel obliged to direct the attention of the committee to a question which was raised by one of our new members, the hon. member for Niagara Falls. The question is reported in *Hansard* on July 12, 1961. It is No. 452 and it relates to personal staff in ministers' offices.

In days gone by the Minister of Finance was a great one for talking about economy and saving the taxpayers' money. I am just an ordinary fellow here, though, of course, I was in the office of the minister of finance at one time. However, in order to get acquainted with our senior officials in the ministers' offices I still use what all of us use, namely, the telephone book. The last telephone book I know of put out in the time of the former administration is a red book dated April, 1957. I have the complete list. I see the Secretary of State for External Affairs here. Apparently he has been given a