

place we can get the information, because it will not be in the estimates of the Department of National Defence this year.

Mr. CLAXTON: It will be covered by the defence estimates. I shall be ready to give full particulars to the committee when the defence estimates come up, and when I shall have the information available.

Mr. FRASER: But they will not be in the estimates, so far as that goes. And if they are, when we come to them there is a chance they might be passed over.

Mr. CLAXTON: They will be passed over only if some member of the opposition does not raise the question, because the defence estimates are couched in a form which permits any member to raise any question.

Mr. GREEN: We will remember that.

Mr. FRASER: But they might be passed over, and I still say they are not included in the estimates.

Mr. CLAXTON: They are provided for in the estimates. I assure my hon. friend they are provided for in the estimates; and I have said this three times.

Mr. FRASER: I say they are not mentioned in the estimates.

Mr. CLAXTON: In the form in which the estimates are made up, if my hon. friend will look at item 275.

Mr. FRASER: They are not in the details.

Mr. CLAXTON: That item covers everything.

Mr. FRASER: Has the minister given any contracts so far on this?

Mr. CLAXTON: No.

Mr. CRUICKSHANK: They cannot get the nails yet.

Mr. FRASER: If the government cannot get them, nobody else can. Certainly we cannot get them in our district. Will Central Housing be asked to consider building these places?

Mr. CLAXTON: Yes.

Mr. MACDONNELL (Muskoka-Ontario): I rise not for the purpose of offering a legal opinion, but for the purpose of offering a comment with respect to lawyers. My observation is that the best lawyers are the most ready, if there is a weakness in draftsmanship, to make a correction. I am going back to what was suggested by the hon. member for Vancouver South, because I suggest earnestly that nobody, however strongly he feels that

the present situation is valid, will suggest that it is the natural way of dealing with this situation. Surely the natural way is to put the powers clearly in section 4.

If I understood correctly the Minister of National Defence, he gave a quite different explanation of the way this was to act from the explanation given by the Minister of Finance; because, if I understood the Minister of National Defence correctly, he suggested that really it was individuals of the Canadian Commercial Corporation as such who were operating under the act.

Mr. CLAXTON: No, I never suggested that; I am sorry to make this correction. What I did say was that, pending the adoption of this bill, the Minister of Trade and Commerce had exercised functions previously exercised by the Minister of Reconstruction and Supply with regard to purchasing for the defence department, and that he had got officers and employees of the Canadian Commercial Corporation, acting in their individual and not in their corporate capacity, to do the job of calling for tenders for him.

Mr. MACDONNELL (Muskoka-Ontario): However that may be, I still suggest that the involved explanation as to how these powers find themselves entering by the back door in the Canadian Commercial Corporation Act could be entirely avoided if as was suggested by the hon. member for Vancouver South, an additional purpose were inserted in section 4. I think it would save a great deal of trouble in the future and would be the wise thing to do now.

Mr. CLAXTON: It is a long time since the hon. member for Muskoka-Ontario has actively practised law. But surely in his experience he would agree that it does not matter where you give power to a corporation in a statute creating it. You can do it in section 1, in section 4 or in section 17. It was considered that for the purposes of ease of draftsmanship and convenient reference it was preferable to put the powers with respect to the Department of National Defence in part II rather than in section 4.

Mr. DIEFENBAKER: Who considered that? When was that considered? Is the minister offering that as a serious answer?

Mr. CLAXTON: Of course, why should I not? It is a most sensible answer. There is nothing whatever in the suggestion that the powers of a corporation should all be gathered in a single section, whether it be section 4 or some other number. It happens, time after time, that powers of a corporation are put in