

Inquiries of the Ministry

Mr. Lewis: I have a supplementary question. In view of the fact that the offers of Hanoi have been refused by Washington, and in view of the fact that the chances of ending the bombing of North Viet Nam appear to be smaller than ever, does the government not consider it necessary now to take some initiative at the Security Council to ensure that the first step is taken?

Mr. Pearson: The hon. gentleman speaks about the offers of Hanoi being refused. Perhaps it would be fair to add that the offers to Hanoi to negotiate this matter have been refused more often than the offers from them.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Right Hon. J. G. Diefenbaker (Prince Albert): Mr. Speaker, I have a question arising out of the reply given by the Prime Minister a few moments ago—with which, I may say, I am in agreement—as to Hanoi's rejection of the United States initiatives which would have led to the negotiation table. Would the Prime Minister consider, as the Canadian government has taken its stand in favour of the cessation of bombing by the United States, introducing a resolution in this house supporting the government's stand so it would be crystal clear, so far as Canada is concerned, that Canadians as a whole believe with U Thant that a cessation of bombing would lead to the negotiation table and bring about an end to the tragic danger of a third world war?

Mr. Pearson: Mr. Speaker, of course I would be very glad to consider the suggestion of the right hon. gentleman. I would only point out, as my first reaction, that any resolution of that kind to be effective and fair might have to deal with more matters than the actual cessation of bombing. But I would be glad to consider the matter.

Mr. Diefenbaker: If the Prime Minister would draft such a resolution—and it should be a joint resolution of the kind he suggests—I think the house generally would give support to it, and would thereby strengthen the position in this regard of the Canadian government.

ALLEGED DISTRIBUTION FROM CANADA OF
PAMPHLETS ADVOCATING ACTS OF
VIOLENCE

On the orders of the day:

Mr. A. B. Patterson (Fraser Valley): Mr. Speaker, I believe this question should be directed to the Solicitor General. I should like

[Mr. Pearson.]

to ask whether his department has had an opportunity to investigate the allegations that pamphlets advocating the fire bombing of United States draft offices, as well as other acts of violence, originated in Canada and were postmarked Toronto.

Hon. L. T. Pennell (Solicitor General): Mr. Speaker, a copy of this pamphlet has been forwarded to the Department of Justice for a legal opinion. In the meantime the investigation is continuing.

Hon. E. D. Fulton (Kamloops): I have a supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Some time ago I asked the Solicitor General whether an investigation was under way to establish whether persons in Canada were advocating the breaking of either Canadian or United States laws in connection with advice to draft dodgers. Is the minister in a position now to say whether that investigation is complete and whether any evidence of urging the breaking of Canadian or United States laws has been established?

Mr. Pennell: A summary examination of the material referred to by the hon. member did not disclose commission of a criminal offence. However, officials of the Department of Justice are studying it further for a more considered opinion.

FINANCE

INQUIRY AS TO NEW BOOK OF ESTIMATES

On the orders of the day:

Mr. A. D. Hales (Wellington South): I should like to address my question to the President of the Treasury Board. It arises out of an answer given yesterday when I inquired about the book of estimates. The minister said the printing of new estimates would cost \$50,000, whereas the existing estimates might be simply revised. I am wondering if this amount was correct, or whether there was an error.

Hon. E. J. Benson (President of the Treasury Board): I thank the hon. member for asking this question. As I informed him yesterday right after the question period, the correct amount should be \$15,000 rather than \$50,000. I apologize to the house for giving the wrong figure.

Mr. Hales: May I ask a supplementary question. May I ask the minister now when he proposes to table the revised estimates, and will there be a completely new book or will it simply be a revision?