

which has been guarded so carefully and, I believe, properly so in the past, I have to say that I cannot find it comes within the parameters of privilege or contempt. The hon. member will therefore have to pursue whatever other remedies may be available to her in the circumstances.

● (1512)

MR. LAWRENCE—ANSWERS GIVEN BY A MINISTER OF THE CROWN

Mr. Allan Lawrence (Northumberland-Durham): Mr. Speaker, just before the one o'clock deadline I gave Your Honour what I hope was valid notice that I wished to raise a question of privilege this afternoon relating to answers and correspondence given to me by a minister of the Crown which were very clearly misleading, which were misleading to a constituent of mine, and which very vitally affected later oral questions in this House to a minister of the Crown. Because I am still having research done for me and I intend to document matters a little better than I have already—some of this information just reached me this morning—I wonder if I could reserve my right to raise this as a question of privilege at a later date.

MR. DIEFENBAKER—BUREAUCRATIC USE OF SOCIAL INSURANCE NUMBERS

Right Hon. J. G. Diefenbaker (Prince Albert): Mr. Speaker, what I have in mind arises out of the discussions which have taken place here today in connection with social security numbers. I have been one who, through the years, has refused to accept the old age pension, and I have consistently followed that course. If I had taken the old age pension I would have had to accept a social security number. That was not the reason I did not accept the old age pension but, nonetheless, it is a fact.

Now we find in connection with investments by Canadians that social security numbers are being demanded. I have investments in bonds and the like, and I received notice the other day that my social security number must be produced and that, if it is not produced, the amount of interest accruing to me would be reduced by 25 per cent.

Some hon. Members: Shame!

Mr. Diefenbaker: If that is not an interference with the privileges not only of members of parliament but of people in Canada generally, I do not know what is. The Canadian people want to invest. They want to join with the government in its request and crusade for increased assistance through bonds, and I would like Your Honour to look into this question.

If ever there was a form of intimidation being practised in order to achieve acceptance of the social security number, which for some reason has become almost a pilgrimage for some departments, this is one. I have a right to determine whether I want to have a social security number. No government institution has the right to tell me that, if I do not do what a bureaucrat says, I am going to lose 25 per cent of my

interest. I hope Your Honour will look into that whole question.

Mr. Speaker: The right hon. member for Prince Albert (Mr. Diefenbaker) raises this matter by way of a question of privilege arising out of some answers which were given in the House today. I do not undertake at the moment to set the matter aside on procedural grounds in a definite way, although I am sure the right hon. member recognizes that there would be severe difficulty in bringing this in as a procedural question. However, I am sure the minister responsible for this program will want to take into account the intervention of the right hon. member, and perhaps make a response. That minister will likely want to do that at the earliest possible occasion, and I will wait for that before I make a final determination on procedural grounds.

* * *

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE

WEEKLY STATEMENT

Mr. Baker (Grenville-Carleton): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Deputy Prime Minister (Mr. MacEachen) with respect to the legislative program for the week. While he is dealing with that I wonder if he would designate Wednesday, November 8, as an allotted day. Perhaps he could advise me whether the schedule I have sent him as a proposal is satisfactory for a set of allotted days, given the problems the government may have with respect to the budget and a number of other things.

Mr. MacEachen: Mr. Speaker, in reply to the hon. member, the business for the House today, as is well known, will be the continuation of the second reading debate on the bill increasing benefits to the children of families in Canada, followed by the health resources fund measure, and then followed by amendments to the Unemployment Insurance Act which will, I hope, be given first reading today. I have already had some discussions with hon. members of all parties with respect to how we might deal with several other bills, including the CALURA bill, the Canada-France trade agreement bill and the independence of parliament bill, and when the discussions are completed it will be possible to say when we will deal with these bills.

In the meantime, I am happy to confirm that the dates suggested by the hon. member for Grenville-Carleton (Mr. Baker) with respect to allotted days are generally satisfactory. Perhaps we will have to change some of them, but certainly the first day, Wednesday, is satisfactory, and I designate next Wednesday as the first allotted day.

Mr. Baker (Grenville-Carleton): Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the Deputy Prime Minister can tell the House when he expects to bring in the supplementary estimates, which are expected fairly soon, and whether there has been any conclusion reached by the government as to the appropriate day for a budget.