

Inquiries of the Ministry

ceedings and evidence No. 19 for Thursday, November 5, 1964, as follows—

Some hon. Members: Order.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. Is not the hon. member beginning to argue the case rather than ask a question?

Mr. Churchill: On the contrary, Mr. Speaker, I am not presenting an argument, unless you wish me to base my statement on a question of privilege, in that the minister has misled the house. I hope, sir, that you will permit me to read the four lines to which I have referred, which are representative of—

Some hon. Members: Order.

Mr. Churchill: —the so-called careful explanation, which the minister used—

An hon. Member: Put it on the order paper.

Mr. Churchill: —to brush aside my question on Thursday.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. Perhaps the hon. member would indicate the great urgency of this question, because I am unable to see the degree of urgency that would require a general statement from the minister at this time. Perhaps if the hon. member put his question on the order paper he would obtain the necessary details.

Mr. Churchill: Mr. Speaker, questions can stay on the order paper for months at a time.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh.

Mr. Churchill: Mr. Speaker, I point out to you that there is still a question on the order paper dated June 3, several others under dates in July and some under dates in August. Therefore, sir, I regretfully have to submit, on a question of privilege, that the Minister of National Defence misled the House of Commons on Thursday when he gave the answer which is to be found in *Hansard* at page 9994, in which he said that a careful explanation of the alterations to the Suttie commission recommendations was made by himself to the defence committee. I base my charge on the fact that the careful explanation amounted to only these words:

—in the interests of what we felt to be an even greater uniformity in the application of the standards across the country, some of the decisions had to be reversed and some were reversed in each direction. It was the application of our review that resulted in some different recommendations from those that had originally been put forward.

I submit that is not a careful explanation of why these changes were made, and that the minister was misleading the house on

[Mr. Churchill.]

Thursday in the answer he gave me on that occasion.

Mr. Hellyer: Mr. Speaker, in addition to the very brief statement just read there were a number of factors which had been listed as forming the judgments which were made in respect of various units, and most members of the committee on defence found them adequate to their comprehension.

Mr. Churchill: That, Mr. Speaker, is another misleading statement, because these units are not mentioned by name with the exception of two, the Irish of Toronto and the Irish Fusiliers.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh.

THE SENATE**INQUIRY AS TO REFORM MEASURES PROPOSED**

On the orders of the day:

Mr. D. M. Fisher (Port Arthur): Mr. Speaker, I should like to ask a non-contentious question of the Prime Minister which is prompted by two things; first, the wide reaction to his latest appointment to the other place, which I am sure he has noticed; and second, item No. 40 on the order paper regarding reform of the other place. I want to ask the Prime Minister when he intends to proceed with this reform and whether this is the limit of Senate reform at present intended by the government?

Right Hon. L. B. Pearson (Prime Minister): We will proceed with that motion just as quickly as possible, Mr. Speaker.

IMMIGRATION**INQUIRY AS TO REPORT ON CHANGES IN ACT AND REGULATIONS**

On the orders of the day:

Mr. Andrew Brewin (Greenwood): Mr. Speaker, I want to direct a question to the Minister of Citizenship and Immigration. Has the minister yet received a report from Mr. Joseph Sedgwick in regard to some matters affecting the department and the proposed changes in the regulations and the Immigration Act? If not, does he expect it soon?

[Translation]

Hon. René Tremblay (Minister of Citizenship and Immigration): Mr. Speaker, I have not yet received this report from Mr. Sedgwick but, as I indicated, I hope to have it before the end of this month.