

Mr. Koyer is being held in connection with crimes allegedly committed during the war when he served as a member of the non-communist underground home army. The investigation of his case by the Polish authorities is still continuing and no formal charges have yet been laid. The Polish authorities have allowed a representative of the Canadian embassy in Warsaw to interview Mr. Koyer, and defence lawyers have been retained by Mr. Koyer's family.

Mr. Koyer remains a Polish citizen in the eyes of the Polish authorities, as I stated the other day, and since he returned voluntarily, he has placed himself under the jurisdiction of that country's laws. For that reason there is little that the Canadian government can do to intercede effectively on Mr. Koyer's behalf beyond what has already been done. The government has taken a deep and continuing interest in this matter, and has strongly expressed its concern to the Polish authorities in a proper and appropriate manner.

AIRPORTS

BRITISH COLUMBIA—REPORTED REMARKS OF DEPARTMENTAL OFFICIALS

On the orders of the day:

Mr. H. W. Herridge (Kootenay West): Mr. Speaker, I wish to put a question to the Minister of Transport. Are Department of Transport officials Mr. G. E. McDowell and Mr. William Irvine, of Vancouver, announcing government policy when they state that the department favours the building of an airport at Creston and that the department would not continue to invest money in the development of the Castlegar and Cranbrook airports?

Hon. Leon Balcer (Minister of Transport): Mr. Speaker, press reports from local papers in the Kootenay area relating to the subject matter of the hon. member's question have just reached headquarters, and since these do not appear to conform with our understanding of the position we are seeking further information from the Vancouver region as to these reports. As soon as the position has been clarified I will be glad to communicate with the hon. member and also with the hon. member for Kootenay East, who has also been in touch with my department regarding this matter.

UNITED NATIONS

CONGO—REQUEST FOR STATEMENT ON FINANCING OPERATIONS

On the orders of the day:

Mr. J. W. Kucherepa (High Park): Will the Prime Minister comment on the editorial in

Maintenance of Railway Operation Act

the *Montreal Gazette* which deals with the attitude of the Soviet union toward the question of financing the operations of the United Nations in the Congo, and indicate the Canadian attitude?

Right Hon. J. G. Diefenbaker (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, Canada believes, and that has always been its attitude, that the principle of collective responsibility for the decisions of the United Nations must be maintained, and that once a decision is made in the security council or the general assembly to undertake a course of action, then all members must be prepared to provide a fair share of the cost.

In so far as the Congo operations are concerned, when I spoke at the United Nations in September I stated that Canada would assume its equitable share of the burden, and I think it should be accepted as a principle of the organization that if collective responsibility were not maintained and if members were allowed to pick and choose the items that they wish to pay for, then, in the nature of things, the United Nations would cease to operate effectively.

MAINTENANCE OF RAILWAY OPERATION ACT

PROVISION FOR CONTINUANCE OF RAILWAY OPERATIONS

The house resumed, from Wednesday, November 30, consideration of the motion of Mr. Starr for the second reading of Bill No. C-45, to provide for the continuation of the operation of railways, and the amendment of Mr. Pearson.

Right Hon. J. G. Diefenbaker (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, I do not intend to speak at any length this afternoon, as I know the house and the country are most anxious that this debate be brought to an early conclusion, to the end that the decision of parliament thereon may be taken in ample time before the hour fixed for the calling of the strike.

Before I deal with one or two matters which I feel I should deal with, I want to refer merely in passing to some words that passed between the hon. member for Laurier and myself yesterday afternoon. I was speaking without notes and without any record before me, and I mentioned the question of subsidies. The hon. member for Laurier is reported at page 359 of *Hansard* to have said as follows:

On a question of privilege, Mr. Speaker, neither the member for Laurier nor anyone else on this side of the house has at any time during the course of this debate, either directly or by way of inference in a question, suggested that there should be a subsidy.