

Concurrence in Committee Report

Mr. Howard:—but the fact of the matter is, and I say it to the chairman of the committee, that he has told in this house a number of falsehoods in respect of my activities on that committee, and I am refuting those by reciting what occurred.

May I say that one of the major reasons there is not now a conflict between the membership of the northern affairs committee and the membership of the Indian affairs committee is that as of last Wednesday there were only six members of the northern affairs committee who were also on the Indian affairs committee. The conflict come about because the chairman of the committee is also the chairman of the immigration committee and is far more concerned with people coming from other countries than he is with our Indian people here.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. The hon. member is not at the moment, in my estimation, dealing with a question of privilege. He is obviously refuting the allegations, alleged to be wrong, made against him, and I am wondering whether this is proper debate. Allegations were made by the hon. member for Timiskaming against the hon. member for Kenora-Rainy River, and allegations were made about the hon. member for Skeena which he is trying to answer now. This might lead to a rather protracted debate.

Mr. Howard: I would just wind up my question of privilege by pointing out, Mr. Speaker, that it is obviously partisanship, because everybody who spoke on this side of the house agreed with the points I was making.

Mr. Roxburgh: I rise on a point of privilege, please, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: Order. I will first rule that there was no obvious or apparent question of privilege in what was raised by the hon. member for Skeena. I will now hear a second question of privilege raised by the hon. member.

Mr. Roxburgh: Mr. Speaker, as deputy chairman of the committee I have listened to what has been said, and had absolutely no intention whatsoever of taking part in the debate, because this is exactly what it has turned out to be. But the last statement made by the hon. member for Skeena is, I think, absolutely incorrect, because he knows that the hon. members on this side of the house, and he has also already mentioned—

[Mr. Howard.]

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. I hesitate to interrupt the hon. member—

Mr. Roxburgh: Mr. Speaker, I will now talk about myself personally. The hon. member for Skeena has also mentioned my name, and that is the reason I have risen. I, along with other hon. members on this side of the house, have been and am as keenly interested in the Indian people as any hon. member on the other side of the house. There has been possibly a certain amount of misunderstanding on a number of occasions. But as far as the over-all picture is concerned, I just wanted to say that when he makes the statement about hon. members on this side of the house, he is absolutely wrong. I just wanted to clarify that matter. I am sure if he is the gentleman I expect he is, he will acknowledge that fact.

Mr. Howard: I wonder, Mr. Speaker—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. I hope the contribution of the hon. member for Norfolk has closed the debate and that we can now go on to another matter. Is it the pleasure of the house to adopt the said motion?

Motion agreed to.

QUESTIONS

(Questions answered orally are indicated by an asterisk.)

REFUNDS OF OVERPAYMENTS UNDER PENSION PLAN

Question No. 1,781—**Mr. Stanbury:**

1. Has the government assessed the proposals made to it on June 22, 1966, by major Canadian trade associations regarding overpaid employer contributions under the Canada Pension Plan?

2. Have all these proposals or any of them been found to be feasible, and, if not, for what reasons?

Hon. E. J. Benson (Minister of National Revenue and President of the Treasury Board): 1 and 2. The proposals made at the meeting of June 22, 1966, by Canadian trade associations did not relate to the interpretation of the provisions of the Canada Pension Plan but rather to the effect of their application as presently enacted. The implementation of any of these proposals would require amendments to the Canada Pension Plan as passed by parliament and, therefore, if considered in the public interest, will be introduced in the usual manner at the appropriate time.