

Now, who is to supply that information and what are reasonable grounds? Again we will have the confusion and uncertainty as to opinions for and against. What one individual may consider hate propaganda, another may consider to be just and proper comment.

The honourable senator who introduced this bill, Senator Roebuck, and his colleague Senator Croll who seconded it, and other honourable members who have spoken in favour of the bill, have not given one single case or incident of a happening in Canada that would make it necessary for the introduction of this far-reaching and objectionable bill, No. S-49. There have been references to the lunatic fringe, hatemongers, crackpots and words to that effect, and references have been made to individuals; but, I repeat, there have been no instances in the slightest degree to show why it is necessary to have a bill of this type. If these things exist in Canada, I for one would like to have the particulars and full information about them. In the meantime, I suggest that this house should be most careful and cautious in giving approval to this bill which, as I said before, in my opinion is an insult to Canadians.

If this bill passes, it certainly will not improve the good name of Canada in other countries. As I stated in my opening remarks, I am opposed to the bill and I sincerely hope that it will not receive second reading.

**Hon. Mr. Belisle:** Honourable senators, before the debate is adjourned, might I be permitted to ask a question of the honourable Leader of the Government? Will it be possible to speak to this bill if and when it returns from committee?

**Hon. Mr. Connolly (Ottawa West):** You can always speak on third reading.

**Hon. Mr. Belisle:** Will it be possible?

**Hon. Mr. Connolly (Ottawa West):** Certainly.

**Hon. Mr. Belisle:** I would like to wait, because I am one of those named on the committee and I should like to gain some additional information in committee.

**Hon. Mr. Aseltine:** We on this side object to the bill getting second reading. If it should get second reading, we will be bound by its principle, and we do not want to be bound by it.

**Hon. Mr. Connolly (Ottawa West):** I quite agree with you, but we are in the hands of the Senate on that.

On motion of Hon. Mr. Hayden, debate adjourned.

## APPROPRIATION BILL NO. 9, 1966

### SECOND READING

**Hon. Jean-Paul Deschatelets** moved the second reading of Bill C-248, for granting to Her Majesty certain sums of money for the public service for the financial year ending the 31st March, 1967.

He said: Honourable senators, the purpose of Bill C-248, known as Appropriation Act No. 9, 1966, is to grant for the public service a sum of \$1,542,982,673.96, which sum will defray the several charges and expenses of the public service to March 31, 1967.

May I say right at the outset that this bill is fortunately not as complicated as it looks. It might be summed up as follows: Article 2 of the bill, paragraphs (a) to (c) inclusive, proposes to pay the full balance of the amounts of all the items not already voted in full in the main Estimates as well as in the Supplementaries (A) and (B). This part of the bill deals, therefore, with items that have already been discussed and voted, in part, in previous appropriation bills.

Clause 2(d) of the bill, however, proposes new and additional expenditures as Supplementary Estimates (C), amounting to \$307,195,632, details of which will be found in Schedule D of the bill, pages 41 to 47 inclusive.

As has been the custom in the past with respect to appropriation bills, financial statements have been placed before honourable senators, and because they are self-explanatory it is not my intention to comment on them at length. However, if honourable senators will be kind enough to look at the financial sheet entitled "Estimates, 1966-67", you will note that the total of the main Estimates plus the three supplementaries, (A), (B) and (C), amount to \$9,099,889,301. If we add to this sum the payments from the Old Age Security Fund, the grand total amounts to more than \$10 billion. As honourable senators know, the payments from the Old Age Security Fund, though coming from taxation, are put in a separate fund and are not included in the budgetary calculation. It will also be noted that a total sum of more than \$5 billion has to be voted, the balance being statutory payments.

Honourable senators will recall that on November 17 last, when explaining Appropriation Bill No. 8, C-245, at page 1170 of the *Debates of the Senate* I stated that with the passage of Bill C-245 the full balance of tabled Estimates to be voted amounted to \$1,235,787,041.96. If we add to this amount the total