

other side and now I know. Because of the initiative of this party which provided the extra hour last night it is our hope that this bill will be passed through its stages today. I hope the government might take this idea into consideration when the situation is ripe.

May I say first of all that the hon. member for Athabasca said some of the things I had intended to say. He now represents part of the constituency I had the honour to represent for many years. There is a problem in that section of the country. The people there do not receive television programs although they do receive some radio programs. They depend on the written word. How can we get to the people of the north information about the misdeeds this government continues to commit unless newspapers are made available all through the north country?

I was very struck by what the minister said about balancing the budget. The Minister of Finance is desperately reaching for that idol. The Prime Minister said that he stands for a balanced budget. I gather this is the hope of the minister in respect of this department. He nods his head.

I should like to quote some authorities whom I will identify in a little while. This is a statement with which the minister probably will take issue:

Among other things, it is inconceivable that politicians should continue to dread budgetary deficits and that, even when resorting to them, they should continue to pay homage to the sacred cow of a balanced budget.

The minister obviously is paying homage to the sacred cow. His colleagues are doing the same thing. The statement I have quoted appeared in the *Montreal Star* of Thursday, May 14, 1964, under the heading "Manifesto For The Nation." This manifesto was drawn up by a group of French Canadian intellectuals, only one of whom was over 35 years of age. Two of these intellectuals were Mr. Marc Lalonde and Mr. Pierre-Elliott Trudeau. Perhaps the minister has a right to change his mind and now believes that a balanced budget is a sacred cow which should be worshipped.

I should like to direct attention to a little exchange which took place between the minister and me last night. I raise this not only for its importance in this particular issue but because of its importance in the future. As reported at page 2016 of *Hansard* I said the following:

If we had considered this in committee we would have been finished by now.

### Post Office Act

The minister replied:

But nothing would have come out in the committee that we do not already know. All of you have been quoting from every brief that has been made.

Then I rejoined:

We would have been able to test the accuracy of your statements.

I think the minister appeared to take a little exception to that. I shall not infringe on your ruling, Mr. Chairman. The chairman knows the scrupulous and desperate anxiety with which members of this party defer to his rulings on all occasions while some opposite hang around the fringe and perimeter of illegality.

I should like to put this forward as a conjecture. The house has made a ruling. We are bound by the rules and there can be no question of challenging them. But this is a situation which may recur in the future. I utter these words with this in mind. I say, purely on an objective basis, that if this measure had gone to a committee it would have required only a week of committee hearings in a form that I suggest would have been similar to an examination for discovery. This would have provided an opportunity to test the accuracy of the statements which have been made.

• (3:20 p.m.)

I have every respect for the integrity of the Postmaster General and I have the greatest respect for the integrity and knowledge of the officials of his department. It is a fact, however, that the government was elected as a result of a combination of circumstances. It was elected because of the changes in the Electoral Boundaries Readjustment Act, because of a certain amount of political deceit in respect of budgets, and two or three other intangible factors that I will not go into at this time. However, it happens that the government represents 45 per cent of the people and will be here for another four years. That is a fact of life. We are going to be here for four years as well, and if we are to do the things that should be done we must get along and co-operate. We do not have to accept everything the government asks for and the government does not have to accept everything we suggest. If good legislation were proposed, even by the devil himself, and I think he sits in different forms on the other side, we would approve it and expedite its passage. We would see that it was passed as quickly as possible. However, we must know the facts.