

Questions

I say, sir, that the fiscal year having ended, no other business should or properly could be taken up in the house until the accounts of the previous year are settled and until the government—which have no right to take this for granted—are satisfied by a vote on these matters that a majority of the members of parliament still have confidence in them. That is what parliament is about, in case the right hon. gentleman has forgotten. That is why I am asserting—

Mr. Speaker: Order.

Mr. Pigeon: Obstruction.

Mr. Speaker: Order. I appreciate the hon. member's argument on the basic right of parliament to vote supply before the money is spent. If governments do not comply with that basic right of the House of Commons, then they are open to criticism and censure. But the ordering of the business of the government is its own responsibility. It is when the expenditure is made without authority that a constitutional issue arises. I think hon. members have anticipated that there will be some unconstitutional act, rather than demonstrating one; therefore I do not propose to accept the motion.

Mr. Hellyer: Control by an irresponsible government.

Mr. Fleming (Eglinton): A babbling brook over there.

Mr. Starr: They have wasted 2½ hours this afternoon.

QUESTIONS

(Questions answered orally are indicated by an asterisk.)

AIRSTRIP, STEEP ROCK IRON MINES, ATIKOKAN

Question No. 336—Mr. Fisher:

Up to March 23, 1962, had the Department of Transport been asked by any person, association, or municipality to take over the airstrip at Steep Rock Iron Mines, Atikokan; and, if so, who or what were they; on what dates, and by what means, did they approach DOT; and to what effect were the representations?

Answer by: Mr. Martini:

Yes: by letter of July 2, 1958 from Mr. W. M. Benidickson, M.P., and by further letter of June 12, 1961, forwarding a letter from Mr. Baswick, reeve of Atikokan. These representations requested the department to look into the possibility of taking over the maintenance and operation of the Atikokan airport.

Investigations indicated that the present strip was a small one and because of its location could only be expanded and developed at high cost; and that the airport did not fall within the category for which the federal

[Mr. Pickersgill.]

government normally assumed responsibility but fell within the category where further development would require a cost-sharing program with local interests and is of a standard and type which, under normal federal policy, is operated by local interests rather than by the federal government.

PORT ARTHUR SHIPBUILDING LTD.

Question No. 337—Mr. Fisher:

Has the Canadian maritime commission, the records of annual expenditure for both shipbuilding and ship repairing in each of the shipbuilding yards in Canada; and, if so, what are the annual figures in each case for Port Arthur Shipbuilding Limited, since 1955, with a breakdown which distinguishes government craft and naval craft?

Answer by: Mr. Martini:

The information provided by Canadian shipyards to the Canadian maritime commission concerning annual expenditures on repairs and conversions is supplied to the commission on a confidential basis and is, therefore, not available for release. With regard to government construction contracts at the shipyard of Port Arthur Shipbuilding Limited there is official record as follows:

- (a) Government naval minesweeper, delivered in 1957, cost \$4,416,000.
- (b) Government icebreaker, *Alexander Henry*, delivered in 1959, cost \$2,795,000.

*PORT ARTHUR SHIPBUILDING—VESSEL
CONSTRUCTION CONTRACTS

Question No. 338—Mr. Fisher:

1. On March 23, 1962, did the Department of Transport or the Canadian maritime commission have any information to indicate that Port Arthur Shipbuilding Limited, had at hand or would have at hand in 1962, any vessel construction contracts under the subsidy arrangement announced on May 12, 1961?

2. If not, has either the commission or the Minister of Transport received any communications from the parent company of Port Arthur Shipbuilding Limited, the Canadian Shipbuilding Company, which indicate any reasons why such contracts have not been assigned by the parent company to the Port Arthur yard; and, if so, what are the reasons?

3. Has the Canadian maritime commission any information which would indicate that Port Arthur Shipbuilding Limited might be given a contract in 1962 to build a government vessel or that it was bidding for the right to build such vessel or vessels; and, if so, what are the details?

Mr. Martini:

1. No application has been received from Port Arthur Shipbuilding Limited.

2. No.

3. The Canadian maritime commission has no information that an order will be placed.

RADIO AND T.V. STATIONS, MARITIME PROVINCES

Question No. 353—Mr. Creaghan:

1. How many English language radio and television stations are there in the maritime provinces