

the Appropriations Act. This one bill I am told the Senate is expected to sit on in committee and we cannot leave it until the last minute in the session.

Those are all reasons, I think, Mr. Chairman, why the decision that I understood the committee took on Friday last is a sound one and will afford the committee the fullest opportunity for a complete and comprehensive study, understanding and review of the bill.

Mr. BENEDICKSON: I do not think probably three members of the committee are familiar with any of the particular briefs that I referred to, coming from national organizations with the possible exception of the brief that we all received as members of parliament from the Canadian Federation of University Women, and I just cannot see how members of the committee would be satisfied to just simply hear the minister say, "I have looked at the complaints that have come from all parts of the country, I have reviewed them with my staff, we are satisfied with our bill, now we will rush it through."

Mr. JONES: Mr. Chairman, I understood the minister to put forward a very different suggestion. I understood him to say that he was prepared not to follow the generalization that Mr. Benidickson has just mentioned, but to outline for the committee the complaints of these various organizations on the various aspects which have come up in respect of this bill and that he and his staff are prepared to advise the committee not only of the complaints of these various organizations on this latter bill in general, but also in respect of the differences of the old bill and this present bill before us. Surely in the light of the assurances that the minister has given us the remarks of Mr. Benidickson are out of order.

Mr. BENEDICKSON: The members of the committee have not been informed of every point raised in the briefs, so they cannot intelligently ask the minister questions unless you want to blindly say on each clause, "Now, what representations did you receive on this clause and from whom and what did they say?"

There is one suggestion I might make—these briefs are so important and so valuable that another suggestion I would make is that we have these briefs filed, these national briefs—not letters from individuals but briefs from national organizations—and that these briefs from these national organizations should be made an appendix to our minutes, so that the members of the committee when they proceed will be fairly well acquainted with the criticisms that have been advanced by these professional organizations after a great deal of work on their part, and they represent the public. It is our duty as a parliamentary committee, not just taking the statement that the minister is satisfied for the reason that there are a lot of things which are to the advantage of the administration, that may lead to ease in their administration and so on but may be very disappointing to the community as a whole or inconvenient to the community as a whole.

Mr. FLEMING (*Eglinton*): Mr. Chairman, Mr. Benidickson is the financial critic of the opposition. He has been over these briefs too, I am sure, but Mr. Benidickson is competent to raise any kind of question that he thinks was soundly raised in any of the briefs, and I will be happy, as I said today and as I said on Friday, to deal with any point and any reason why we accepted suggestions in whole in any brief or why we accepted it in part and did not accept it in whole and, thirdly, why we did not accept it. I am sure that Mr. Benidickson is going to see to it, Mr. Chairman, having discharged his responsibility as financial critic, to see to it that those points are raised.

Mr. BENEDICKSON: Well, Mr. Chairman, I think the minister is certainly imposing an unusual burden on any one member of the committee to bore the committee steadily for several days trying to see just what has been pointed out by one organization and another organization and why the department