

*Student Loans*

from debate, to cast aspersions on a provincial government, and endeavoured to exculpate his government from the shortcomings of the loans plan. That is all it was designed for. The smirk on the minister's face as he finally said to Your Honour "Well, I have said everything I was going to say, so it really does not matter", bears this out. If provocation was ever engendered by any minister, it was now. I ask him this: Where are the 10,000 scholarships that you and the Prime Minister promised?

**Some hon. Members:** Hear, hear.

**Mr. Reid Scott (Danforth):** Mr. Speaker, the Leader of the Official Opposition has made the point which everybody will want to make, namely that the minister's statement is nothing but an attempt by this government to shed itself of the responsibility for a scheme which was ill conceived and inadequate in the first instance. We are merely at this time repeating what we have said before, that this is the cheapest form of aid to higher education; that it has not worked out in any really satisfactory way; that students are being forced to incur large debts before they graduate; that the universities in this country are starved, not for this kind of cheap loan but for scholarships and bursaries, which are the real need in this country. The Leader of the Opposition has mentioned the 10,000 scholarships that we were promised in the last two election campaigns. This is one of the commitments which this government has not honoured.

With regard to the regulations, the minister cannot get out from under his responsibilities in this regard. I have gone over these application forms carefully, and the means test inherent in them is a disgraceful thing and something that should have no place in a modern educational system. So far as general policy is concerned, the responsibility rests clearly on the federal government. They are the people who lay down the general guide lines, and the provinces only go into the general matter of administration. We are just not going to be taken in, and hope the public is not taken in, by this kind of façade which is nothing but a cheap political excuse on the part of this government to evade its responsibilities.

[Mr. Diefenbaker.]

**JUSTICE AND LEGAL AFFAIRS****CONSIDERATION OF CONCURRENCE IN THIRD REPORT OF STANDING COMMITTEE**

**Mr. Speaker:** Mr. Cameron (High Park), seconded by Mr. Habel, moves that the third report of the standing committee on justice and legal affairs, presented to the house on Tuesday, October 18, 1966, be concurred in.

• (3:10 p.m.)

[Translation]

**Mr. Gilles Grégoire (Lapointe):** Mr. Speaker, I should like to speak briefly to this motion.

The member for High Park (Mr. Cameron) introduced it as chairman of the standing committee on justice and legal affairs and the following appears on page 870 of the *Votes and Proceedings* for October 18, 1966:

Your committee recommends:

1. That it be granted permission to adjourn from place to place.

Everything is quite all right up to there, Mr. Speaker. But I happened to read on page 51 of *La Presse* for Wednesday, October 19, 1966, an article by a reporter named Jacques Pigeon and entitled:

The parliamentary committee on justice agrees to go to Detroit at the expense of car manufacturers.

That committee asks us to sit outside Ottawa or, as mentioned in the *Votes and Proceedings*, "to adjourn from place to place". And one of those places is Detroit, at the expense of car manufacturers.

Why should a committee of the House of Commons inquiring into safety devices in motor cars go and investigate on the premises of car manufacturers and at the latter's expense?

This is certainly something strange and beyond comprehension. I understand very well that a dealer or a manufacturer would invite prospective clients at his own expense to visit his plant or store and ask them for a cocktail or a dinner, in order to enhance his products. But such is not the case. The fact of the matter is that members of a committee of the House have been inspecting car manufacturing plants to see whether the safety of Canadian citizens—of whom we are responsible—is really overlooked in the construction of motor cars, and the owners of those plants are paying the costs of such an investigation. Is there not something disgraceful in all that? Does it mean that the members of the committee agreed to that trip and that, once they get there, all their expenses will be paid and they will be more inclined to accept