

brought in in 1951 by the then Liberal government, there could have been any opportunity for the Board of Transport Commissioners, in respect of the tolls, to do other than deal with the question of discrimination. I think this is what they are limited to. Quite recently in the public accounts committee we had the opportunity to have some of the officials of the seaway appear before us. I am not in a position to quote from the report of the committee, but I can act as a pipeline and give some of the impressions I received as a result of what was said. The tolls were established as a result of a projection made by a tolls committee which was set up I believe in 1957. This committee considered the matter. It was a joint committee established by the United States and Canadian governments. It made certain estimates as to the possible revenue and projected expenses. Their recommendation was made to the two governments and the tolls were then set. Since that time it has been discovered that this projection was so far out that over a period of years from the time the seaway came into operation there has been a shortfall of some \$32 million.

Today it is proposed that the new tolls be established as a result of a projected economic review made by another committee. What is there in this projection for us to accept as assurance that their estimate will be any more accurate than that of the committee which made its report in 1958? It is suggested that this increase of 10 per cent in five or six years somehow will result in there being equalization of the expenses and the tolls. I doubt this very much. In the last few years, with an expanding economy it has been impossible to make the tolls meet the cost of operation and the interest charges which, under the act, must be taken into consideration.

Under these circumstances I suggest the sensible thing would be for the government to urge the seaway authority not to project these additional tolls at this time but rather to let the matter be delayed so that the whole issue may be brought into parliament and considered in connection with an over-all transportation policy for the good of Canada. I would suggest that this is a matter for this house, for parliament, and not for the government or any crown corporation. The proper thing to do is to put a stop to this proposal. Let us continue under the same rates which have been in effect, and then let the whole matter come to parliament to receive proper

#### *Proceedings on Adjournment Motion*

discussion so that we may be able to reach a proper decision.

**Mr. Speaker:** Order. It being ten o'clock I should like to bring to the attention of hon. members citation 100 paragraph 12 of Beauchesne's fourth edition:

The debate on the urgent matter referred to in standing order 26 cannot be adjourned, as the motion actually before the chair is "that the house do now adjourn". Once the house rises, the motion is carried.

Normally, according to the standing order I should leave the chair now, but I believe I should bring to the attention of hon. members that there is a long list of questions which are pending now for the adjournment debate. If hon. members wish to give unanimous consent that the Speaker do not leave the chair at this moment, the three questions which have been placed on the program for the adjournment debate could be heard.

**Some hon. Members:** Agreed.

#### BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE

**Mr. McIlraith:** Mr. Speaker, may I state the business for tomorrow. We will begin with an interim supply bill for one month. Then we will proceed to the estimates of the Department of Labour, the Department of Industry, the Department of Defence Production, Legislation and the Privy Council.

**Mr. Knowles:** In that order?

**Mr. McIlraith:** Yes.

#### PROCEEDINGS ON ADJOURNMENT MOTION

A motion to adjourn the house under provisional standing order 39A deemed to have been moved.

#### IMMIGRATION—RECOGNITION OF PROFESSIONAL QUALIFICATIONS OF EUROPEANS

**Mr. Max Saltsman (Waterloo South):** Mr. Speaker, on Thursday of last week I raised the question concerning immigrants in Canada who are forced to take menial work although they have professional qualifications. My question arose from an article which appeared in the *Globe and Mail* of Thursday, May 19, headed, "Graduate Becomes Sweeper." The article pointed out that university trained, professional men and women from Europe are working in Canada as dishwashers, labourers and technicians because professional associations will not accept