

National Harbours Board Act

you reconsidered and you saw wisdom in the suggestion by the hon. member for Prince Albert, but it is only one step farther to reconsider a third time and see the wisdom of this amendment.

Mr. Macdonnell: I am sorry, Mr. Chairman, that my rising is not greeted with enthusiasm. If it will relieve hon. members' pain at all, I shall tell them I will be very brief. I have a somewhat unique qualification for intervening in this debate, and that is that I did not hear any of the earlier part of it. I just heard the speeches by the hon. member for Vancouver-Quadra and the hon. member for Vancouver East. I was not a member of the committee. I have the advantage, as I say, of an open mind. After listening to the hon. member for Vancouver-Quadra and the hon. member for Vancouver East I said to myself, those arguments sound very reasonable indeed. The minister must have some tremendous argument that he is going to produce, and it is just going to flatten them out and I am going to be completely twisted around.

I waited, therefore, for the minister's argument. So far as I can make out, his great argument was that there were hundreds of millions of dollars belonging to the harbours board to be protected. He sought to distinguish, in a manner that I could not follow, between the fact the Canadian National Railways jurisdiction is one-quarter mile and the harbours board wants 25 miles. Incidentally the hon. member for Vancouver-Quadra sought to meet the special case the minister raised as regards Montreal by suggesting that some special arrangements should be made.

All I want to say is that in so far as I have any claim to being, what shall I say, a man of average intelligence, I submit that any man of average intelligence who has been in this house for the last three-quarters of an hour would wonder why on earth the arguments made by the hon. member for Vancouver-Quadra and the hon. member for Vancouver East were not accepted. He would still wait for that pulverizing argument the minister was to make.

Amendment (Mr. Green) negatived: Yeas, 44; nays, 75.

The Chairman: I declare the amendment lost. Shall clause 3 as previously amended carry?

Clause 3 as amended agreed to.

Bill reported.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: When shall the bill be read a third time?

Mr. Green: Next sitting.

[Mr. Winch.]

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE

Mr. Harris: Mr. Speaker, perhaps we might alter our agenda for the moment to take care of a matter to which reference was made this morning in connection with the pension bill. There is a resolution which has been consented to by His Excellency the Governor General, and of which notification could be made now. We could then deal with the resolution, and do as we did on another occasion—that is, move that it be referred to the committee of the whole, and then it could be considered with the pension bill itself. If that would meet with the wishes of hon. members, I suggest that we do it, before proceeding with the amendment to the Post Office Act.

PENSION ACT

AMENDMENTS TO PROVIDE FOR ADOPTED CHILDREN, CHANGES IN ADMINISTRATION, ETC.

Hon. Hugues Lapointe (Minister of Veterans Affairs) moved that the house go into committee to consider the following resolution:

That Bill 339, intituled: "An act to amend the Pension Act", now before the house, be amended by substituting the words and figures "1st day of May, 1954" for the words and figures "1st day of January, 1954" where they appear in clauses 10, 11, 12 and 18 in the said bill and that subsection (3) of section 31 and subsection (3) of section 42 of the Pension Act be amended by striking out the words "in respect of service during world war II" where they appear in the said subsections.

He said: His Excellency the Governor General, having been made acquainted with the subject matter of this resolution, recommends it to the house.

Motion agreed to and the house went into committee, Mr. Robinson (Simcoe East) in the chair.

Resolution reported, read the second time and concurred in.

Mr. Lapointe thereupon moved that this resolution be referred to the committee of the whole on Bill No. 339.

Motion agreed to.

And the order for committee of the whole having been called:

Mr. Green: We cannot go on now. Members of the veterans affairs committee met at 3.30. This contains some highly controversial points.

Mr. Harris: I think that the clerk assistant may have misunderstood me. It was not intended to proceed with it at this time. It was the intention to proceed now with the Post Office Act; and then, later this day, to call the Pension Act.