

Inquiries of the Ministry

This is a complicated matter. The course taken by the Canadian delegation was a responsible one.

Mr. Douglas: A supplementary question. Is the minister implying that all other governments which voted for the resolution took an irresponsible attitude?

Mr. Martin (Essex East): My hon. friend knows that my reply obviously does not reflect on the action taken by any government. But my hon. friend may be sure that the Canadian government, after assessment of its commonwealth position and in its anxiety to see all groups treated alike, believes that this is the responsible attitude to take at this time.

Right Hon. J. G. Diefenbaker (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, in no way disagreeing with the hon. gentleman's final statement may I ask, so the record will be complete, that he place before the house the names of the nations which were the sponsors of the resolution in question?

Mr. Martin (Essex East): I will be glad to do that.

PENITENTIARIES**ST. VINCENT DE PAUL—ASSAULT OF INMATE BY GUARDS**

On the orders of the day:

Mr. Harold E. Winch (Vancouver East): Mr. Speaker, I should like to ask the Minister of Justice if he is now in a position to inform the house of the results of the investigation by the commissioner of penitentiaries into the attack by guards on an inmate of St. Vincent de Paul penitentiary days after a riot took place, such investigation having been most strongly recommended by a judge of the Quebec courts.

Hon. Lionel Chevrier (Minister of Justice): Mr. Speaker, I came into the house during the last week with a statement covering that matter. It is a lengthy statement, and it would be much too long for me to read. However, if I have the permission of the house I can bring it in tomorrow and, with unanimous consent, table it. It is an answer to the statements which were made before the courts in Montreal. I take it my hon. friend is referring to the Gunn case?

Mr. Winch: Yes. It will be brought in tomorrow and filed?

Mr. Chevrier: If there is unanimous consent I will have it ready for tabling tomorrow.

Mr. Speaker: Does the house agree?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

[Mr. Martin (Essex East).]

NATIONAL DEFENCE**DISCONTINUANCE OF COMMUTER ALLOWANCE AT MILITARY ESTABLISHMENT**

On the orders of the day:

Mr. Robert Muir (Cape Breton North and Victoria): Mr. Speaker, on October 23, as recorded on page 3922 of *Hansard*, I directed a question to the Associate Minister of National Defence in relation to the discontinuance of the commuter allowance at the Point Edward naval base. Is the minister in a position today to confirm this, or are these employees in fact receiving a cut in wages by this government.

Hon. Lucien Cardin (Associate Minister of National Defence): Mr. Speaker, I am informed that as of November 1 the commuting allowance will be discontinued at the Point Edward naval base in order to keep our practices in accord with those prevailing in industry. So far as any cut in wages is concerned, of course, this is not a question of wages. I understand that the Department of Labour revises the wage rates in these bases periodically.

SUPPLY

Hon. Walter L. Gordon (Minister of Finance) moved that the house go into committee of supply.

ABANDONMENT OF DEFENCE PROJECTS AND INSTALLATIONS

Hon. Gordon Churchill (Winnipeg South Centre): Mr. Speaker, I rise to take part in this debate today because of a situation prevailing in Canada that has engaged the attention of everybody and needs to be examined here in this house of parliament. I hope to open up discussion of a subject which will create a lively interest amongst all members of this chamber.

We have, as Canadians with some national pride, been disturbed about Canada's prestige abroad. It has reached an all-time low. When we read in foreign newspapers that the present government is a rudderless mess, we think it is time that parliament had a look at the situation. It is a regrettable circumstance indeed when people abroad are looking at Canada, finding fault with Canada and expressing their opinion in the printed word that the government of this country is unsuitable to carry on the work that we expect the government of Canada to do. It is a very serious matter indeed.

The prestige of the government at home is another matter of very serious concern. There is no question about the widespread discontent across Canada with regard to this