

*Private Bills*

members of the executive if it were necessary for them to delay the passage of this legislation until this fall. I would think the sponsor might consider this. Also I believe the hon. member who spoke favourably about referring the matter to the committee might be interested in this particular proposition because he is well aware that the convention is to be held in his home town in July of this year. Therefore, he should be able to attend the convention as a member representing that area. Then, he would be in a much better position when he returns in the fall to tell us whether or not in his opinion the executive have been given the authority to do this.

It is unfortunate that our private bills legislation does not carry with it the obligation to provide the information that would normally be provided in England. It bothers me when a fraternal organization comes before us and we receive correspondence which indicates the members are not in the least satisfied with some of the things that are going on. One motion which has come to my attention is in respect of subsection (6), section 8, page 9 which reads as follows:

This would allow any employed officer of High Court to run for an Executive position. There is reason to believe there are those, who because they are deeply disturbed by the direction our Fraternity is going, would contest seats on this Executive. Why refuse them this chance?

This relates of course to the argument that the general executive is not operating in the general interest of some of the lodges. It seems to me this is an indication they are not completely satisfied. Then, there is another motion which relates to subsection (5), section 8, page 9, which states as follows:

There is no need for such a subsection in our Constitution. If these officers are doing a good job the members of the Canadian Order of Foresters will re-elect them.

If they are not, why restrict replacing them to only six people from amongst our many thousands of members.

As long as the Subsection is in force it will prevent our Society, even if the need should ever arise, from quickly ridding itself of leadership that is poor or unresponsive to the needs and wishes of the Canadian Order of Foresters as a whole.

The Canadian *Forester Echo*, official publication of the Winnipeg council, for March, 1968 contained this headline:

Brantford High Court Delegates Defer Final Action Till Edmonton High Court in 1969. High Court Officers Claimed Ignorance of Federal Insurance Act Regulations.

The article goes on to outline the fact that the executive did not have the answers. And then the article reads:

One delegate's comments were that the officers seemed to answer most questions with "perhaps, maybe, not sure, don't know, never heard of this, etc."

• (4:40 p.m.)

These facts have emerged. Our executive had approached the federal Department of Insurance about a federal charter in January of 1964. This is a full four years before the Brantford High Court meeting. A regular High Court meeting was held last July in Hamilton. Despite the importance of a federal charter and name change, they were not mentioned in the motions for July.

In other words, at the Hamilton meeting these matters were not raised, although they had been raised originally by the executive in 1964.

These items were introduced to the July convention by a Good and Welfare committee report (which report we all know is prepared by the High Court officers) in the dying moments of the session. The delegates accepted this report to let information of the issues at stake.

As near as we can make out, it seems instead of investigating the executive actually tried to incorporate federally. But a committee report was not enough for the federal Insurance Department, they insisted on a proper notice of motion.

Next High Court calls a special High Court meeting at Brantford.

Here is the comment from a court delegate "notices were sent out at a time when the High Court knew that it would be hard to arrange meetings for delegates elections" also "the meeting day itself is the most inconvenient day of the week."

High Court called a meeting but gave no facts. The members of our society should not be denied information of the issues at stake.

Head office treats the courts like children "you can be seen but not heard, you can listen but not talk." Can we be blamed for thinking that head office's attitude is "If the members know nothing, they can say nothing and if they say nothing they can do as we please." The courts in this area initiated an investigation of the issues and found good reason to oppose the motion at Brantford.

Our delegates to Brantford have effectively stopped either change of name or charter until it can be debated at Edmonton.

This was done by adding a section to the original executive motion that defers final action on the questions until the High Court meeting in 1969.

If they have deferred action, the sponsor of this bill is not aware of it. Certainly, the Senate were not told that the Brantford court felt it had been able, by certain action taken under their charter, to stop this action. If we pass this bill the matter will not be referred to the convention at Edmonton in July of this year. Yet, the people who have investigated