

Inquiries of the Ministry

the President of the Privy Council, namely that all we are agreeing to at this point is to spend the next seven days on estimates. The business for the rest of the session is left for further discussion.

Mr. McIlraith: That is correct, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Howard: The Prime Minister made some comments today bearing on the priority to be accorded to the other two items, and I do not think we should proceed now to make an agreement when it is only a half-hearted agreement and when the Prime Minister has in effect destroyed it.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh.

Mr. Howard: It would be far better, in my opinion, if the President of the Privy Council were to withhold his proposal until later in the day and allow further discussion to take place.

Mr. Speaker: As the Chair understands the situation, it is this. The President of the Privy Council read a statement which had been agreed to by the different parties and their representatives, a statement which I have in my hand. At the request of the leader of the house I asked whether it should be so ordered, and it was ordered.

An hon. Member: It was not ordered.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh.

Mr. Speaker: As far as I understand it, that is the situation.

Mr. Knowles: May I have confirmation from the Prime Minister that the statement I made a moment ago is correct, namely that no decision has been made as to the priority of house business beyond a week from Friday?

Mr. Pearson: Of course it is. The order covers only the business for next week. That is clear. No decision has been made as to what will be done after next week, one way or the other.

Mr. Howard: I do not want to be obstinate about it.

Some hon. Members: You are.

Mr. Howard: But it is quite obvious that the government, because of its concern about this rag of a flag, is trying to make a sucker out of parliament.

Mr. Hellyer: On a point of order, may I ask whether the order was passed by the house?

Mr. Speaker: Yes, the order was passed. I said so twice.

[Mr. Knowles.]

AIRPORTS**WINNIPEG—INQUIRY AS TO PROSECUTION OF TAXI DRIVER**

On the orders of the day:

Mr. Ralph Cowan (York-Humber): I have a question I should like to put to the Minister of Transport. Can the minister advise the house what progress is being made by the government in its prosecution of Gabriel Robert Johnson, the taxicab driver who has been accused of picking up a fare at Stevenson field, Winnipeg, despite a monopoly contract given to Moore's taxi service in that city.

Mr. Speaker: This is a question for the order paper.

PENSIONS**PROVISION FOR ESTABLISHMENT OF CONTRIBUTORY PROGRAM**

The house resumed, from Tuesday, November 17, consideration of the motion of Miss LaMarsh for the second reading of Bill No. C-136, to establish a comprehensive program of old age pensions and supplementary benefits in Canada payable to and in respect of contributors.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Esquimalt-Saanich.

Mr. H. E. Gray (Essex West): On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, I had the floor at ten o'clock last evening, and my remarks will take a few minutes to complete.

Mr. Speaker: That is so. It was a mistake of the Chair. The hon. member for Essex West had the floor. The Chair will recognize the hon. member for Esquimalt-Saanich next.

Mr. Gray: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I will only take a minute or so more and then I will be happy to yield the floor to the hon. member.

I find it strange that some of the business executives to whom I was referring last evening as expressing concern over the possible effect of the decisions of politicians on the funds of the Canada pension plan should regularly invest large amounts of the money of their firms and the money of other people in government bonds whose soundness is based on the decisions of those same politicians.

Of course a somewhat different type of criticism, and perhaps a more substantial one, has been made, and it arises out of the possibility that the provinces in using their share of the pension fund may make investments