

and again in the House of Commons, was that I found it a bit difficult to intervene in another country's internal affairs and discuss the seeking of independence by any part of that country if I did not want that country in return to discuss those who in Canada are trying to break up the country. And this is the reason why I did not discuss it on this visit. But what I did say, both in the House of Commons and here, is that by establishing a good rapport—

And this is what I emphasize.

—a good rapport, a good climate of confidence and exchange with the Soviet authorities, we would perhaps be in a better position to make representation on, not a legal or constitutional basis, but on a humanitarian basis about some individual cases which might be brought to our attention in the future.

I am sure that that language of the Prime Minister, expressed with great care, really sets out the true situation. It is easy to misinterpret remarks. I do not believe that if we want to meet a particular objective we should go out of our way, for one reason or another, to misinterpret.

Canada, I will repeat again, is a land made up of many peoples. Our unity depends upon the good relationship that prevails among these peoples. No prime minister of Canada would be worthy of his high office if he sought to set off one class against another. There is nothing in government policy or in the nature of the present Prime Minister that would cause him to lend himself to that.

I can assure honourable Senator Yuzyk, and he can pass this on, that we will make more progress about these separated families as a result of the Prime Minister's visit than by anything else that has happened thus far.

Hon. Mr. Yuzyk: I should like to adjourn the debate, but I will be away next week with the Joint Committee on Constitutional and Legal Affairs.

The Hon. the Speaker: There is nothing to prevent you from adjourning the debate. If other senators wish to participate in this debate in the meantime, I am sure some way can be found to enable them to do so.

On motion of Hon. Mr. Yuzyk, debate adjourned.

OFFICIAL RESIDENCES ACT

BILL TO AMEND—SECOND READING—DEBATE ADJOURNED

Hon. Paul Martin moved the second reading of Bill C-241, to amend the Prime Minister's Residence Act.

He said: Honourable senators, Bill C-241 is not a complicated piece of legislation. The intention of the bill is to propose the maintenance by the Crown of three residences, one for the Prime Minister, one for the Leader of the Opposition in the House of Commons, and one for the Speaker of the other house, all on a rent-free basis.

If this bill becomes law, it will be effective as of January 1, 1970, with the exception of the provision

which deals with rent payable on the Prime Minister's residence. That provision will take effect only after the next general election. The figure of \$5,000 per year currently being paid by the Prime Minister was inserted at the stipulation of the then Prime Minister, Louis St. Laurent. No doubt many of you recall that. It was characteristic of that right honourable gentleman that he should have wished to pay for his family's board and lodging, and despite the fact that his cabinet colleagues, as well as the Leader of the Opposition, as we know from the record, felt otherwise, Mr. St. Laurent insisted upon that figure being inserted. That was the reason for the provision in the bill. However, the general view now is that the Prime Minister's residence ought to be rent-free.

The bill is an attempt to put into legislative form the recommendations of the Advisory Committee on Salaries and Expenses. That report, commonly known as the Beaupré Report, states in paragraph 79, and I quote:

The committee further recommends that neither the Prime Minister nor the Leader of the Opposition should be required to pay rent for publicly owned residences provided for their official use.

Existing legislations already provides for the maintenance of the Prime Minister's residence at 24 Sussex Drive, and the summer residence at Harrington Lake. As for the Leader of the Opposition, he currently occupies a property called Stornoway, located in Rockcliffe Park Village. The title of the property has been held in trust since 1950 by the Royal Trust Company. The trust was intended to provide, and I quote from the trust itself:

A suitable residence for the use and occupation of the Leader of the Conservative party or the Liberal party, whichever shall be in Opposition.

Some people might regard that wording as a little inflexible. No rent is provided for Stornoway, and the trustees have in addition paid for the maintenance of the property, including property taxes, and have provided about 60 per cent of the furnishings.

I wish Senator O'Leary were in his place. I would acknowledge at once the great initiative he took in the establishment of Stornoway House. He was Chairman of the Board of Trustees of Stornoway. In 1969 he suggested to the Government that the property be transferred to the state at no cost and that it be maintained in the future by the Government as an official residence for the Leader of the Opposition. Senator O'Leary's reasoning, and I think it was compelling, was that the purchase of Stornoway was made possible by citizens representing all parties and residents in all the provinces who considered that the Leader of the Opposition, who is a key figure in our parliamentary structure, should be provided with a residence consistent with the dignity and importance of his office.

Stornoway was originally provided as a residence for the Honourable George Drew, when he was Leader of the Opposition. It was offered to the Right Honourable Louis St. Laurent during his brief period as Leader of