

*Inquiries of the Ministry*UNEMPLOYMENT—REQUEST FOR REPORT ON DELAYS IN  
PAYMENT OF INSURANCE BENEFITS

**Mr. A. P. Gleave (Saskatoon-Biggar):** Mr. Speaker, in view of the seriousness of the unemployment situation, will the Acting Prime Minister ask the Minister of Labour to report to the House on Monday on the cause of the extensive and excessive delays in the payment of unemployment insurance benefits and on the measures that will be taken to correct the problem?

**Hon. Mitchell Sharp (Acting Prime Minister):** I have talked with the Minister of Labour about this situation, Mr. Speaker, and he assures me that a very high proportion of the claims have been met on time, and that those that are delayed are a very small fraction of the total.

**Mr. Gleave:** In view of the fact that the city of Saskatoon is quite small and I am receiving many complaints, there must be a great deal more than—

**Mr. Speaker:** Order, please.

**Hon. Robert L. Stanfield (Leader of the Opposition):** A moment ago the Acting Prime Minister referred to the fixed timetable of the government for the introduction of amendments to the Unemployment Insurance Act. Does the minister consider the maintenance of a fixed timetable more important than the welfare of the people of this country?

**Mr. Speaker:** Order, please.

\* \* \*

## HOUSING

## MONTREAL—EFFECTS OF PROPOSED EXPRESSWAY

**Mr. Andrew Brewin (Greenwood):** I have a question for the Minister without Portfolio in charge of housing. Will the minister join with the city of Montreal in urging the government of the province of Quebec to abandon the project to extend the trans-Canada highway through the city of Montreal in view of the fact that 2,000 families are likely to be uprooted and it is admitted that there is no other housing in which to place them?

**Hon. Robert K. Andras (Minister without Portfolio):** Mr. Speaker, I think I replied to a similar question from the hon. member a few weeks ago.

\* \* \*

## FAMILY ALLOWANCES

OBJECTIONS TO PROPOSED MAXIMUM FAMILY INCOME  
LEVEL

**Hon. Marcel Lambert (Edmonton West):** My question is for the Acting Prime Minister. Has the government decided when and if it will reply to the provincial ministers in connection with the representations they made on

[Mr. Speaker.]

the income security plan as it affects family allowances, particularly the strong objections from the province of Ontario with regard to the maximum cut-off family income level included in the plan?

**Hon. Mitchell Sharp (Acting Prime Minister):** The reason the government put forward its proposals in the form of a white paper was to invite comment. I understand there will be at least some revisions in the plan expressed in the white paper.

**Mr. Lambert (Edmonton West):** Can the minister state when the government is likely to make this announcement so that we can then consider how sincere it may be?

**Mr. Sharp:** I expect the announcement will be in the form of legislation.

\* \* \*

## NATIONAL SECURITY

REPORTED PROPOSAL TO ESTABLISH CIVILIAN  
SECRET SERVICE

**Right Hon. J. G. Diefenbaker (Prince Albert):** Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the Acting Prime Minister. It is in connection with a civilian secret service being established to replace the Royal Canadian Mounted Police security and intelligence agency. Is it a fact that a decision in this regard has been made, as reported in the press, and if that is so will the minister say whether the Royal Canadian Mounted Police force is to be placed in a position in which it will have no responsibility in this regard?

**Mr. Speaker:** Order, please. Before the Acting Prime Minister replies I think I should take exception to the form of the question asked by the right hon. gentleman since it asks for confirmation or denial of a press report. Perhaps we can assume the question has been asked directly, in which case the Acting Prime Minister might be allowed to reply.

**Mr. Diefenbaker:** Mr. Speaker, with all respect to Your Honour—

**An hon. Member:** Now, don't get mad, John.

**Mr. Diefenbaker:** —I suggest to you that the manner in which the question period is being restricted places the opposition in a position where it cannot discharge its responsibilities.

**Some hon. Members:** Shame!

**Mr. Speaker:** Order, please. It seems to me that the opposition has been discharging its responsibilities very ably. In any event, the rule to which I have alluded is one of long standing. It is just as easy to ask a question directly, and I must assume at this point that the question has been asked in this way.