

perhaps bring the necessary pressure to bear, or pass on suggestions of a constructive nature to the minister himself, so that he in turn may pass them on to the council, and in that way have a closer control over the operations, and certainly a closer reporting of what is being done by the national research council than we have at the present time.

I would, therefore, suggest to the minister that he bring in an amendment whereby the report of the president will be made not later than three months after the close of the fiscal year. That would seem to be a reasonable period, and one which would not press upon the work of the president or of the council. It would give the members of the house a reasonable period within which to act and a period before the facts, upon which they sought to act, had become too stale. Therefore I would ask the minister to thaw out a bit so that those in the opposition and hon. members generally may have at least a snowball's chance to keep up with the activities of the national research council and to report any recommendations which they may have.

Mr. HOWE: My hon. friend seems to suggest that parliament would not have the same control over the expenditures of the national research council that it would have over the expenditures of the Department of Public Works or any other department of the government. I point out that when the estimates of the national research council are before parliament hon. members have the same opportunity to examine the operations of the national research council that they have to examine the operations of the Department of Public Works. It seems to me that the objection just raised is wholly fallacious.

I take it that the presentation of estimates to the house is made largely to enable hon. members to find out the details of any expenditures of public funds contained therein. That privilege would certainly apply to the appropriation of the national research council.

Mr. JACKMAN: May I just say to the minister that it is one thing to appropriate certain moneys to carry on the work of the national research council and another thing to have a report on how these moneys were spent and the general stewardship of the council itself. The two are entirely different and I believe that the point is well made. We should have a report of the council within a reasonably short time. May we just ask ourselves, why is the minister unwilling that the national research council should make its report within three months? From his point of view I can see no objection to the council

making a report within that time, and I do not understand why he should not be amenable to the suggestion I made. My second point is that he said this afternoon the national research council does not live entirely from funds which we in parliament may vote. I am not sufficiently familiar with the technique of the matter upon which we voted the other day which showed that there are certain sums which the minister may draw upon which are, I believe, passed en bloc, to discuss it. Perhaps someone else will take up that point later.

The point I wish to make just now is that this afternoon the minister said the national research council during the war years had received \$4,360,900 from the funds within its own confines, if you like, revenue which it had received for work done, to say nothing of \$6 million which it had received from other departments of government. I presume that \$6 million was voted upon in this house and carefully gone over during the consideration of the estimates; but as to the \$4,360,900, the national research council received this money, and it was not responsible to parliament as to the spending of it. While that sum may not be so large when it is spread over the whole period of the war years, we now find that the national research council is to be greatly expanded and may develop new processes and patents from which it will receive revenue. That revenue is not to be returned to the consolidated revenue fund from year to year, but it is to revolve within the accounts of the national research council alone. The reason this is important is that while it may start off in a small way with a few companies under the aegis of the national research council, the history of this country has shown us that the average small town in Ontario or in the whole dominion has started out in this way. Within that small town one chief industry was started by a man with \$25,000 or less; and over a period of ten or twenty years or longer by ploughing back the earnings, not taking them out, those little companies have grown to a substantial size and in many cases now employ three or four hundred men. That is the history of enterprise on this continent and also in the old country. These things start in a little way, but if they are successful and are allowed to retain their money, they expand. In the case of the national research council there is no share of the tax burden being borne by them; and it would be only a short time, with the compounding of these earnings that they might make, before they might earn substantial sums. For that reason parliament