

The Address—Mr. J. A. Ross

time for the whole house to deal with everything. Hence, the practice of referring specific matters to committees for study and report should be extended.

Then he states further on:

Committees should sit regularly on matters like manpower and labour, financial and economic questions, reconstruction, external affairs and information, munitions and supplies, agriculture,— And then the very points contained in the new bill—

—the navy, the army and the air force.

This is his own expression as published in *Maclean's* some time ago.

He says:

The United States Senate has forty-seven committees exercising great power. We do not need anything like that number. The close connection of our executive with our legislative branches makes it unnecessary. Fifteen working committees of our house, most of them only meeting through half the session, would do the job. My fifth point, therefore, is: Whenever possible a matter of major importance should be referred to a committee of parliament and where necessary the committee should be provided with adequate research assistance.

I am sure there is no one in the country who would not agree that this is a very important matter and that the committee should deal with those very items set forth so well by the Minister of National Defence. As I say, I know there would not be many who would not be interested in a veterans' committee, and I urge the necessity of such a committee so that this bill may be referred to it for consideration.

I have already referred to the speeches of one parliamentary assistant, when I have been discussing this matter of veterans' affairs. There is another parliamentary assistant, a very good friend of mine, the hon. member for Winnipeg South (Mr. Mutch), to whom I would refer. Knowing him, as I have known him most of my life, I find it most difficult to understand the speech he made only the other day to a businessmen's club in Toronto. More especially do I find it difficult to understand when I point out that he is parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Veterans Affairs (Mr. Gregg). His speech is reported in the *Toronto Daily Star*, a newspaper which, after all, has been rather friendly at times to this government, I believe. The article is headed "Social Security under Fire" and states:

In addressing the Toronto Liberal Businessmen's Association, Mr. Leslie Mutch, Liberal M.P. for Winnipeg South, had some hard things to say about social security. He is quoted as stating that "social security in Canada is an ill-fitting garment that hampers our development and could strangle us." Mr. Mutch might have stopped there and felt he had put social security in its place. But he saw fit to add that social security "is the excuse of the lazy, the narcotic of the weak-willed and the refuge of the coward."

[Mr. Ross (Souris).]

With those remarks and more along the same line, Mr. Mutch left no doubt that he does not approve of social security. The revelation might be of slight interest were it not that Mr. Mutch is parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Veterans Affairs in a Liberal administration.

I recollect that this hon. member was out campaigning against me in my riding last summer. I happen to have with me one of the advertisements which appeared so frequently in all newspapers throughout Canada, and which dealt with social security. "Vote Liberal For Your Future Social Security". Is this not a strange set of circumstances? It is difficult to find a reasonable explanation for it.

There is another matter I should like to mention, and my reason for bringing it up now is that the Prime Minister (Mr. St. Laurent) did make reference to it yesterday. He referred several times to the House of Commons, and the overwhelming majority this government received last June. As to the number of members elected, I am bound to agree with him. I believe he stated yesterday, if I heard him correctly, that 73 per cent of the constituencies in Canada by their votes certainly approved of this government and its policies.

Mr. Fournier (Maisonneuve-Rosemont): Very good.

Mr. Rowe: Just approved the part he told them.

Mr. Fournier (Maisonneuve-Rosemont): And it will be repeated.

Mr. Ross (Souris): There have been very few sessions since I came to the House of Commons that I have not spoken in favour of the transferable vote. Therefore I cannot be accused of advocating something new because of the present set of circumstances. However, it could happen the opposite way in another election.

Let me place on record some figures released to the *Canadian Press* on August 24. The article states:

A record total of 5,856,307 votes was cast in the June 27 general election compared with 5,246,130 in the 1945 election, it was disclosed Tuesday by Jules Castonguay, chief electoral officer.

The Liberal party, returned to power with an overwhelming majority, received 2,926,029 votes in the last election compared with 2,170,625 in 1945.

The Progressive Conservatives, second largest group in the commons, polled 1,742,235, compared with 1,455,453.

Then the article gives the figures for the C.C.F. and Social Credit parties.

The point I wish to make clear is that it is indicated by this statement from the chief electoral officer that the majority of people who cast their votes on June 27 did not vote for the present government in Canada.