

heard—the same kind of interested organizations as Mr. Benidickson has mentioned today. He said we have heard all those at length in the department and now we have incorporated some of their ideas and rejected others and this is now our bill; it is a government bill.

This is the same situation we have here today. When this matter was under discussion in the house, I put forward the same idea that in the committee—this can be looked up at page 2104 of *Hansard*, July 10—I pointed out the briefs would be before the committee. There has been no suggestion held out to these organizations at any time that we would be asking the committee to repeat the hearings they have already had. Therefore, Mr. Chairman, I submit to the committee that the procedure Mr. Benidickson is suggesting is quite unnecessary. It is a repetition of something that has already been done. The committee may be very sure it will have all the information about all the views of all the organizations that it wishes to know and it may be very sure now that we have been over all these and have considered them and the new bill is a result of the consideration of all these questions.

Mr. LOCKYER: Has there been any basis of opposition to any of the amendments that are incorporated in the bill?

Mr. BENIDICKSON: We have not seen the new bill.

Mr. FLEMING (*Eglinton*): The various organizations that made representations to us may, in some cases, have confined their representations to certain outstanding points, outstanding in the sense that in their view they were very important to them. In the case of some organizations they made running comments on the various clauses of the bill. We have all these and we can discuss the views of anyone on any clause of the bill as we come to it. The briefs were all tabled.

Mr. FRASER: Mr. Benidickson said that it was not likely this bill would be reviewed again for some years. Would it be your intention if you received requests from different organizations to review certain parts of the bill that you would perhaps go over it again in a year or so?

Mr. FLEMING (*Eglinton*): We think, Mr. Fraser, that we have a very good bill here. We do not say it is perfect and we are certainly going to watch the operation of the bill very closely in the period after it comes into operation. Members may be very sure if there are any weaknesses found in it or anything that has not been foreseen with the extended study that has been given to it that we will be coming back to parliament for correction of any short comings that may be found.

Mr. FRASER: If that is so, then those people who have put the briefs before the committee and the members of the House of Commons if after they have studied the bill, can request a review?

Mr. BENIDICKSON: After it is passed and mistakes made.

Mr. FLEMING (*Eglinton*): I think there is a misunderstanding there. We know the views of these organizations now on the points that are raised by the bill and any departures in the present bill from Bill 248 of the previous session. We have already put a number of these suggestions into the new bill. In the case of those we have not accepted, we are prepared to give the committee the reasons why.

Mr. FRASER: We ought to let it go on the new bill now and in a year or so bring it back if there is something definitely wrong with it which should be changed. It could come before the committee again.

Mr. FLEMING (*Eglinton*): I would not want to leave the impression we think there is anything wrong with the bill. I am prepared to defend the bill. At the same time, Mr. Chairman, we will welcome free and full discussion of this committee on any aspect of it.