

Inquiries of the Ministry

[Translation]

THE MINISTRY

**POSSIBLE WITHDRAWAL OF RESIGNATION
BY MINISTER OF JUSTICE**

On the orders of the day:

Mr. Gilles Grégoire (Lapointe): Mr. Speaker, I should like to put a question to the Prime Minister (Mr. Pearson) in order to clear up a situation which has been going on for a few days.

Could the Prime Minister tell us whether it is true the Minister of Justice (Mr. Cardin) has withdrawn at noon the resignation he handed a few days ago?

Mr. Speaker: Order. The question is out of order.

[English]

TRADE

**INCREASE IN COMMODITY EXPORTS TO
OVERCOME TRADE DEFICIT**

On the orders of the day:

Hon. George Hees (Northumberland): I should like to address a question to the Minister of Trade and Commerce. Would the minister advise the United States secretary of commerce that Canada must be allowed to ship greatly increased quantities of oil and gas, base metals, livestock, lumber and other commodities to that market this year as a positive means of overcoming the commodity trade deficit with that country which increased last year—

Some hon. Members: Order.

Mr. Hees:—by some \$300 million to a total of more than \$1 billion.

Mr. Speaker: The Chair has been unable to hear the whole question, so perhaps we might give the hon. member the benefit of the doubt and allow the minister to answer it.

Hon. Robert Winters (Minister of Trade and Commerce): The hon. gentleman was good enough to give me notice of his question so I am prepared to answer it. At last week's meeting of the Canada-United States joint committee on trade and economic affairs we emphasized the importance which Canada attaches to improvement in our current account with the United States, including in particular more exports to that market. While last year Canada's total exports increased by 5.6 per cent over 1964, our sales to the United States increased by 13 per cent and surpassed the \$5 billion mark for the first time. They were more than \$600 million higher than for

Mr. McIlraith: I can tell the hon. member why it was not answered. Question 71 on the order paper reads as follows:

1. Since June 15, 1963, how many Dominion-Provincial Conferences have been held?
2. Which of these conferences were held at the (a) ministerial and which at the (b) official level?

When it comes to meetings at the official level, you get into an area where there is a very large number of meetings.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh.

Mr. McIlraith: It is extremely difficult to know how many meetings are going on. For instance, today in my own department I do not know how many officials are meeting with officials from the various provinces. This is precisely the difficulty. If the hon. member would draft the question correctly we would produce an answer without delay.

Mr. Macquarrie: On a point of order; may I point out that the hon. gentleman has been very gratuitous with his misplaced comments and suggestions. I was asking about dominion-provincial conferences, a fairly distinct kind of meetings.

Mr. McIlraith: On a question of privilege, I should like to point out that in the Department of Fisheries alone, there have been over 50 such dominion-provincial conferences.

Mr. Speaker: That is not a question of privilege.

FINANCE

**ATLANTIC ACCEPTANCE CORPORATION—
EFFECT OF GUIDE LINES ON
COMPANY COLLAPSE**

On the orders of the day:

Hon. J. W. Monteith (Perth): I should like to ask a question of the Minister of Finance. Has the minister any comment to make concerning evidence given yesterday before Hon. Mr. Justice Hughes in Toronto to the effect that the United States guide lines instituted early last year contributed to the collapse of the Atlantic Acceptance Corporation?

Hon. Mitchell Sharp (Minister of Finance): Yes. I was hoping somebody would ask me a question about this. I am sure the house would not expect me to comment on the financial affairs of a particular company which is currently under investigation by a royal commission. I might point out, however, that the United States balance of payments measures, qualified as they were by exemptions negotiated on behalf of Canada, did not prevent Canadian borrowers as a group from obtaining substantial inflows of capital in 1965.