

Inquiries of the Ministry

indulgence of the house I am sure that I can give an explanation, and I am sure that I shall be able to clarify the situation.

Mr. Speaker: Do I understand that the minister wishes to make a statement?

An hon. Member: Make it on Monday on motions.

Mr. Speaker: Does the minister want to table the report to which he has referred?

Mr. Robichaud: I think it might help, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Douglas: Mr. Speaker, is it not more appropriate, if the minister wants to make a statement, to let him make it on motions? That is the proper place to make it.

Mr. Diefenbaker: Mr. Speaker, this is a very important matter that the minister wants to deal with. Canada is getting a black eye as a result of representations being made to the effect that the cruelties perpetrated in the past are being perpetuated now. I suggest that the government might see fit to ask the house to revert to motions so the minister can make his statement.

Mr. Robichaud: Whatever the decision of the house, Mr. Speaker, I am prepared to abide by it.

Mr. Speaker: Is it the desire of the house to revert to motions at this time?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Mr. Siarr: Mr. Speaker, do I understand that the minister is asking that the house revert to motions?

Mr. Speaker: I did not hear that from the minister.

Hon. G. J. McIlraith (Minister of Public Works): Mr. Speaker, the minister has not made any such request. The situation is that a question was put on orders of the day asking for certain information. The nature of the question is such that it cannot be properly answered on orders of the day. It raises the old problem of whether it should not have been put in the form of a written question. In any event the answer is a lengthy one.

This is a very, very important subject. Perhaps it would be agreeable if the question could be put as a written question to which a written answer would be given. That is the way the subject should be handled. Asking to

[Mr. Robichaud.]

revert to motions to make an answer to an oral question, even if properly placed, solves no problem at all for the house. It seems to me the other method is the better one. If the house is ready and willing at this moment to treat the oral question as a written one and to permit it to be answered now, then perhaps that might meet the situation; but I am not asking that that be done.

Mr. Speaker: There is obviously no agreement in this matter, so the Chair has no alternative but to call orders of the day.

SPEECH FROM THE THRONECONTINUATION OF DEBATE ON ADDRESS
IN REPLY

The house resumed, from Thursday, January 20, consideration of the motion of Mr. Goyer for an address to His Excellency the Governor General in reply to his speech at the opening of the session, and the amendment thereto of Mr. Diefenbaker, and the amendment to the amendment of Mr. Douglas.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Réal Caouette (Villeneuve): Mr. Speaker, allow me to congratulate all the members who, last night, through their vote, confirmed their respect for the rights of the minorities in the house. Indeed, minorities, wherever they may be, must be respected. I was not at all surprised to see the members for Yukon and Grey-Bruce (Messrs. Nielsen and Winkler) doing their utmost to curb my freedom as a member and the leader of the *Creditistes* in the house.

That is precisely the type of narrow-mindedness and meanness which is prejudicial to mutual understanding in Canada. The true fanatics, strange as it may seem, are always found in the ranks of the Tories, the Conservatives, the people who wear blinkers and cannot see beyond them.

Mr. Lambert: How about examining your own conscience.

Mr. Caouette: Too bad the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Diefenbaker), was away last night. He would have had the opportunity to see with his own eyes and hear with his own ears the utterances of his two assistants. The Leader of the Opposition who clamours his love of minorities wherever they may be would have blushed with shame at the sight of his two colleagues. We all know that the