

for that power in time of peace, and I am happy to say that was one of the sections which went by the board in the committee. Again I say of the Secretary of State that he conceded the point and accepted the amendments proposed in that connection by the committee.

This section gave the committee a great deal of difficulty, and I wish to say further that the Secretary of State did not get very much cooperation in that committee from his colleague the Minister of National Defence. I do not say that in a personal way. I say it by way of urging on the government that before it brings in legislation of this kind, legislation sponsored by one minister for the purpose of conferring power upon another, there should at least be close consultation and cooperation between the ministers before the legislation is introduced.

What happened was this. This section proposes to vest very wide powers in the Minister of National Defence. A strong case for the giving of those powers was made out before the committee by Brigadier Morrison, an official of the Department of National Defence. He made out a very strong case, so much so that, after his evidence was taken, I think the committee felt that broader powers still would be needed, in the light of the information he had given.

But we later on had a visit from the Minister of National Defence. He fell far short of supporting the very strong case made out in committee by Brigadier Morrison. I think it was a matter of great surprise to the committee that the Minister of National Defence, when invited to address the committee, had this to say to it concerning that most important section in the bill which confers upon him in his capacity as Minister of National Defence very broad powers. Concerning this section he said, "It was only after it appeared that my attention was drawn to it." This appears at page 187 of the proceedings of the committee.

That was the reason the Minister of National Defence gave for confining his remarks to generalities, saying he would have to consult officials of his department again in regard to it. Think of that, Mr. Chairman! Here is a bill designed to give very broad powers to the Minister of National Defence. It gets to the stage of second reading and goes before the committee. The Minister of National Defence comes before the committee at a late stage of its sittings, about the fifth of its meetings on this particular bill, and says in effect, "I did not see this until it was printed and put before the house. And while the officials of my department have been here making out the case for the provisions in the bill, before

I make comment upon it in detail I shall have to confer with the officials of my department." I submit that more is to be expected of the government than that, in the way of cooperation.

I am not making it a personal matter as between minister and minister. But I submit that in fairness to the house and in fairness to members a situation of that kind should not be permitted to recur.

I submit to the committee that the bill in its present form is a satisfactory legislative provision for dealing with the situation disclosed to the committee.

Section agreed to.

Sections 5 to 18 inclusive agreed to.

On section 19—Tariff of fees.

Mr. FLEMING: I have one comment to make on this section. It proposes to increase the fees charged by the patent office. There is no blanket rate of increase. I think it is fair to say the increase averages about twenty-five per cent. So far as the committee was concerned, it was quite prepared to approve increasing the fees, provided that the public is given better service. It would not be fair for the house now to approve the proposed increase in these fees, and then at a later stage to refuse to devote some of the increase in fees to giving the public better service. If the public is to have that better service it means that there must be an increase in staff, and it means also that there must be an increase in space available. There is not space for the staff to work in at the present time, nor is there adequate space for the storage of records. I think the committee should regard it as a matter of honour, in approving this increase in fees, to see to it at the appropriate later stage, that adequate amounts of these fees are turned back to improve facilities for the service of the public.

Mr. GIBSON (Hamilton West): I should like to reply to what the hon. member has said, and to go farther and express my appreciation to the committee for the work it did, not only in amending this bill but also in taking upon itself the responsibility of looking about for better accommodation, for more extensive accommodation, and for making a thorough investigation so that it can bring in a report to the house with respect to what additional facilities the patent office should be provided with.

I wish also to agree with what the hon. member for Eglinton said about the splendid work done by the banking and commerce