

Business of the House

very matter. What is a member of parliament to do? The editorial goes on:

This time he's concerned about the shareholders of the companies who get cost-aid. He says these companies take advantage of the act and yet never pay any dividends. The great example here, he says, is Little Long Lac. Now, is Mr. Fisher so ignorant of what goes on in his own riding that he doesn't know that the Little Long Lac mine closed seven years ago and, naturally, has not received cost-aid since. We think not. In fact, after having aired this bare-faced misstatement, Mr. Fisher later on reveals that he knows differently when he remarks that Little Long Lac receives cost-aid through some other subsidiaries.

This is simply a problem of semantics. I advanced the argument last year and again this year that Little Long Lac has become a large corporation, that is to say a management concern. The mine may have closed down seven years ago but it has built up a number of other mines which it manages in essence. One of these is the McLeod-Cockshutt mine. If you know anything about it, Mr. Speaker, you will be aware that it is a mine that is receiving cost-aid. It is in my constituency and a number of my constituents own stock in the mine. Since Little Long Lac took it over it has not paid a dividend. Before that dividends were paid regularly. The annual report of the company reveals no costs of exploration. The argument advanced by the management of Little Long Lac is that the shareholders really do not want the dividends but are interested in the value of the stock.

Mr. Speaker, may I call it ten o'clock?

Mr. Churchill: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. I did not want to interrupt the hon. member during the course of his remarks but it is contrary to the rules to debate in this house with the editor of a newspaper outside the house and I believe that is exactly what the hon. member was doing. The hon. gentleman might have risen on a question of privilege in dealing with an editorial but he should not use that material as an exchange of opinion between himself and someone outside the house. I hope this will not stand as a precedent for debate.

Mr. Speaker: We had a similar point raised the other day. I think it is contrary to the rules of the house to introduce editorial opinion to support your argument but I am

not sure it is a breach of the rules to refute opinions expressed outside the house. However, I shall look at the point the minister raises in case the hon. member who calls it ten o'clock wishes to pursue the editorial he has mentioned.

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE

Mr. Chevrier: May I inquire what the business is for tomorrow?

Mr. Churchill: For tomorrow the first item will be No. 8 on today's order paper, the resolution in the name of the Prime Minister, which we have called to the attention of the house before, dealing with the tenure of office of judges. The second will be No. 9 on today's order paper, the motion in the name of the Minister of National Revenue to set up a select committee on broadcasting. The third item will be the bill we have just been considering having to do with the Emergency Gold Mining Assistance Act. The fourth will be the second reading of Bill No. S-32, No. 1 on today's order paper, dealing with a bridge across the St. Lawrence river. If required, No. 5 will be No. 10 on today's order paper, the resolution in the name of the Minister of Finance concerning amendments to the Public Service Superannuation Act.

Mr. Chevrier: Can the house leader indicate what we will be doing on Wednesday?

Mr. Churchill: If these legislative items proceed satisfactorily, on Wednesday we will go on with estimates starting with the continuation of the estimates of the Department of Citizenship and Immigration followed by post office and mines and technical surveys.

Mr. Chevrier: That is only in case we dispose of the items that have been named?

Mr. Churchill: I was thinking chiefly in terms of the setting up of a committee on broadcasting. Should that not be finished tomorrow we might carry on that debate on Wednesday, but we are hoping we will finish the five items I have mentioned.

It being five minutes after ten o'clock the house adjourned, without question put, pursuant to standing order.