

*Bank of Canada Act*

he lives with me, since we share the same apartment.

The hon. member says that he did not insist?

**Mr. Clermont:** He did not, Mr. Chairman.

**Mr. Gauthier:** I think there was no need for him to insist, Mr. Chairman, because it was a matter of tabling his report. If the committee is to be impartial, it should table this report like any other, and that is precisely why I raise the point.

In my opinion, this is the very basis of all financial dictatorship to which we are more and more subservient every day in our economic structure; furthermore, we find a second control, that is the one exercised upon those who question the witnesses and who have the favour of the special committee. Indeed, when some members of the standing committee who are known as opposed to the government group question the witnesses, a well directed artillery was put into action with a view to annihilating the evidence as much as possible. We have proof of this, and here it is. I will simply mention the most recent case which, to my mind, is the most subtle one.

In this respect, I ask the house to refer to page 125 of the provisional report that was handed to us concerning volume 49 which had not already been translated into French when motion for second reading of the bill was put—and here I wish to thank the members of the bureau for translations who have brought forward the French copies of the true proceedings—when the hon. member for Compton-Frontenac, representing the Ralliement créditiste was questioning Mr. Rasminsky.

The other day I did not have those memoranda before me to start the discussion, and that is precisely why I wish, Mr. Chairman, to tell this house that I wanted to have the proof in order to point out what was happening in the committee.

After a great many sneaky detours to keep the hon. member for Compton-Frontenac from questioning Mr. Rasminsky, the chairman of the committee, realizing that he could not do otherwise, finally agreed to recognize him in the following terms, as recorded in the report:

You may start your questioning and if the members of the committee and myself, as chairman, think you are out of order, we can resume this discussion in due course.

And a second fiddle, the hon. member for Quebec-Montmorency (Mr. Laflamme) added:

Perhaps we could simply advise Mr. Rasminsky to answer more concisely than before.

Mr. Chairman, as recorded at page 125(2) of these reports, it is there very plainly in the verbatim notes I have just read, but what do we find in the printed report? This is the reason why I do want to put the record straight at this stage.

For instance, instead of reporting the hon. member for Quebec-Montmorency as saying:

Perhaps we could simply advise Mr. Rasminsky to answer more concisely than before.

the report distributed to us says:

We want to let Mr. Rasminsky know that it is not necessary for him to repeat what he has already said.

Mr. Chairman, in plain words instead of legal jargon, that means that Mr. Rasminsky does not have to answer the questions put to him by the hon. member for Compton-Frontenac. I can assure you that such speech, from the mouth of a member who may think of himself as a genius in monetary matters, because he has studied law, are likely to deter a business operator like the hon. member for Compton-Frontenac.

In fact, if one reads impartially the questions asked by the hon. member for Compton-Frontenac, one notes that they are as timely and sensible as any asked by any other member.

I was getting a while ago to other remarks made by the hon. member for Quebec-Montmorency. Having failed to understand clearly a question put by the hon. member for Compton-Frontenac, Mr. Rasminsky said quite simply:

I do not understand the question.

Once again, to make fun of the hon. member for Compton-Frontenac, the hon. member for Québec-Montmorency said to Mr. Rasminsky:

You do not have to understand.

Mr. Chairman, all those questions do something to us and when we read the evidence and see such things happening, I assure you that we are right to be ashamed sometimes.

The supremacy of the government is proclaimed in Bill No. C-190. Finally, in the proposed amendment it is said that the government will hold supreme authority over the Bank of Canada. Under the new amendment, the Bank of Canada will have to pay interest but it is not told how to act with our capital which it gives so generously to foreigners. It