

Some hon. MEMBERS: Answer.

Mr. MENARY: Will the minister answer?

Right Hon. J. G. GARDINER (Minister of Agriculture): Mr. Speaker, neither one of the questions applies to my department.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order.

Mr. MENARY: May I ask the Minister of Finance, Mr. Speaker?

Mr. SPEAKER: I understand that the hon. member has put his question. I suggest that he put it on the order paper.

COAST GUARD

INQUIRY AS TO ESTABLISHMENT ON WEST COAST— WRECK OF "CLARKSDALE VICTORY"

On the orders of the day:

Mr. H. G. ARCHIBALD (Skeena): I should like to direct a question to the Minister of National Defence of which I have given him notice. Since he is not in his seat I shall appreciate it if an answer is given tomorrow. Has the government given further consideration to establishing a coast guard on the west coast of Canada, especially in the light of the recent wreck of the *Clarksdale Victory* on the west coast of the Queen Charlotte islands?

Hon. LIONEL CHEVRIER (Minister of Transport): I think the question might have been more properly directed to myself than to the Minister of National Defence, and I am happy to answer it. The matter is one which has been given consideration not only by the Department of Transport but also by the government as a whole, and while the establishment of a coast guard deserves a great deal of sympathetic consideration, on the other hand when one considers the tremendous cost which would follow the extensive establishment of coast guards on all the coasts of Canada he cannot help but come to the conclusion that the cost would be entirely out of proportion to the matter to which my hon. friend referred. I should bring to the hon. member's attention, however, the fact that at the present time the existing facilities for such service are marine service steamers, fishery patrol vessels, Royal Canadian Mounted Police vessels and also the search and rescue squads of the R.C.A.F., which are devoted almost exclusively to air rescue, but which oftentimes have come to the assistance of marine casualties.

Mr. ARCHIBALD: None was there when this boat went down.

PRICES

APPOINTMENT OF SPECIAL COMMITTEE TO INQUIRE INTO PRICE INCREASES AND MATTERS PERTAINING THERETO

The house resumed from Thursday, February 5, consideration of the motion of Mr. Mackenzie King that a select committee be appointed to examine and report on the causes of the recent rise in the cost of living, and matters pertaining thereto.

Mr. CLARENCE GILLIS (Cape Breton South): Mr. Speaker, on Thursday night when this debate adjourned I had said a good deal, and I am not going to repeat anything that I said at that time. To pick up the discussion where I left off, I suggest to the house that the government was not smart when it refused to accept the amendments proposed by the official opposition and by the C.C.F. group. All that the amendments suggested was to broaden the scope of the committee, to give it latitude with regard to bringing in some recommendation.

If the committee is restricted so that it cannot do anything, then it serves very little purpose and the investigation will not mean very much. I have in mind the industrial relations committee which was handling a serious and urgent problem. I know how it functioned; I know of the restrictions which were placed on it. It had no legal status, no right to recommend, no right to file a minority report. It was merely a matter of getting something backstage and out of the mind of the public.

Had the Prime Minister (Mr. Mackenzie King) and the government accepted the amendments proposed, in effect they would have been tying every group in the house to the committee, but by refusing to permit any latitude whatsoever, as suggested by the opposition, the several groups in the house are placed in the position of having to consider whether they are being logical or not in accepting membership on the committee if and when it is set up. I consider that the last amendment of the C.C.F. group was a proper one and that the house should have been permitted to vote on it. Believing that, I am going to read it again to refresh the memory of some hon. members who were home on Thursday and Friday. The amendment reads as follows:

That all the words after "that" be struck out and the following be substituted therefor:

this house is of the opinion that the present crisis demands and the people of Canada want not a parliamentary committee but action by the government to restore price controls and subsidies.