

CANADA

HOUSE OF COMMONS DEBATES

OFFICIAL REPORT

FIRST SESSION—TWENTY SEVENTH PARLIAMENT

14 ELIZABETH II

VOLUME III, 1966

COMPRISING THE PERIOD FROM THE SEVENTH DAY OF MARCH, 1966,
TO THE TWENTY EIGHTH DAY OF MARCH, 1966, INCLUSIVE

INDEX ISSUED IN A SEPARATE VOLUME

ROGER DUHAMEL, F.R.S.C.
QUEEN'S PRINTER AND CONTROLLER OF STATIONERY
OTTAWA, 1966

23033—143½

HOUSE OF COMMONS

Monday, March 7, 1966

The house met at 2.30 p.m.

TRANSPORT AND COMMUNICATIONS

MOTION FOR CONCURRENCE IN SECOND REPORT OF STANDING COMMITTEE

Mr. Joseph Macaluso (Hamilton West) presented the second report of the committee on transport and communications and moved that the report be concurred in.

He said: The second report of the committee on transport and communications asks permission to sit for tomorrow only while the house is sitting.

Mr. Speaker: The report should be read before the motion is made.

[*The Clerk Assistant having read the report of the committee:*]

Mr. Speaker: Does the house agree to the motion?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Motion agreed to.

TRADE

CANADA-U.S. MINISTERIAL MEETING— REPORT BY MINISTER

Hon. Paul Martin (Secretary of State for External Affairs): Mr. Speaker, the house will recall that early in February the Prime Minister announced plans for the tenth meeting of the Joint Canada-United States Ministerial Committee on Trade and Economic Affairs. This meeting took place last Friday and Saturday in Washington. With the co-operation of the house it was possible for me and my colleagues, the Ministers of Trade and Commerce, Finance, Industry, Mines and Technical Surveys and Agriculture, together with the Governor of the Bank of Canada, to meet with a United States delegation led by Secretary of State Dean Rusk and including Secretaries Fowler, Connor and Freeman. I now wish to table the English and French language versions of the communiqué issued at the end of the meetings. For the convenience of hon. members, the house might wish the text of the communique to be printed as an appendix to today's *Hansard*, as was done in other years.

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Mr. Martin (Essex East): Mr. Speaker, the communiqué records the nature of the discussions and agreement reached on a number of subjects of concern to Canadians and of great significance for Canadian-United States relations. Naturally, a document of this kind cannot do full justice to the spirit of understanding and friendship in which the meetings took place, nor to the fullness and vigour of the exchange of views we had on a wide range of subjects of common interest, both in the meetings and on the various other occasions which provided me and my colleagues with opportunities for private and less formal discussion with our United States counterparts.

• (2:40 p.m.)

May I draw the attention of the house to the references in the communiqué to three of the specific subjects which we raised at the meetings: the United States balance of payments program; the proposed S.E.C. regulations on "over the counter trading in securities"; and the United States foreign assets controls which affect trade with countries such as Communist China and Cuba.

We reiterated in some detail our views on the implications for Canada of the United States guide lines regarding direct investment as they have been commonly understood, and our objections to them. The United States response made it clear that there is no thought that these guide lines given to their corporations should lead to companies in Canada being requested to operate other than in accordance with their normal commercial objectives.

The United States secretaries explicitly recognized that companies in Canada should be governed by Canadian national interest as good citizens of this country. As the communiqué states:

> The committee discussed the balance of payments of both countries. They recognized that decisive progress had been made toward reducing the United States balance of payments deficit and reviewed measures being taken to bring the U.S. external accounts into balance. In this connection, the committee noted measures that have been taken to maintain access to the U.S. capital market for an unlimited amount of new Canadian securities free of interest equalization tax. The United States members reaffirmed that in buying such issues U.S. investors were completely free to be guided by market considerations.

For our part we expressed our concern over the possible implications for Canada of the United States voluntary program on direct investment and the relation of this program to the position of Canadian subsidiaries of U.S. corporations. The United States members made clear that the U.S. government was not requesting U.S. corporations to induce their Canadian subsidiaries to act in any way that differed from their normal business practices as regards the repatriation of earnings, purchasing and sales policies, or their other financial and commercial activities. The United States members re-emphasized the view that U.S. subsidiaries abroad should behave as good citizens of the country where they are located.

Secretary Rusk later confirmed to the press that we had tried to resolve, and he thought succeeded in resolving, "any misunderstanding or differences of approach on this problem as between our two countries". The communiqué, moreover, records the agreement reached that the United States government would ensure that any misunderstandings on the part of United States companies as to the government's views would be dispelled.

Turning now to the S.E.C. problem, we put forward the strong Canadian views on the proposed regulations as an intrusion into our sovereignty. Responsibility for securities and exchange matters in the United States rests with a quasi-judicial body, but the chairman of the S.E.C., Mr. Emmanuel Cohen, was present for this part of the joint committee's discussion and the communiqué records that:

> —the United States members appreciated the concern of the government of Canada and assured Canadian members that most careful consideration would be given to Canadian views in an effort to work out at an early date mutually satisfactory arrangements.

There was also a thorough and useful discussion of United States foreign assets controls which have on occasion created serious difficulty for Canadian companies trading with such countries as Communist China and Cuba. As the communiqué states:

> —the United States members reaffirmed their readiness to consult promptly on any transactions of importance to Canada which are affected by United States foreign assets control. They also stated that regulations over exports of technical data are being revised and that, in the light of the committee's discussions, further consideration will be given to the possibilities of additional modifications to these regulations.

On all these major subjects I consider that the results achieved are very substantial. The government is confident that, on the basis of the understandings reached, experience will confirm our judgment that the problems which were threatening have been effectively dealt with.

Mr. Speaker, the Joint Committee also discussed a wide variety of other matters of common interest to our two countries. In particular we reviewed the Kennedy round negotiations in Geneva and agreed on the importance of their timely and successful conclusion; we agreed to continue to work closely together towards this objective.

In addition to dealing with these matters of general concern, the committee also discussed a number of questions of great practical interest to different sectors of our economy, including the progress which has been achieved under the automotive agreement, Canadian exports of cheese and oil to the United States and trade in agricultural equipment, tractors and aircraft between the two countries, the problem of water pollution in the Great Lakes and the food aid programs of our two countries, notably in the light of the current Indian food situation.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, I had several opportunities to review a wide range of international problems with Secretary Rusk. One that I might mention here is Viet Nam. Secretary Rusk made it amply clear that he recognizes and appreciates the obligations and commitments we have assumed as a member of the International Control Commission and that he hoped we would continue in this capacity to make such contributions as we can toward a peaceful settlement of the Viet Nam problem. At no time did Secretary Rusk press for any contribution other than that which the Canadian government decides in the light of these responsibilities.

Mr. Speaker, this was the tenth meeting of the Joint Committee. I am sure that hon. members on the other side who have participated in the past recognize how useful these meetings can be and I would say that this particular session has been the most constructive and fruitful of the three meetings in which I have had the privilege of taking part.

In taking my seat, I want to thank my colleagues for their co-operation on the Canadian delegation.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. Is it the wish of the house that the communiqué referred to by the Secretary of State for External Affairs be printed as an appendix to *Hansard*?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

[*Editor's note: For the communiqué referred to above see appendix A*].

Right Hon. J. G. Diefenbaker (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, I again express the thanks of the opposition to the government for the courtesy extended by the Secretary of State for External Affairs in providing a copy of the statement that he has just made. In so far as the concluding words of the statement are concerned, as to the benefits that flow from these meetings, all of us who have participated at any time in any of these meetings are fully aware of the beneficial effects of meeting together and exchanging views. However, in so far as the statement is concerned, I think it is far too optimistic, regarding the attainments of this meeting. I might point out that it has been apparent for a considerable time that this government has been carrying into effect rather too literally the recommendations and suggestions of Mr. Merchant and Mr. Heeney, which were issued I think last July, and which placed Canada in the category of being seen and not heard. As I review the events which have taken place since the imposition of the United States guide lines, I can only say that the attitude of the Canadian government has been so supine, so meek, so weak, that interferences with our sovereignty have taken place, which are, and have been, unfair and unreasonable.

• (2:50 p.m.)

Yet as I read the statement of the hon. gentleman I find that the only place in which strong views were expressed was in connection with the S.E.C. program. It is stated in this regard:

> Turning now to the SEC problem, we put forward the strong Canadian views on the proposed regulations as an intrusion into our sovereignty.

In so far as the guide lines were concerned, the words used do not give that degree of certainty which should be expected and which the Canadian people have the right to demand. It is stated:

> We reiterated in some detail our views on the implications of the guide lines for Canada.

When these guide lines were first imposed no serious objection was taken by the government. The attitude was, indeed, that some of these guide lines might perhaps be a kind of windfall for Canada—if I might use that expression without appearing to intrude on any royal commission investigation which is taking place.

The communiqué says:

> The United States members made clear that the United States government was not requesting United States corporations to induce their Canadian subsidiaries to act in any ways that differed from their normal business practices as regards the repatriation of earnings, purchasing and sales policies, or their other financial and commercial activities.

I say that those guide lines have been detrimental to Canada, and are detrimental, and that they constitute an invasion of what should be an exclusively Canadian area of decision and regulations. The wording of the communiqué gives no indication that this problem has been met in a way which is acceptable and reasonable.

There was mention also of the two or three other phases which were dealt with, including the United States balance of payments program. What has happened here is that the United States has a balance of payments problem because of the fact that it sells so much elsewhere less than it is importing. Our position is the very reverse. Yet Canada is made to pay for the settlement or the solution of a United States problem.

In the field of automobiles to which the hon. gentleman made reference, it is of interest to note that according to the communiqué, the arrangement entered into has been of benefit to Canada. Well, in the latest weekly bulletin of the Dominion Bureau of Statistics, dated March 4, we find the following figures: September, 1964, 52,144; September, 1965, 52,-421.

There is very little difference there. Now we come to passenger automobiles. The Canadian consumer still buys, and pays through the nose, though under this agreement Canadian manufacturers are selling their cars abroad and meeting American competition while the Canadian has to pay. Imports of passenger automobiles in 1964 amounted to $96,184,000 from January to September. In the same period in 1965, the amount of imports was $144,315,000.

I am disappointed in this statement. It is simply a diplomatic statement which could have been made before the minister made his visit together with those others who took part in the pilgrimage. It is simply a general summary of a serious situation which in no way has been resolved by the communiqué.

Mr. T. C. Douglas (Burnaby-Coquitlam): Mr. Speaker, I desire to thank the Secretary of State for External Affairs for sending me a copy of the statement which he has just made to the house.

The communiqué, in the main, has dealt with three topics. The first had to do with the application of the United States guide lines to Canadian subsidiaries of American corporations, and I was interested in the minister's statement that the communiqué could not possibly convey the vigour with which the views of the Canadian delegates were expressed. I hope the vigour in Washington was much stronger than has ever been expressed in Ottawa—

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Douglas: —because I recall that last December the Minister of Finance (Mr. Sharp) said of these United States guide lines that they were in effect in line with the Canadian government's policy, and they constituted a political economic windfall for the Canadian government.

Had it not been for the objections which were raised to those guide lines on this side of the house, buttressed by the letters sent by Hon. Eric Kierans of the Quebec government, there would have been no serious objections to these guide lines.

It is true that the government began to have second thoughts about this matter, and a few days ago the Secretary of State for External Affairs said on a national television program that Mr. Kierans was not the only one who had registered objections with the United States government, and that the Canadian government had registered objection. However, I have not been able to find any written objection from the Minister of Finance, from whom one would expect it to come, and other than an aide memoire, which the Secretary of State for External Affairs says he sent, but which so far he refuses to table, and which dealt only with the S.E.C. regulations, no formal objection has been registered by the government to the United States guide lines. Now we are told the ministers have expressed themselves with great vigour, and the communiqué says they have expressed their concern over the possible implications for Canada of the U.S. guide lines.

It seems to me the communiqué is most unrevealing in saying what the attitude of the United States government will be. It says:

> The United States members made clear that the U.S. government was not requesting U.S. corporations to induce their Canadian subsidiaries to act in any ways that differed from their normal business practices as regards the repatriation of earnings, purchasing and sales policies, or their other financial and commercial activities.

But, Mr. Speaker, I point out that this very vague and general statement is, to a very large extent, offset by Mr. Thomas C. Mann, United States Under-Secretary for Economic Affairs who, at the week end, when asked in Washington by the press what it meant when the American government said it expected firms in Canada, which were subsidiaries of United States corporations, to act as good citizens of the country, replied that—

> —the guide lines are flexible enough to let American subsidiaries abroad be good citizens although unnecessary retention of earnings abroad is not desirable.

Which of the guide lines is the United States going to follow—the vague, nebulous statement of the communiqué, or the very specific statement of the U.S. Under Secretary of State for Economic Affairs that a retention of earnings abroad is not desirable?

I think the Canadian government has a responsibility to tell the house what this communiqué means. Does it mean that the United States government is not going to apply these voluntary economic guide lines to Canada? Certainly Mr. Mann, when he was asked, did not say that there would be any difference in the application of these guide lines to Canada from their application to any other country.

• (3:00 p.m.)

The second matter which is dealt with in the communiqué has to do with the change in the Security Exchange Commission regulations. I am glad the Canadian government in this case put forward strong views to the effect that these proposed regulations constitute a violation to our sovereignty. The communiqué does not offer too much comfort. It says that the United States members appreciated the concern of the government of Canada and assured the Canadian members that the most careful consideration would be given to Canadian views.

Well, Mr. Speaker, I do not know how much that means; but I certainly want to urge the government to press for more than consideration and, if early action is not taken, that the government take a much more forceful and forthright attitude than they have taken to date.

The third matter which was dealt with had to do with the United States foreign assets controls which, the minister's statement says, have on occasions created serious difficulty for Canadian companies trading with such countries as Communist China and Cuba.

Again we are not given any specific information other than the statement from the communiqué that the United States members reaffirm their readiness to consult promptly on any transactions of importance to Canada which are affected by United States foreign assets control.

Mr. Speaker, this does not answer the concrete questions. Is there to be any repetition of the deplorable situation which arose last summer when three milling companies in this country, wholly owned subsidiaries of United States corporations, refused to mill Canadian wheat into flour because that flour was going to be sold by the Soviet Union to Cuba. Has the government received any undertaking that there will be no repetition of this kind of incident which makes Canada look like nothing other than an economic satellite of the United States?

There is one last observation in the statement of the minister which intrigues me; that is the one which says that at no time did Secretary Rusk press for any contribution other than that which the Canadian government decides in the light of these responsibilities—referring of course to the Viet Nam situation. Knowing with what care the Secretary of State for External Affairs selects his words, sometimes in order to clarify a situation and sometimes in order to confuse it, I am intrigued by the word "press".

When the minister says that Secretary of State Rusk did not press for any contribution, I want to know whether he has asked for any; I want to know whether he has suggested any. I want the minister at the earliest opportunity to tell the house exactly what position the Canadian delegates took at the Washington meeting. It is not enough for us to hide behind the fact that we are a member of the International Control Commission.

It seems to me the Secretary of State had a clearly defined responsibility to make it clear to the United States that since they have intervened unilaterally in southeast Asia, the Canadian government feels no responsibility to give any support whatsoever in this military venture irrespective of whether or not we are a member of the International Control Commission.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Réal Caouette (Villeneuve): Mr. Speaker, we listened intently to the statement of the Secretary of State for External Affairs (Mr. Martin).

I thank him for sending me a copy of his press release. But I call his attention to the fact that he has sent me an English copy. We hear all the ministers of the crown tell us that there are two official languages in Canada. I wonder a little what the reaction of the Leader of the Opposition would have been if he had received that statement in French without an English copy.

Mr. Martin (Essex East): If it is true that I have sent an English copy to the hon. member, I must say that the French copy which should have been sent to him was received by the hon. member for Burnaby-Coquitlam (Mr. Douglas).

Mr. Caouette: Mr. Speaker, I would ask the minister to inform his departmental officials that the leader of the Créditistes is not the leader of the New Democratic party and that we do not want the leader of the New Democratic party with the Créditistes.

Mr. Speaker, I see four main items in the minister's statement.

First, American investments in Canada;

Second, trade with the communist countries, for which we must secure the Americans' blessing;

Third, the situation in Viet Nam;

Fourth, co-operation in other areas with the United States, in this case the matter of water pollution with regard to the Great Lakes, etc.

But there is one point which we must consider a little more closely, because the statement does not change in any way the statements which we have been hearing in the house in the last month and a half, that is since the opening of the new session. I would even say that there is not much change between last year and this year.

Here is the paragraph which caught our attention and was read a short while ago by the Leader of the Official Opposition. Here it is:

[*English*]

We reiterated in some detail our views on the implications for Canada of the United States guide lines, regarding direct investment as they have been commonly understood, and our objections to them. The United States response made it clear that there is no thought that these guide lines given to their corporations should lead to companies in Canada being requested to operate other than in accordance with their normal commercial activities.

Canada—U.S. Ministerial Meeting

[*Translation*]

Mr. Speaker, this whole matter concerning the United States can be summed up as follows: when American companies decided to ask their Canadian subsidiaries to refrain from investing in Canada and to try and repatriate their earnings without delay to the United States, the situation changed considerably as soon as the U.S. Federal Reserve Commission announced early in February that the interest rate on its loans would be raised from 4 to 4.5 per cent.

Shortly after, the Bank of Canada followed suit and increased its rate by .5 per cent or 1/200th.

The obvious purpose of the American government in announcing a stop to investments at the time was to increase its interest rate; afterwards, as soon as the interest rates were accepted, as soon as the Bank of Canada had followed suit and the Minister of Finance had given his consent, we are told today that the United States does not intend to prevent Canadian subsidiaries from acting otherwise than Canadian companies proper and as good Canadian citizens.

So much for investments, Mr. Speaker.

As far as trade with communist countries is concerned—I said only a word about it a while ago—the minister must ask the Americans permission to trade with China, Russia or Cuba, in short with any communist country in the world; otherwise, the U.S. will resort to reprisals against Canada. The minister is aware of this but breathes not a word about it.

I believe that to insure respect of our sovereignty, we should make up our own minds about trade with these communist countries and the Americans should keep their noses out of our national affairs. I think the minister should take a strong position in this matter.

I come now to my third point: Our participation or contribution in Viet Nam. There is here, and the minister himself stated—

• (3:10 p.m.)

[*English*]

"Finally, Mr. Speaker, I had several opportunities to review a wide range of international problems with Secretary Rusk."

[*Translation*]

Reference is made here to our participation in Viet Nam. Canada is a member of the international control commission for the maintenance of peace. When the Canadian government decides to send technical aid, doctors, nurses or equipment to Viet Nam while being one of the three members of a control commission for peace in the world whose aim is to help solve the problems that might come up here and there, I wonder if there is not a glaring contradiction in our sending technical aid to Viet Nam when we must work to have peace respected in that country, or at least for the establishment of a peace that does not exist at the present time.

The fourth point, Mr. Speaker, has to do with co-operation and collaboration in other fields. I think we are in favour of that. There are several fields, I believe, where we are already co-operating and collaborating with the United States. Inasmuch as our sovereignty and our internal administration are respected, we can co-operate with the United States in many fields, as long as it is to the advantage of both Canada and the United States, but not at the expense of one or the other. That is a sound policy. I feel that is the policy our government should follow.

Now, Mr. Speaker, this side of the house, and particularly our group feels that the hon. Secretary of State for External Affairs did not tell us very much that was new today. We are naturally eager for something more concrete, more details and especially to see more action on the part of the federal government.

[*English*]

Mr. R. N. Thompson (Red Deer): Mr. Speaker, I too wish to thank the hon. minister for seeing that we had copies of his statement prior to the convening of the house. I would say that this general conference now taking place annually between the cabinet members of the Canadian and United States governments is a good thing. We hope it will continue. We hope that as a result of this conference many of the problems that we face will be clarified.

One of the points that concerns me is this. Where does Canada come out of this so-called voluntary investment squeeze with the United States? This statement certainly does not clarify the picture. What is the situation going to be for the more than 900 American subsidiaries that are now operating in Canada? Is it true that Canada has really been given some special status under this United States guide lines program aimed at trimming direct investment and the repatriation of the earnings of these subsidiaries?

These are items upon which there will have to be much more elaboration if we are to understand what the situation really is in Canada. I would say, Mr. Speaker, that the

report of the minister and the communiqué that is referred to mentions that these guide lines which have been set out by the American government are intended to act toward reducing the deficit of the United States' external accounts. Recognizing that the United States does have a balance of payments problem and that it is a very acute problem for them, I find there is no mention at all of the tremendous imbalance in our own trading situation with the United States.

Certainly it is a good thing for us to consider their problems, but what about our problems? While we may be able to ease our own conscience in this regard because of our comparatively favourable balance in the over-all world trade picture, it would be much more favourable than it is if it were not for our imbalance of trade with the United States.

Another point I am concerned about is whether or not these guide lines will permit the United States subsidiaries in Canada to float loans in Canada for the international operations of these companies in their development outside both the United States and Canada. Just the other day the Chrysler Corporation in Canada announced that they were going to raise $50 million outside of the United States for their international operations. Does this mean they are going to do it in Canada? If so, this matter should certainly be clarified as well.

The statement also referred to the Viet Nam situation. I gather from the remarks of Secretary Rusk that he agrees that the contribution of Canada in so far as the Viet Nam picture is concerned can best be made through the International Control Commission. I wonder whether this means that the so-called secret letters that are supposed to have passed between the President of the United States and the Prime Minister of our country now indicate that the Americans have changed their policy from that of a few months ago in relation to our contribution.

I find, also, reference in today's press to the fact that the United States maritime unions are concerned about United States companies trading with North Viet Nam and are planning a waterfront strike to protest against this action. Can it be that Canada is trading with North Viet Nam as well? We would like answers to these questions and I believe the minister must elaborate in much greater detail than he has so far.

We note that the headlines about this conference say that it has been most profitable and productive and that the exchanges covered numerous topics. I think the minister owes it to the house to report on some of the discussions as they relate to topics other than just the guide lines and the Viet Nam picture. We trust that the government will see fit to report on these matters, because not only do I think it is our right in this house to know what the situation is but the Canadian public should have more information in this regard.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. Perhaps hon. members would allow me at this point to bring to the attention of the house the provisions of provisional standing order 15 (2a) regarding ministerial statements and comments. I shall not read the standing order to hon. members and I have purposely up till now refrained from bringing this matter again to the attention of hon. members so that it would not be suggested that I am pointing an accusing finger at any particular commentator. But in my view, when we spend something over 40 minutes commenting on a statement at this time of the day we are in some way offending the requirements of the provisional standing order dealing with this matter.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Speaker: I am sure all hon. members will want to take this into consideration whenever ministerial statements and comments are made.

ADMINISTRATION OF JUSTICE

GEORGE VICTOR SPENCER—TABLING OF CORRESPONDENCE

Mr. John R. Matheson (Parliamentary Secretary to Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, I should like the permission of the house to table copies of correspondence between the solicitor for Mr. George Victor Spencer and officials of the Post Office Department and the Privy Council, referred to in last Friday's debate.

Mr. Speaker: Does the parliamentary secretary have the consent of the house to table the documents he has referred to?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

• (3:20 p.m.)

CANADA PENSION PLAN AMENDMENT

CONTRIBUTIONS TO AND BENEFITS BY HOUSEWIVES

Mr. Max Saltsman (Waterloo South) moved the first reading of Bill No. C-135, to amend the Canada Pension Plan (housewives contributions and benefits).

Some hon. Members: Explain.

Mr. Saltsman: Mr. Speaker, the purpose of this bill is to enable housewives to make contributions to and collect benefits from the Canada Pension Plan.

Since many housewives spend part of their careers working in industry as well as working at home, they should be permitted to continue their contributions to the Canada Pension Plan while at home, to ensure them a full pension at retiring age.

The bill recognizes the equal importance of work performed at home with the work performed in industry and provides housewives with the same pension opportunity.

Motion agreed to and bill read the first time.

FINANCIAL ADMINISTRATION ACT AMENDMENT

EXTENSION OF DUTIES OF AUDITOR GENERAL

Mr. R. N. Thompson (Red Deer) moved the first reading of Bill No. C-136, to amend the Financial Administration Act (parliamentary commissioner for administration).

Some hon. Members: Explain.

Mr. Thompson: Mr. Speaker, this bill is related in intent but not necessarily complementary to Bill No. C-113 which would provide for a parliamentary commissioner or ombudsman.

I believe this bill is necessitated by the tremendous number of cases coming before members of parliament regarding the administration, to which it becomes increasingly difficult to obtain adequate answers.

This bill would extend the duties of an office already in existence, that of the Auditor General. This is an office which is already organized to deal with such matters. This bill would provide authority for certain functions and duties which the Auditor General has by his own admission already assumed because of the nature of his office. This would not require a new appointment or new personnel but would merely extend the authority and would eliminate possible conflict of jurisdiction by channelling complaints through members of the federal house—

Some hon. Members: Order.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. I should like to remind the hon. member of the provisions of standing order 71(2), which allow an hon. member to make a short or brief statement. It seems to me that he is now going beyond the limitations of that standing order.

[Mr. Saltsman.]

Motion agreed to and bill read the first time.

QUESTIONS

(Questions answered orally are indicated by an asterisk.)

UNION GRIEVANCES WITH C.N.R.

Question No. 20—**Mr. Orlikow:**

1. How many grievances have the unions representing C.N.R. employees filed with the company in each of the past three years?

2. How many of these grievances (a) have been settled (b) are still outstanding?

3. Of the grievances that were settled, how many took longer than (a) one month to be settled (b) two months to be settled?

4. Does the C.N.R. use a system of demerits for disciplining its employees, and, if so (a) when was this system established (b) was the system established unilaterally, discussed or negotiated with the unions representing C.N.R. employees?

5. Have the unions representing C.N.R. employees made representations to the company urging abolition or revision of the system of demerits and, if so, on what occasions and what was the response of the C.N.R. management?

Mr. J. A. Byrne (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Transport): 1. Management advises that all collective agreements set out procedures to be followed in the handling and adjudication of grievances between the Company and its employees. It has not been the practice to disclose information as embraced by the questions, it being considered that such information concerns confidential matters between the signatories of the collective agreements.

The C.N.R. has 168 collective agreements covering 85,000 employees. Such information has not been compiled in the form asked, nor is it a requirement under the various requests for information and statistical material made upon the Company by the Board of Transport Commissioners or the Dominion Bureau of Statistics which publishes extensive material concerning the railways.

The traditional and accepted system of railway discipline is known as the Brown System which was inaugurated by the Company in 1923. No representations have been made for its abolition.

2. See above answer.

3. See above answer.

4. See above answer.

5. See above answer.

GRADE CROSSING FUND PAYMENTS

Question No. 37—**Mr. Allard:**

What were the amounts and the percentage of the grants paid from the federal grade crossing fund each year, by province, from 1962 to 1965 inclusively?

Mr. J. A. Byrne (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Transport): The Board of Transport Commissioners for Canada advise as follows:—Table No. 1 hereunder shows the amounts and percentage of commitments, by provinces, made against the railway grade crossing fund for the years 1962 to 1965 inclusive.

Table No. 2 hereunder shows the amounts and percentage of payments, by provinces, made from the railway grade crossing fund for the years 1962 to 1965 inclusive.

TABLE No. 1

COMMITMENTS

	1962		1963		1964		1965	
	Amounts	Per-centage	Amounts	Per-centage	Amounts	Per-centage	Amounts	Per-centage
B.C.	525,086.41	3.17	1,390,105.40	12.78	1,239,213.10	6.76	336.222.55	1.95
ALTA.	575,055.11	3.47	961,202.64	8.84	822,771.34	4.49	1,423,626.35	8.26
SASK.	323,130.00	1.95	439,310.30	4.04	802,692.96	4.38	176,292.89	1.02
MAN.	318,283.61	1.92	133,943.81	1.23	830,220.00	4.53	309.620.46	1.80
ONT.	10,892,629.30	65.69	5,203.951.50	47.84	9,126,275.45	49.80	9,561,230.13	55.51
QUE.	2,111,775.79	12.73	1,793,133.08	16.48	3,520,860.29	19.21	3,963,032.65	23.01
N.B.	384,735.82	2.32	229,883.73	2.11	650,437.40	3.55	461,226.07	2.68
N.S.	1,021,387.89	6.16	456,455.73	4.20	418,593.36	2.28	666,778.63	3.87
P.E.I.	45,770.00	.28	46,604.29	.43	10,232.66	.06	41,840.00	0.24
NFLD.	169,300.00	1.02	10,080.00	.09	679,267.24	3.71	55,489.92	0.32
Non allocated								
Reflectorized crossing signs.	187,336.78	1.13	187,412.00	1.72	200,670.50	1.10	202.674.50	1.18
Reflectorized markings on cars	27,275.63	.16	25,805.24	.24	24,491.09	.13	27,786.84	0.16
Total...	16,581,766.34	100.00	10,877,887.72	100.00	18,325,725.39	100.00	17,225,820.99	100.00

TABLE No. 2

PAYMENTS

	1962		1963		1964		1965	
	Amounts	Per-centage	Amounts	Per-centage	Amounts	Per-centage	Amounts	Per-centage
B.C.	208,557.93	1.89	556,057.24	4.28	1,386.714.95	9.55	187,701.72	1.47
ALTA.	1,330,741.93	12.05	1,601,694.67	12.32	531,013.36	3.66	450,759.17	3.52
SASK.	392,719.25	3.56	405,821.87	3.12	155,273.52	1.07	85,939.23	0.67
MAN.	1,030,180.25	9.33	491,962.41	3.78	678,993.40	4.67	480,376.52	3.75
ONT.	5,936.538.11	53.76	6,394,609.41	49.18	6,997,258.75	48.18	8,844,443.63	69.06
QUE.	858,783.23	7.78	2,383,006.49	18.33	3,381,576.58	23.28	964,656.69	7.53
N.B.	573,434.11	5.19	177,837.70	1.37	352,988.02	2.43	564,927.56	4.41
N.S.	511,177.45	4.63	619,906.05	4.77	387,765.69	2.67	877,739.68	6.85
P.E.I.			64,021.57	0.49	59,277.97	0.41	8,167.74	0.06
NFLD.			115,397.76	0.89	473,155.75	3.26	207,980.62	1.63
Non allocated								
Reflectorized crossing signs.	173,904.97	1.57	165,161.03	1.27	93,985.09	0.65	113,351.01	0.89
Reflectorized markings on cars	26,696.23	0.24	26,384.64	0.20	24,491.09	0.17	20,117.59	0.16
Total...	11,042,733.46	100.00	13,001,860.84	100.00	14,522,494.17	100.00	12,806,161.16	100.00

Questions

FISHING VESSEL "GOLDEN SCARAB"

Question No. 87—**Mr. Crouse:**

1. What is the amount of federal shipbuilding subsidy paid to Scarab Fishing Ventures Ltd., on the tuna seiner *Golden Scarab*?

2. How many pounds of tuna were landed in Canadian ports by this Canadian subsidized ship since it started fishing operations?

3. How many Canadian fishermen are employed on the *Golden Scarab*, and what is the total number of crewmen?

4. What is the amount of the special subsidy paid to the owners of the *Golden Scarab* by the industrial development service of the federal Department of Fisheries?

5. What value was received by the Canadian taxpayer for this expenditure?

6. What are the names of Canadian government officials who accompanied the *Golden Scarab* on her first two voyages, and what were their duties?

7. Has any Canadian company indicated it intends to purchase the *Golden Scarab*?

Miss Judy V. LaMarsh (Secretary of State): I am informed by the departments of Fisheries and Transport as follows: 1. $764,250.

2. Nil.

3. At last report 1 Canadian in crew of 13.

4. $25,000.

5. The principals involved in construction of this vessel are proceeding with construction of a large tuna plant in southern New Brunswick. Furthermore, construction is proceeding in Canada of three 210-foot trawler seiner tuna vessels to supply raw material to this plant. An industry of considerable magnitude is being established which will be significant to the economy of the Atlantic region.

6. First voyage, G. H. Imbeault, technical officer, Department of Fisheries. Second voyage, Clarence Savoie, fisheries specialist engaged under contract with the Department of Fisheries.

Their duties were to observe and report on the operations, and to collect information useful in a biological and technological assessment of this new fisheries development.

7. Unknown.

OTTAWA—RENTAL OF FEDERAL PROPERTY

Question No. 89—**Mr. Howard:**

Does the Alexander Fleck Company Limited or Beach Foundry Limited lease or otherwise rent any property from the federal government or any agency or branch thereof and, if so (a) upon what day did the lease or rental arrangement commence (b) what is its duration (c) what, in detail, are the rental or lease fees?

[Mr. Byrne.]

Miss Judy V. LaMarsh (Secretary of State): I am informed by several departments as follows: no.

OFFICE FACILITIES OUTSIDE OTTAWA

Question No. 114—**Mr. Ormiston:**

What is the location of government office space and office facilities, if any, outside of Ottawa now being utilized or made available to Ministers, parliamentary secretaries and members of parliament?

Hon. G. J. McIlraith (Minister of Public Works): Arichat, N.S., federal building; Inverness, N.S., federal building; Quebec, Que., Champlain Harbour station; Montreal, Que., postal station "B"; Youville postal station; Drummondville, Que., federal building; Longueuil, Que., Post Office building; Kingston, Ont., Federal building; Niagara Falls, Ont., Customs building; Toronto, Ont., Arthur Meighen building; Manitoba, St. Boniface Federal building; Vancouver, B.C., Federal building; Customs House.

OWNERSHIP OF LOTS 38 AND 39, ST. NICHOLAS DE LÉVIS, QUE.

Question No. 122—**Mr. Caouette:**

1. Has the National Harbours Board ever been the owner of lots Nos. 38 and 39 in the municipality of St. Nicholas de Lévis?

2. If so, is the National Harbours Board still the owner of these lots?

3. If not (a) when were they sold (b) to whom (c) at what price (d) who were the bidders and what was the amount of each bid (e) for what reason was the successful bid accepted?

4. Are the records in which such deeds of sale are registered available to the public and, if not, for what reason?

Mr. J. A. Byrne (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Transport): The National Harbours Board informs as follows: 1. Yes.

2. No.

3. (a) October 10, 1963; (b) Paul Beaurivage; (c) $3,000; (d) (i) Mr. Jules Cantin offered $100 on June 8, 1957. (ii) Mr. Paul Beaurivage offered $3,000 on May 22, 1962. This offer was accepted. (iii) Mr. Andre Cantin offered $3,300 or $3,500 on March 26, 1963, but the offer of Mr. Beaurivage had been accepted by that time.

4. Property transactions are usually filed by the purchaser with the local land registry office, and such records are available to the public.

Questions

PERMANENT VOTERS LIST

Question No. 153—**Mr. Stefanson:**

1. Has the government received a report from the representation commissioner with regard to establishing a permanent voters list?

2. If so, what plans has the government for implementing any recommendations contained therein?

Hon. Judy V. LaMarsh (Secretary of State): 1. The Representation Commissioner Act of 1963 provides in Section 9 that the Commissioner shall report to the Speaker on this subject within two years after the issuance of the first representation order made pursuant to the Electoral Boundaries Readjustment Act. I am informed by the Representation Commissioner that no such report has yet been made.

2. N/A.

CIVIL SERVICE HOLIDAYS AND OVERTIME, 1965

Question No. 214—**Mr. Winch:**

1. Was an order issued in 1965, that all or certain classification employees in the government service had to take holidays owing or accumulated overtime prior to December 31, 1965, or lose their rights to same?

2. If so, what consideration was given to those employees, who because of their responsibilities in government service, were unable to take the time off?

3. In the circumstances outlined in (2) above, has or will immediate consideration be given to make provision for time off to be taken in 1966, or pay, for the services rendered by these loyal civil servants in 1965?

Hon. Judy V. LaMarsh (Secretary of State): 1. No.

2. n/a.

3. n/a.

C.B.C. SERVICES ABROAD

Question No. 405—**Mr. Caouette:**

1. How many representatives or employees work for the C.B.C. in countries other than Canada?

2. What has been the cost of maintenance for the C.B.C. of these services (employees, material, equipment, etc.) outside Canada for the last three years?

[*Translation*]

Hon. Judy V. LaMarsh (Secretary of State): I am informed by the C.B.C. as follows:

1. A total of 55 employees, including foreign correspondents and clerical staff hired locally, are employed by C.B.C. foreign offices at eight locations outside Canada.

2. 1962/63, $636,519; 1963/64, $825,094; 1964/65, $954,815.

DESALINATION OF SEA WATER

Question No. 431—**Mr. Laprise:**

1. For how long has the government been interested in the economic aspects of the desalination of sea water?

2. Has the government asked anyone to make a study of this question and, if so (a) who was asked, and (b) what amount of money was required for such a study?

3. Who were the representatives of Canada at the first international symposium held on the desalination of water, and how much was the government required to pay to defray the expenses of its delegates?

[*English*]

Hon. Judy V. LaMarsh (Secretary of State): I am informed by the Departments of Mines and Technical Surveys and Industry as follows:

1. Progress in the development of an economic method or methods for the desalination of saline water has been of general interest to the government of Canada since its development began. Interest in this possibility became definite late in 1964 when the United States government began to organize the first international symposium on water desalination which was held in Washington, D.C. during the period October 3-9, 1965.

2. No.

3. Mr. J. A. MacDonald, chief delegate, assistant deputy minister, Department of Northern Affairs and National Resources, $276.45. Dr. S. Sourirajan, National Research Council, $286.82. Prof. R. L. Hummel, University of Toronto, $335.00. Mr. A. Wyatt, Atomic Energy of Canada Limited, $270.46. Dr. J. F. Fulton, water resources branch, Department of Northern Affairs and National Resources (now Mines and Technical Surveys), $224.52. Total, $1,393.25.

FILM BOARD FILM ON MOTORCYCLE HILL CLIMBING

Question No. 462—**Mr. Hales:**

1. Did the National Film Board pay a midwestern Ontario motorcycle club for the opportunity of making a film on "Hill Climbing" and related feats, in 1965?

2. If so, how much was the club paid and in what form was the obligation paid?

Hon. Judy V. LaMarsh (Secretary of State): 1. & 2 No payment was made to the club itself. However, payments totalling $95 were made to seven club members for their services in the film over a 17 day period. Furthermore, the film board incurred expenditures

of $81.72 for (a) rental of premises and (b) refreshments provided to a group taking part in a kind of party sequence.

AVONLEA, SASK.—SERVICES FOR C.N.R. SECTION HOUSE

Question No. 506—**Mr. Watson (Assiniboia):**

1. On what date were tenders called for sewer and water in the section house at Avonlea, Saskatchewan?

2. Were the C.N.R. officials aware that there were no sewer and water connections available to service this property?

3. When will these modern conveniences be connected to the town sewer and water system?

Mr. J. A. Byrne (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Transport): The management of Canadian National Railways advise as follows: 1. May 31, 1964.

2 & 3. As stated in reply to question No. 424 by Mr. Watson as recorded in the *Hansard* of Wednesday, June 16, 1965, page 2488; sewer and water connections were not available on railway property. However, application had been made for an easement through school property to enable connections being made to the town facilities. At that time, approval was expected almost immediately; however, such approval was not received until late in 1965. As it was considered to be too late in the year to commence installation of sewer and water lines, the work was postponed until this spring when weather permits.

CIVIL SERVICE RADIO OPERATORS

Question No. 512—**Mr. Mather:**

1. Have representations been received from radio operator personnel of the civil service calling attention to the discrepancies between their wage levels and that of staff members with similar responsibilities?

2. Is consideration being given to a pay review for working-level radio operators of the civil service?

Hon. Judy V. LaMarsh (Secretary of State): I have been given the following information by the civil service commission:

1. The civil service commission has received representations from a staff association on behalf of radio operators pointing out that another class of employees, performing duties unrelated to those of a radio operator received a slightly higher maximum salary while the qualification requirements were lower than those for radio operator.

2. Measures are to be taken very shortly by the Department of Transport and the civil service commission to develop a new classification standard for radio operators. Salaries for the class radio operator, grades 1, 2 and 3, were revised effective October 1, 1964 and August 1, 1965. This class will be subject to a special review in expectation of transition to collective bargaining before the regular cyclical review of July 1, 1967.

CLOSING OF C.N.R. STATION, CONISTON, ONT.

Question No. 530—**Mr. Fawcett:**

Has Canadian National Railways a master plan which involves the closing of some stations in Northern Ontario and, if so, is the station at Coniston one of these and for what reason?

Mr. J. A. Byrne (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Transport): The management of Canadian National Railways advise as follows:

In connection with express freight operations, all accounting associated with carload, express freight, passenger and telecommunication functions was transferred from Coniston to Sudbury in October last year.

No decision has been reached regarding the closing of the station at Coniston. The closing of any station is dependent on approval being obtained from the Board of Transport Commissioners.

SEAWAY INTERNATIONAL BRIDGE CORPORATION

Question No. 543—**Mr. Caouette:**

1. When was the Seaway International Bridge Corp. Ltd., a subsidiary company of the St. Lawrence Seaway Authority, incorporated?

2. Does this subsidiary company have an official name in French?

3. Since its incorporation, what have been the profits or the losses of this subsidiary company?

4. Is this subsidiary company a Crown agency?

5. Does this subsidiary company pay municipal taxes?

6. Since its incorporation, how many employees has it had each year?

7. Do its employees come under ordinary labour legislation?

Mr. J. A. Byrne (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Transport): The St. Lawrence Seaway Authority advises as follows:

1. November 13, 1962.

2. No, the company is owned jointly by the Saint Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation of the United States and The St. Lawrence Seaway Authority.

3. Since its incorporation the excess of income of the corporation over the cost of

operating and maintaing the bridge has amounted to $556,570. In accordance with the agreement between The St. Lawrence Seaway Authority and its U.S. counterpart, this excess has been transferred to The St. Lawrence Seaway Authority to be applied against amortization of the cost of the north channel bridge.

4. Yes.

5. As the Bridge Corporation owns no land it pays no municipal taxes. The corporation does, however, reimburse The St. Lawrence Seaway Authority for grants in lieu of taxes related to the land occupied by the bridge.

6. 1963, 19 employees; 1964, 18 employees; 1965, 18 employees.

7. Yes.

MUNICIPAL TAXATION ON CROWN CORPORATIONS

Question No. 545—**Mr. Caouette:**

1. Does the government intend to make Crown corporations, carrying on business of a commercial nature, liable to municipal taxation?

2. Do the subsidiary companies of the Canadian National Railways pay municipal taxes?

Hon. Judy V. LaMarsh (Secretary of State): I am informed by the Departments of Finance and Transport as follows:

1. Crown corporations of a commercial nature are already paying grants in lieu of municipal taxes. The payments are generally ex gratia and the corporations involved are therefore not legally liable for the payments which they make. In general this arrangement has worked well and there does not appear to be a need to alter the tax exempt status of our crown corporations. There are, however, some differences between the grant practices of different crown corporations and a review is being conducted to determine whether all of these differences are warranted.

2. The management of Canadian National Railways advise as follows: yes.

WHEAT SALES TO AND IMPORTS FROM CHINA

Question No. 564—**Mr. Mandziuk:**

1. What has been the amount realized from wheat sales to mainland China during the years 1963, 1964 and 1965?

2. What is the value of Canada's imports from China during the years 1963, 1964 and 1965?

3. What items are on the sensitive list which limits China's exports to Canada?

4. Are worsted fabrics from mainland China on the sensitive list?

Hon. Judy V. LaMarsh (Secretary of State): I am informed by the Departments of Finance and Trade and Commerce as follows:

1. The value of wheat exports to mainland China during the calendar years 1963 and 1964, and January to November 1965, latest figures available, was as follows: 1963, $103,001,000; 1964, $116,725,000; January-November 1965, $95,042,000.

2. The value of imports from mainland China during the calendar years 1963 and 1964, and the period January to September, 1965, latest figures available, was as follows: 1963, $5,147,000; 1964, $9,420,000; January-September 1965, $11,512,000.

3. The following is the list of goods for which separate limitations have been established on exports by Chinese trading corporations.

I. Cotton piece goods: (a) Velveteen and other pile fabrics, other than terry cloth; (b) Yarn dyed fabrics; (c) Greige cotton fabrics excluding gauze and corduroy; (d) All other cotton fabrics.

II. Cotton yarn; cotton sewing thread.

III. Other cotton products, not including those with substantial hand embroidery or other hand work. (a) tablecloths; (b) handkerchiefs; (c) pillowcases; (d) sheets; (e) cotton garments (sub-quotes on shirts made from woven fabrics, blouses, trousers, slacks and shorts, knitted shirts, including T-shirts).

IV. Other textile items not including these substantially of silk, linen, ramie or wool: (a) ladies' dress gloves; (b) work gloves; (c) bedspreads; (d) dish towels and hand towels; (e) other towels and bath mats; (f) fabrics wholly or substantially of man-made fibres; (g) narrow fabrics; (h) garments of man-made fibres or mixed fibres.

V. Non textile items: (a) plywood; (b) table flatware; (c) waterproof rubber footwear; (d) rubber soled footwear with fabric uppers; (e) polyester buttons; (f) metal friction toys; (g) flashlights; (h) vacuum flasks; (i) sewing machines; (j) paint brushes.

4. No.

STOP-OFF CHARGE AT TERMINAL ELEVATORS

Question No. 616—**Mr. Watson (Assiniboia):**

1. What is the amount of the "stop-off charge" levied by the railways at terminal elevators for each year that the grain is in storage?

Questions

2. For how many years can this be charged?

3. How much has been paid in this way to the railways in each of the years from 1955 to 1965?

Mr. J. A. Byrne (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Transport): The Board of Transport Commissioners for Canada advise as follows:

1. The railways provide in their freight tariffs that barley, oats and wheat shipped by, or for account of the Canadian Government (Canadian Wheat Board), now in storage or hereafter received for storage in: Canadian Government terminal elevators at Calgary, Edmonton, Lethbridge, Alberta, Moose Jaw and Saskatoon, Saskatchewan; Elevator of Eastern Terminal Elevator Company Limited, North Transcona, Manitoba; Elevator of Searle Grain Company Limited, Kenora, Ontario. Also screenings from such grains, may be shipped from storage point within the periods specified below from date of inward expense bill, at the stop-off charges listed below, subject to the conditions (other than time limit for reshipment) governing storage-in-transit privilege provided in Rule 14: If reshipped within twelve months after arrival at storage point, 3 cents per 100 lbs. If reshipped later than twelve months after arrival at storage point but not later than twenty four months, 5¼ cents per 100 lbs. If reshipped later than twenty four months after arrival at storage point but not later than thirty six months, 7½ cents per 100 lbs. If reshipped later than thirty six months arrival at storage point but not later than forty eight months, 9¾ cents per 100 lbs.

2. See answer to part 1.

3. Information not available.

USE OF INSECTICIDES ALDRIN AND DIELDRIN

Question No. 627—**Mr. Monteith:**

1. Are Aldrin and Dieldrin permitted for use in Canada as insecticides?

2. If so, on what specific types of crops are they permitted to be used?

3. Are they permitted for use on any vegetable, green or forage crops?

Hon. J. J. Greene (Minister of Agriculture):

1. Aldrin and Dieldrin are registered for use as insecticides in Canada.

2. These insecticides are registrable at the present time for use on the crops noted with the following provisions as specified: Provision 1—that such crops or parts thereof are not for animal feeding purposes; Provision 2—where soil applications are recommended, that such crops are not grown in rotation with root crops for animal feeding purposes.

Seed crops: Provisions 1 and 2, alfalfa, clover, grasses and sugar beets.

Fruit crops: Provisions 1 and 2 as applicable, apple, blueberry, cantaloupe, peach, cranberry and strawberry and in addition for Dieldrin only: apricot, cherry, pear, plum, prune, currant and melons.

Vegetable: Provisions 1 and 2 apply, asparagus, celery, beet, broccoli, Brussels sprouts, cabbage, carrot, cauliflower, cucumber, eggplant, kohlrabi, lettuce, marrow, onion, pepper, potato, pumpkin, spinach, squash, tomato, turnip, rutabaga and in addition for Alrin only: collard, endive, gourd, horseradish, kale, mustard, greens, parsnip, pimento, radish, Swiss chard.

Grain—Group 1, Provision 2 applies, bean peas, soybean and corn. Seed treatment and preplant soil treatment only. Group 2, barley, oats, rye and wheat for grain production only. Application not to be made later than the shot blade stage, and straw not to be fed to livestock. Group 3, flax and sunflower. Application not to be made later than the flowering stage, and the straw and stocks not to be fed to livestock.

3. Answered by 2.

SHIPBUILDING SUBSIDIES ON B.C. FERRIES

Question No. 641—**Mr. Davis:**

Since the inception of the federal subsidy policy for shipbuilding (a) what total sum has been remitted to shipbuilders on ferries built for the account of the government of British Columbia or its toll authority (b) what is the estimated subsidy on ferries approved but not yet completed?

Mr. J. A. Byrne (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Transport): The Canadian Maritime Commission advises as follows: (a) $13,759,980.05; (b) $2,106,822.29 of which progress payments in the amount of $1,685,457.82 have been made to date and are included in the answer to (a) above.

SHIP CONSTRUCTION SUBSIDIES

Question No. 642—**Mr. Davis:**

1. How much has been paid in subsidies for ship construction since passage of the ship construction assistance regulations in 1961 for (a) the whole of Canada (b) each of the shipyards on the Pacific coast?

2. What was the percentage of such subsidies to the total cost of construction (of those vessels which qualified) for (a) the whole of Canada (b) each of the shipyards on the Pacific coast?

Mr. J. A. Byrne (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Transport): The Canadian Maritime Commission advises as follows: 1. (a) $130,721,047.52; (b) Allied Shipbuilding Ltd. $1,659,774.80; B.C. Marine Engineers & Shipbuilders Ltd., $364,720.25; Bel-Aire Shipyard Ltd., $166,546.70; Benson Bros. Shipbuilding Co. (1960) Ltd. (formerly A. C. Benson Shipyard Ltd.), $771,062.17; W. E. Bond, $3,400.00; Burrard Dry Dock Company Limited, $4,192,-772.82; International Shipbuilders Ltd. (formerly Matsumoto Shipyards Limited), $266,-689.98; John Manly Ltd., $606,630.08; McKenzie Barge & Derrick Co. Ltd., $1,117,-292.59; Osborne Shipyards Ltd., $12,023.43; Star Shipyards (Mercer's) Ltd., $1,403,805.30; Victoria Machinery Depot Company Limited, $12,798,123.68; West Coast Salvage & Contracting Co. Limited, $49,944.34; Yarrows Ltd., $6,263,568.39.

2. (a) 32.7 per cent. (b) Allied Shipbuilders Ltd., 33.8%; B.C. Marine Engineers & Shipbuilders Ltd., 27.3%; Bel-Aire Shipyard Ltd., 36.8%; Benson Bros. Shipbuilding Co. (1960) Ltd. (formerly A. C. Benson Shipyard Ltd.), 39.2%; W. E. Bond, 40.0%; Burrard Dry Dock Company Limited, 39.5%; International Shipbuilders Ltd. (formerly Matsumoto Shipyards Limited), 38.8%; John Manly Ltd., 37.6%; McKenzie Barge & Derrick Co. Ltd., 33.1%; Osborne Shipyards Ltd., 40.0%; Star Shipyards (Mercer's) Ltd., 29.9%; Victoria Machinery Depot Company Limited, 36.1%; West Coast Salvage & Contracting Co. Limited, 31.5%; Yarrows Ltd., 31.5%.

BIDS FOR N.R.C. ACCELERATOR BUILDING

Question No. 650—**Mr. Douglas:**

1. Did V. K. Mason Construction Limited of Ottawa submit a bid for the construction of a National Research Council accelerator building, and (a) if so, what was the amount of their bid (b) has this company an agreement with the unions affiliated with the Ottawa Building Trades Council?

2. Did Sirotek Construction Limited of Ottawa submit a bid for the construction of a National Research Council accelerator building, and (a) if so, what was the amount of their bid (b) does Sirotek Construction Limited have an agreement with the unions affiliated with the Ottawa Building Trades Council?

3. Which company's bid was accepted?

4. Is it the policy of the federal government to award contracts, all other things being equal, to companies that are unionized?

Hon. G. J. McIlraith (Minister of Public Works): 1. Yes. (a) $1,547,000. (b) We have no information from the company in this respect, but advice from the Trades Council indicates that the company has an agreement with unions affiliated with the Ottawa Building Trades Council.

2. Yes. (a) $1,547,000. (b) No, we have been informed that Sirotek have agreements with other unions.

3. Sirotek Construction Limited.

4. Labour conditions applicable to these contracts are set by the Department of Labour and are included as part of tender documents. Under the system of public bids, therefore, no preference is given to contractors whose employees belong to any specific labour union since all bidders must meet the labour conditions applicable to the contract.

WEST BLOCK ELEVATORS

Question No. 655—**Mr. Martin (Timmins):**

1. On what date were the existing House of Commons West Block elevators installed?

2. Were tenders called for these elevators and, if so, which concerns submitted tenders, what were the amounts bid, and which bid was successful?

3. Was the successful bidder a Canadian firm?

4. Is the firm in question still in business, and if not, when did it cease operation?

5. Did any guarantee accompany installation of the elevators and, if so, what were its terms?

6. What has been the total cost to the government of maintenance and repairs to these elevators since installation?

7. Is any action proposed to improve elevator service in the West Block?

Hon. G. J. McIlraith (Minister of Public Works): 1. Installation completed May 21, 1963.

2. Not by the department. At least three elevator companies submitted tenders to the general contractors in accordance with standard practice. The elevators formed a part of the general contract. These were: Beckett Elevator Co. Ltd., Toronto, amount $183,675, Turnbull Elevator Co. Ltd., Toronto, amount not known, Otis Fenson Elevator Co. Ltd., Hamilton, amount not known. Successful bidder, Beckett Elevator Company Limited.

3. Yes.

4. Yes.

5. Yes. The materials and workmanship of the apparatus installed would be first class in every respect; and that the contractor would make good any defects, not due to ordinary wear and tear or improper use which may develop within one year from date of final acceptance and commencement of operation by the owner.

Questions

6. Up to September 30, 1965—$9,760.77.

7. Yes.

WAR VETERANS RECEIVING PENSIONS

Question No. 666—**Mr. Caouette:**

1. How many war veterans received pensions from the Department of Veterans Affairs in 1965?

2. What is the total amount of such pensions?

3. How many war veterans, by province, received a pension in 1965?

Hon. Roger Teillet (Minister of Veterans Affairs): 1. There were 141,612 Canadian veterans of World War I and World War II in receipt of disability pensions from the Canadian Pension Commission as at September 30, 1965, the last date for which complete information is available.

2. The total amount of such pensions was $128,815,387.00.

3. War veterans, by province, receiving disability pensions as at September 30, 1965:

Province	W.W. I	W.W. II	Both Wars
Newfoundland	535	978	1,513
Prince Edward Island	277	1,200	1,477
Nova Scotia	1,798	6,330	8,128
New Brunswick	957	4,621	5,578
Quebec	2,180	13,935	16,115
Ontario	11,751	38,082	49,833
Manitoba	2,709	8,556	11,265
Saskatchewan	1,409	4,829	6,238
Alberta	2,160	8,458	10,618
British Columbia	6,228	15,112	21,340
Outside Canada	5,093	4,414	9,507
Totals	35,097	106,515	141,612

*REPAYMENTS BY MUNICIPALITIES UNDER WINTER WORKS

Question No. 673—**Mr. Ricard:**

According to the audit made by the provincial governments of the books kept by the municipalities on account of the winter works, what are the sums recovered by each of the provincial governments and what is the share to be recovered by the federal government for the years of 1963, 1964 and 1965?

Mr. J. C. Munro (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Citizenship and Immigration): Mr. Speaker, the answer to starred question No. 673 is as follows: The information is not available. Municipal claims under the Municipal Winter Works Incentive Program must be submitted in the first instance to the provincial governments for approval. The provincial auditors delete ineligible items and relevant costs from such claims before transmitting them to the federal government for reimbursement of the federal share. The provincial pre-audit therefore does not lead to recovery as no payment is made in the first instance in respect of ineligible items discovered by the audit.

SHIPBUILDING SUBSIDIES TO C.N.R.

Question No. 678—**Mr. Barnett:**

1. Have any subsidies been paid toward construction of any vessels for Canadian National Railways or its subsidiaries under the program instituted by the previous government?

2. If so, for what vessels and in what amount for each vessel?

3. Are vessels which may be constructed for Canadian National Railways or its subsidiaries eligilble for subsidies under the program announced by the Minister of Transport on February 2, 1966?

Mr. J. A. Byrne (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Transport): 1. No.

2. Not applicable.

3. No.

PURCHASE OF COAST GUARD LIFEBOAT

Question No. 680—**Mr. MacEwan:**

1. When will the Department of Transport purchase the first new type lifeboat for the coast guard?

2. From what company will this lifeboat be purchased?

3. What will be the size of the lifeboat and of what material will it be constructed?

Mr. J. A. Byrne (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Transport): 1. Purchasing action has commenced and delivery is scheduled for November, 1966.

2. Procurement of the prototype for evaluation purposes will be from the U.S. coast guard.

3. Length overall, 44′-10½″; breadth extreme, 12′-8″; draft, 3-2½″. The boat is of steel construction.

LEVEL CROSSING REMOVALS AND PROTECTION

Question No. 683—**Mr. Noble:**

1. For the last period of one year available, what sums have been paid out under the railway grade crossing fund by way of assistance directed toward the removal of level railway crossings?

2. In the same period, what expenditure has been made for signal protection devices?

3. Will the government consider increasing these grants as a centennial project in 1967?

Mr. J. A. Byrne (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Transport): The Board of Transport Commissioners for Canada advise as follows: 1. During the calendar year 1965 the Board of Transport Commissioners authorized the payment of $8,874,292.34 from the fund to assist in the actual construction of overhead bridges, subways and railway highway diversions which eliminated level crossings.

2. During the calendar year 1965, the board authorized payment from the Fund of $2,891,876.98 for the installation and improvement of automatic protection devices.

In addition to the two amounts stated above $1,040,091.84 was paid out of the Railway Grade Crossing Fund for the reconstruction of inadequate grade separations, improvements to grades and vision at crossings, the installation of reflectorized crossing signs and the placing of reflective markings on railway box cars.

The board also authorized commitments to be made against the Railway Grade Crossing Fund in the amount of $17,231,674.95 to aid construction work for the protection, safety and convenience of the public in respect of highway railway crossings, during this same period.

3. No information is available in so far as the Board of Transport Commissioners is concerned.

HALIFAX—NAVAL SHIPS AND LAND FACILITIES

Question No. 697—**Mr. Mongrain:**

1. How many ships of the Canadian navy now have Halifax as their home port?

2. Which land facilities are controlled by the navy at Halifax?

Hon. Paul Hellyer (Minister of National Defence): 1. 26, excluding two British submarines on loan to the RCN, seven ships in reserve and civilian manned auxiliary vessels.

2. In the Halifax area—HMCS Stadacona, HMC Dockyard, Central Victualling Depot, Seaward Defence Base, RCN Supply Depot, Outside storage site, Gladstone Street Stores, Garage site, Melville Island, Part of McNabs Island. In the Dartmouth area—HMCS Shearwater, RCN Armament Depot, Albro Lake Radio Station, RCN Diving School—French Cable Wharf, Shannon Park—Married Quarters.

REGISTRATION OF DRUG MANUFACTURERS

Question No. 711—**Mr. Harley:**

1. Does the government intend to register drug manufacturers as recommended by the special committee on food and drugs?

2. If so (a) under what terms of reference will this be brought about (b) what is the expected date of commencement of such a program (c) what will be the method of enforcement of such a program?

Hon. A. J. MacEachen (Minister of National Health and Welfare): 1. As this is a matter of government policy, any announcement will be made by the government at the appropriate time.

2. See answer 1. above.

WATER CONSERVATION PROJECTS, ONTARIO

Question No. 713—**Mr. Lind:**

1. What is the total estimated cost of the Pittock dam, now under construction at Woodstock, Ontario?

2. What is the cost of the city of London for the Pittock dam?

3. What is the cost to the town of Ingersoll for the Pittock dam?

4. What is the cost to the city of Woodstock for the Pittock dam?

5. What benefit would the city of London receive from the Pittock dam as regards flood control?

6. Will the water stored behind the Pittock dam be drawn down to maintain a normal summer flow on the south branch of the river Thames?

7. Will the water stored behind the wildwood be drawn down to maintain a normal summer flow on the north branch of the river Thames?

8. What was the approved cost on which the federal government is to pay 37½ per cent for the Wildwood dam?

9. What was the approved and actual cost of the Fanshawe dam at London, Ontario?

10. What is the total amount to date paid by the federal government as grants in aid for structures constructed by the upper Thames River conservation authority?

11. What is the total contribution to date of the federal government to the Grand River conservation authority or commission?

12. What is the total of federal grants or assistance to date, paid to the Metro (Toronto) conservation authority?

13. Which conservation authority, Upper Thames, Grand or Metro, has the greatest area of arable agricultural land?

14. What is the largest flood control structure built in Ontario on which the federal government paid part of the cost?

15. What is the largest flood control structure in Canada in which the federal government shared in the capital cost?

Questions

Hon. Jean-Luc Pepin (Minister of Mines and Technical Surveys): 1. $4,200,000.

2. Information not available. The division of project costs between member municipalities is made by the Upper Thames River Conservation Authority.

3. Information not available, (See No. 2).

4. Information not available, (See No. 2).

5. Benefit will depend on plan of operation, for which the Province of Ontario is responsible.

6. Yes.

7. Yes.

8. $1,471,800.

9. Approved cost $4,635,252; actual cost $4,799,000.

10. $3,966,563.87 to November 30, 1965.

11. $2,598,126 to the Grand River Conservation Commission; nil to the Grand River Conservation Authority.

12. No federal contributions for flood control projects have been paid directly to the Metropolitan Toronto Conservation Authority. The Province of Ontario has been paid $3,473,758.14 to November 30, 1965, as the federal government contribution to the shareable portion of the Metropolitan Toronto Conservation Authority program which had been completed at that date.

13. Information not available, as it is not a requirement for appraisal of flood control project proposals submitted by provinces in applying for federal government contributions.

14. The largest flood control structure built in Ontario in terms of total water storage capacity to which the federal government has contributed a share of the cost is the Shand dam.

15. The largest flood control structure in Canada to which the federal government has contributed a share of the cost is the Greater Winnipeg floodway, now under construction with completion scheduled for early 1968.

AIR CANADA JET SERVICE, MONTREAL-HALIFAX

Question No. 714—**Mr. Forrestall:**

1. What is the frequency of Air Canada's overseas jet service with regard to Halifax?

2. Will at least once weekly jet service be maintained between Montreal and Halifax?

[Mr. Lind.]

Mr. J. A. Byrne (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Transport): The management of Air Canada advises as follows:

1. Air Canada's jet service Halifax-Overseas for the Winter 1965/66 consists of twice weekly service, and for summer of 1966, three times weekly service.

2. Yes.

MIDDLESEX COUNTY, ONT.—THIRD JUDGE

Question No. 723—**Mr. Irvine:**

When will the necessary federal amendment be presented to permit the appointment of a third county court judge for the county of Middlesex?

Hon. Lucien Cardin (Minister of Justice): As soon as may be appropriate, having regard to the progress made with the legislative program.

WINTER WORKS APPLICATION, KAMOURASKA COUNTY, QUE.

Question No. 737—**Mr. Dionne:**

1. How many applications were made by the municipalities of Kamouraska county under the winter works incentive program in 1965?

2. Of such applications, how many were accepted and what was the amount granted for each of these municipalities?

[*Translation*]

Mr. J. C. Munro (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Citizenship and Immigration): 1. 26 under the 1965-66 program.

2. 26. The estimated Federal Government share of payroll costs in respect to projects approved for these municipalities is as shown hereunder: Andreville, $3,000; Kamouraska, $7,800; Mont Carmel, $9,210; Woodbridge, $22,800; St. Alexandre, $18,960; St. Andre (5 projects), $35,900; Ste. Anne de la Pocatiere, $10,740; St. Athanase, $36,300; St. Denis, $2,640; St. Eleuthere, $3,600; St. Gabriel Lalemant, $2,700; St. Germain, $7,200; St. Helene (4 projects), $15,912; St. Joseph de Kamouraska, $3,000; St. Louis de Kamouraska, $10,440; St. Pacome (Parish), $6,600; St. Pacome (Village), $15,240; St. Pascal (Parish), $9,300; St. Pascal (Village), $31,200.

ALLOWANCES FOR DISABLED PERSONS

Question No. 740—**Mr. Godin:**

1. What was the total amount disbursed by the government, as allowances for disabled persons, during the years 1964 and 1965 (a) for Canada (b) for the province of Quebec and (c) for the county of Portneuf?

2. For the same areas and during the same years, how many persons received the above allowances?

3. For the same areas and during the same years, how many applications were received by the government for such allowances and (a) how many of these applications were accepted and (b) how many were rejected?

Hon. A. J. MacEachen (Minister of National Health and Welfare):

1. Fiscal Years	Canada	Quebec	County of Porneuf
1963-64	$20,206,543	$8,081,258	Not avail.
1964-65	23,365,493	9,090,736	Not avail.
2. 1963-64	51,671	20,753	Not avail.
1964-65	53,103	20,171	Not avail.
3. 1963-64	17,268	7,870	Not avail.
1964-65	14,532	4,235	Not avail.
(a) Approved			
1963-64	5,635	1,162	Not avail.
1964-65	6,344	1,215	Not avail.
(b) Rejected			
1963-64	11,633	6,708	Not avail.
1964-65	8,188	3,020	Not avail.

[*English*]

SAFETY REGULATIONS FOR VESSELS BEING REPAIRED

Question No. 748—**Mr. Douglas:**

1. Who establishes safety regulations for vessels being repaired while in Canadian ports?

2. Who has jurisdiction for the enforcing of any such regulations?

Mr. J. A. Byrne (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Transport): 1 and 2. Assuming that the question relates to regulations for the protection against accident of workers engaged in repairing ships in shipyards, there are no Federal regulations on this subject; it is presumed that there are provincial regulations in most provinces.

COST OF OPERATING ARMED FORCES CAMPS

Question No. 752—**Mr. Sherman:**

What is the annual cost of operating (a) Fort Osborne military barracks in Winnipeg (b) H.M.C.S. *Chippawa* in Winnipeg (c) Camp Shilo, Manitoba (d) R.C.A.F. Station, Gimli, Manitoba?

Hon. Paul Hellyer (Minister of National Defence): Annual estimated costs for 1965-66 are as follows: (a) $3,020,000; (b) $50,000; (c) $3,214,000; (d) $1,670,000.

These costs include housekeeping costs of the bases comprising civilian labour, communications, construction and engineering maintenance, salaries of commissionaires and teachers for dependants, heating and cooking fuel and public utilities.

*HARBOUR DEEPENING, PORT COLBORNE, ONT.

Question No. 762—**Mr. Tolmie:**

1. Is the Department of Transport negotiating for the deepening of harbours in Port Colborne at Canada Cement Company Ltd., and Maple Leaf Mills Ltd.?

2. If so, what progress has been made in these negotiations and when may a decision be expected as a result?

Mr. J. A. Byrne (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Transport): Mr. Speaker, the answer to this question is in two parts.

1. The St. Lawrence Seaway Authority is negotiating with Maple Leaf Mills Limited, but not with Canada Cement Company Limited.

2. Surveys of the work have been carried out and cost estimates prepared by Authority engineers. A financial proposal is presently being worked on for presentation to Maple Leaf Mills Limited toward the end of March.

*WELLAND CANAL BYPASS

Question No. 763—**Mr. Tolmie:**

1. Was an anouncement made by the Minister of Transport on December 6, 1965, that some 4,000 acres were to be expropriated in the Welland area for the possible construction of a Welland canal bypass?

2. If so, when will the committee of officials considering this proposal make their report?

3. Is there a deadline for receipt of the report, and if so, what is it?

Mr. J. A. Byrne (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Transport): Mr. Speaker, the answer to this question is in three parts.

1. Yes.

2 and 3. The matter is presently under consideration by the government and an announcement will be made when a decision is reached.

REVIEW OF PENSION ENTITLEMENT OF WIDOWS

Question No. 767—**Mr. Brand:**

Will the government consider reviewing the case of the widow of airman Edward E. Chambers, and other cases like it, with regard to pension entitlement?

Hon. Roger Teillet (Minister of Veterans Affairs): An appeal board of the Canadian

Pension Commission will deal with the case of the widow of Airman Edward E. Chambers as soon as her advocate indicates that the case is ready for presentation.

With respect to other cases, the Canadian Pension Commission is always ready to entertain applications submitted in accordance with the provisions of the Pension Act.

FREE SHIPMENT OF TEXT BOOKS TO UNDERDEVELOPED COUNTRIES

Question No. 774—**Mr. Hopkins:**

1. Has any consideration been given to arrange that text books and related reading materials (used or otherwise) be shipped postage free to underdeveloped countries?

2. If so, when will this come into effect?

3. If not, would the government consider adopting such a measure?

Hon. Jean-Pierre Côté (Postmaster General): 1. Exchange of mail between countries is governed by the provisions of the Convention of the Universal Postal Union which do not provide for free postage for text books and related reading materials. Such materials mailed in Canada for destinations abroad may benefit from the special arrangement provided by the convention for transmission in bulk at a rate of postage calculated on the bulk weight.

2. Not applicable.

3. Unilateral action is not possible under the abovementioned convention.

RESEARCH INTO AIR POLLUTION AND CANCER

Question No. 781—**Mr. Fawcett:**

Has research shown that air pollutions caused by fumes from industrial plants, cars, asphalt dust, etc., are contributing factors to lung cancer and, if so, has the Department of National Health and Welfare instituted a program of research to study this grave problem with a view toward implementing some corrective measures?

Hon. A. J. MacEachen (Minister of National Health and Welfare): It has been well established that a significant relationship exists between the incidence of lung cancer and long term exposure to pollutants in certain industrial environments as well as what may collectively be called urban pollution. The Occupational Health Division of the Department of National Health and Welfare is carrying out a research program related to aspects of this matter.

[Mr. Teillet.]

CROP LOSS ASSISTANCE PROGRAM

Question No. 787—**Mr. Horner (Acadia):**

1. How much money has been paid out by the federal government to Ontario and Quebec farmers under the crop loss assistance program?

2. When did the payments start and what will the closing-off date of the payments be?

3. What was the average price for feed grains at local feed mills in Ontario and Quebec before the subsidy rate took effect and the average rate now for feed grains after the subsidy has been in effect for some months?

4. What was the average rate per ton for hay before the subsidy was announced and what is the average price for hay now that the subsidy has been in effect for a number of months?

Hon. J. J. Greene (Minister of Agriculture): 1 and 2. Federal government payments under the 1965 feed assistance program are made as reimbursement to the provinces. The provinces issued redeemable coupons to eligible farmers. As the provinces redeem these coupons used by farmers in the purchase of hay and eligible feeds, claims are made on the federal government for reimbursement.

Coupons were issued in Ontario starting about October 1, 1965 and in Quebec starting about January 1, 1966. No claims for reimbursement have yet been received from Quebec and reimbursement totalling $190,000 has been made against claims received from Ontario.

Coupons are eligible for use in Ontario on hay purchased and delivered in the period commencing May 16, 1965 and ending May 15, 1966 and on other eligible feeds purchased and delivered in the period commencing July 16, 1965 and ending May 15, 1966.

In Quebec coupons are eligible for use on hay and other eligible feeds purchased and delivered in the period commencing July 1, 1965 and ending May 30, 1966.

3. Average retail prices, per 100 pounds, delivered (bags included)*:

	Ontario		Quebec	
	Aug. 1, 1965	Jan. 1, 1966	Aug. 1, 1965	Jan. 1, 1966
Corn, cracked	$3.65	$3.65	$3.89	$3.84
Oats, unground	3.10	3.17	3.14	3.23
Barley, ground	3.30	3.41	3.34	3.41
Wheat, unground	3.64	3.65	3.72	3.71

*Source: Dominion Bureau of Statistics.

4. Average price, per ton, received by farmers at the farm for hay and clover in bales*:

	Ontario	Quebec
July, 1965	$24.09	$25.38
August, 1965	25.68	28.51
December, 1965	27.27	33.25

*Source: Dominion Bureau of Statistics.

CONFEDERATION SQUARE—EMPLOYMENT OF CONSULTANTS

Question No. 794—**Mr. Bell (Carleton):**

1. Referring to part I of the sixty-fifth annual report of the National Capital Commission at page 12, what are the names of the "numerous consultants" employed in respect of the area of Confederation square?

2. For what particular purpose was each such consultant employed?

Hon. G. J. McIlraith (Minister of Public Works): 1. Consultants employed by the National Capital Commission with respect to the redevelopment of the Confederation square area; and

2. The purposes for which they are employed are as follows: J. B. Parkin Associates, Architects and Engineers, Toronto, overall project planning and design. De Leuw Cather & Co. of Canada Limited, Consulting Engineers, Ottawa, traffic engineering. Sasaki, Strong & Associates Ltd. Landscape Architects, Toronto, landscape design. Larry Smith & Co., Toronto and Washington, economics, marketing and real estate. Hart Massey, Architect, Ottawa, detailed design, war memorial area.

NATIONAL CAPITAL COMMISSION—INDUSTRIAL SITES

Question No. 796—**Mr. Bell (Carleton):**

1. What industrial sites have been developed by the National Capital Commission and where are they located?

2. Of these sites, how many have been sold or otherwise disposed of, since April 23, 1963?

3. To whom have they been sold or otherwise disposed of?

4. What was the price and/or other terms attendant upon such sale or disposal in each case?

Hon. G. J. McIlraith (Minister of Public Works): 1. Four industrial areas have been developed by the National Capital Commission. They are: (a) Belfast Road, Registered Plan 725, east of the new Ottawa Station, south of the Queensway, west of St. Laurent Boulevard, City of Ottawa. (b) Coventry Road, Registered Plan 747, east of the new Ottawa Station, north of the Queensway, west of St. Laurent Boulevard, City of Ottawa. (c) Sheffield Road, Registered Plan 783, adjacent to east limits City of Ottawa, south of Innes Road, north of Walkley Road. (d) Bell's Corners, west side of Moodie Drive, north of Highway No. 15 and No. 7, Township of Nepean.

2. Of these sites, 25 parcels have been sold or otherwise disposed of, since April 23, 1963.

3. The sites were sold to: Gamble Robinson; Boyd Moving and Storage Limited; Ivor Chandler and Sons Limited; Electronic Materials of Canada Limited; Queensway Centre (Ottawa) Developments Limited; General Motors Products of Canada Limited; Ottawa Transportation Commission; Raport Fruit Company; Ledon Investments Limited; Baker Brothers Iron and Metal Company; Florence Realty Company Limited; Gould Cold Storage Company; National Grocers Company Limited; Langelier Limited; Red Line Taxi Company; Consumers Gas Company; Dominion Loose Leaf Company; Doran Construction Co. (1960) Limited; Beauregard Press Limited; Emco Limited; Sunshine Uniform Supply Company; Miron Frères Company; Bell Telephone Company of Canada; William Teron Limited; Royal Canadian Legion Br. 593.

4. The price and/or other terms attendant upon such sale or disposal in each case is as follows:

Gamble Robinson, $27,248, terms-cash; Boyd Moving and Storage Ltd., $76,800, terms-cash; Ivor Chandler and Sons Ltd., $30,420, terms-cash; Electronic Materials of Canada Ltd., $24,000, terms- Agreement of Purchase and Sale $1,000 with agreement, $2,324 each and every year until 1 December 1975 unpaid balance at 6% per annum; Queensway Centre (Ottawa) Developments Limited, $153,000, terms-cash; General Motors Products of Canada, $131,436, terms-cash; Ottawa Transportation Commission, $30,253.50, terms-cash; Raport Fruit Company, $12,000, terms-cash; Ledon Investments, $33,900, terms-cash; Langelier Limited, $26,040, terms-cash; Red Line Taxi Company, $35,928, terms-cash; Consumers Gas Company, $87,500, terms-cash; Doran Construction Co. (1960) Ltd., $24,000, terms-cash; Beauregard Press Ltd., $24,750, terms-cash; Sunshine Uniform Supply Co., $41,250, terms-cash; Dominion Loose-Leaf

Company Ltd., $45,000, terms-cash; Emco Limited, $57,360, terms-cash; Florence Realty Company Ltd., $36,000, terms-cash; Baker Brothers Iron and Metal Co. Ltd., $35,718, terms-cash; Gould Cold Storage Company, $36,680, terms-cash; National Grocers Co. Ltd., $60,000, terms-cash; Miron Frères Company, $45,690, terms-cash; Bell Telephone Co. of Canada, $38,200, terms-cash; William Teron Limited, $22,650, terms-cash; Royal Canadian Legion Branch 593, $28,357, terms-cash.

ST. VICTOR DE BEAUCE—WINTER WORKS PROGRAM

Question No. 805—**Mr. Caouette:**

What amounts has the government paid in 1964 and 1965, to the municipality of St. Victor de Beauce for winter works?

[*Translation*]

Mr. J. C. Munro (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Citizenship and Immigration): Payments were made to the province of Quebec on behalf of the municipality of St. Victor de Beauce as follows: 1964, $9,-553.24: 1965, $17,240.48.

[*English*]

*SPORTS—SALE OF TELEVISION FOOTBALL RIGHTS

Question No. 825—**Mr. Basford:**

Will the government examine the situation with regard to the sale of television football rights by the eastern and western conferences to assure that the matter is settled well before the start of the Canadian conference games?

Mr. Albert Béchard (Parliamentary Secretary to Secretary of State): Mr. Speaker, the disposition of television rights for the Canadian Football League is not a matter which falls under the purview of the government. However, I am informed by the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation that it is holding preliminary discussions on this subject with other interested parties and that the corporation, for its part, is making every effort to bring about a solution. It is my further understanding that to this point there has been no final disposition of the rights as between the vendor of them and any purchaser.

NARCOTICS ADDICTION—B.C.—REQUEST FOR FEDERAL ASSISTANCE

Question No. 827—**Mr. Groos:**

1. Has the government received, through the government of British Columbia, a brief from the Narcotic Addiction Foundation of British Columbia, dated July 1965, asking for federal assistance?

[Mr. McIlraith.]

2. If so, what was the response of the federal government to this request?

Hon. A. J. MacEachen (Minister of National Health and Welfare): 1. A brief was sent to the Department of National Health and Welfare for information. No federal assistance was requested.

2. See answer 1, above.

EXHIBITIONS—LOANS FOR BUILDINGS

Question No. 832—**Mr. Dubé:**

1. Has the Minister of Agriculture or any officials of his department conferred this year with representatives of exhibition associations on the topic of long-term loans to exhibitions for the purpose of constructing multi-purpose buildings?

2. If so, does the minister hope to propose legislation in this regard?

Hon. J. J. Greene (Minister of Agriculture): 1. Yes.

2. This is a matter of government policy and should a decision be taken to implement such a program, parliament will be advised in the usual manner.

FATAL ACCIDENTS AT RAILWAY CROSSINGS

Question No. 837—**Mr. Noble:**

How many fatal accidents occurred at railway crossings in Canada in 1964 and in 1965?

Mr. J. A. Byrne (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Transport): The Board of Transport Commissioners for Canada advise as follows: 1964, 154 fatalities; 1965, 150 fatalities.

FATALITIES FROM OPERATION OF FARM MACHINERY

Question No. 838—**Mr. Noble:**

How many deaths were the result of accidents involving farm equipment and farm machinery in 1964 and 1965?

Mr. Jean-Charles Cantin (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Trade and Commerce): In 1964, the number of deaths caused by machinery on farms was 113. Information for 1965 is not available.

TECHNIQUE IN USE OF INSTRUMENT OF ADVICE

Question No. 841—**Mr. Bell (Carleton):**

1. When was the technique of an instrument of advice first used as a method whereby the Prime Minister of Canada might advise the Governor General with regard to the appointment of ministers

and privy councillors and the summoning of parliament?

2. What was the technique previously used?

3. Why was a change made?

4. In respect of whose appointment was this technique first devised?

5. In respect of what matters or appointments specifically is the technique of an instrument of advice now used to advise the Governor General?

6. What is the accepted constitutional technique to advise the Governor General in respect of other matters?

7. What is the constitutional or other reason for the differentiation between those matters upon which the Governor General is advised by instrument of advice and those in respect of which the advice is submitted in accordance with the answer to part 6?

Mr. John R. Matheson (Parliamentary Secretary to Prime Minister): 1. For appointment of Minister and Privy Councillor: 17 Sept., 1953; for summoning of Parliament: 7 Oct., 1953.

2. Minute of Council.

3. The Minute of Council was considered inappropriate as a means of advising the Governor General on those matters on which the tendering of advice is the responsibility of the Prime Minister alone and not of the committee of the Privy Council.

4. The Hon. Robert H. Winters as Minister of Public Works, and the Hon. Jean Lesage as member of the Privy Council and Minister of Resources and Development.

5. Appointments to the Privy Council and to ministerial office; summoning of Parliament; dissolution of Parliament.

6. A Minute of Council.

7. See answer to 3 above.

*CANADIAN BROADCASTING CORPORATION—COLOUR TELECASTS

Question No. 889—**Mr. Allmand:**

1. Was an announcement made on Friday, February 25, 1966, that the C.B.C. will start colour telecasts on the English network for 30 hours per week starting on October 1, 1966, and on the French network for 15 hours per week sometime during the fall?

2. If so, how much of this colour programming, both in English and French will be produced in Montreal?

Mr. Albert Béchard (Parliamentary Secretary to Secretary of State): Mr. Speaker, the answer to the first part of this question is yes. The C.B.C. issued a press release to this effect on February 25.

In reply to the second part, the C.B.C. advises that most of the estimated 15 hours of French network colour programming plus some English network originations such as sports telecasts will be Montreal produced. The English network will have a greater volume of network and colour film imports available, making up perhaps two thirds of the 30 hours of English network colour programming. Canadian colour production by C.B.C. Montreal is expected to be approximately the same as that for C.B.C. Toronto. The corporation's Ottawa studio will originate a small portion of the colour programming for both networks.

QUESTIONS PASSED AS ORDERS FOR RETURNS

*COMMISSION ON BILINGUALISM AND BICULTURALISM

Question No. 370—**Mr. Rynard:**

1. What is the estimated cost to date of the royal commission on bilingualism and biculturalism?

2. What was the total cost of the most costly royal commission inquiry between 1945 and 1965?

3. How many persons are employed full time by the commission on bilingualism and biculturalism?

4. How many are employed part time?

5. How many of these employees are paid at the rate of $10,000 per year or more?

6. What was the employment of each of these persons immediately prior to joining the staff of the commission?

7. What qualifications did he or she show for the duties required with the commission?

Return tabled.

DAIRY STATISTICS

Question No. 478—**Mr. Vincent:**

1. In Canada, for the calendar year 1965, what was (a) the number of milk cows (b) the production per cow (c) the milk production and the fluid cream production, as a percentage of the total production?

2. How much natural milk, as a percentage of the total production, was sold (a) per province, and (b) for the whole of Canada?

3. How much milk per province was produced in 1965, as a percentage of the total Canadian production?

4. How much milk, as a percentage of the total Canadian production, was used in 1965 with regard to (a) the sales of fluid milk (including the equivalent in milk of fluid cream) (b) the milk used on farms (including the milk given to cattle, the milk used for the making of farm butter, and milk for human consumption) (c) creamery butter (d) cheddar cheese (e) the other cheeses (f) condensed milk products and (g) ice cream?

5. For the calendar year 1965, what were the production and the distribution of creamery butter under the following headings (a) stocks as to

February 1 (b) production (c) imports (d) supplies (e) exports (f) national consumption (i) total consumption (ii) consumption per capita, and (g) wholesale price in Montreal.

6. For the calendar year 1965, what were the production and distribution of cheddar cheese under the following headings (a) stocks as to February 1 (b) production (c) imports (d) total supplies (e) exports (f) national consumption (i) total consumption (ii) per capita (g) wholesale price in Montreal?

7. For the calendar year 1965, what were the production and the distribution of whole evaporated milk under the following headings (a) stocks as to February 1, 1966 (b) production (c) imports (d) total supplies (e) exports (f) national consumption (i) total consumption (ii) per capita consumption (g) wholesale price per case in Montreal?

8. For the calendar year 1965, what were the production and the distribution of skim powdered milk under the following headings (a) stocks as to February 1, 1966 (b) production (c) imports (d) total supplies (e) exports (f) national consumption (i) total consumption (ii) per capita consumption (g) wholesale price in Montreal (cents per pound)?

9. What is the average price which farmers have received on the farm, during the calendar year 1965, for the following products (a) fluid milk (in dollars per hundred pounds) (b) creamery butter fat (in cents per pound) (c) milk intended for the condensing and making of ice-cream (in dollars per hundred pounds), (d) milk for cheese (in dollars per hundred pounds) and (e) all categories of milk (in dollars per hundred pounds)?

10. What cash income did farmers receive from the sale of byproducts of the dairy industry during the calendar year 1965, under the following headings (a) total income (b) sales of fluid milk products (c) creamery butter fat (d) milk intended for the making of cheese (e) farm butter?

Return tabled.

COMMUNITY PASTURES, PRAIRIE PROVINCES

Question No. 487—**Mr. Watson (Assiniboia):**

1. How many community pastures were there in 1965 in (a) Manitoba (b) Saskatchewan (c) Alberta?

2. What is the name of each pasture, the federal electoral district in which it is located, and the year each opened since 1957?

3. How many acres are fenced in each pasture?

4. What was the total construction cost of each?

5. What was the assessed carrying capacity of each for 1965?

6. How many stock were pastured in each, in the year 1965?

7. How many patrons used each pasture in 1965?

8. How many pastures will be using artificial insemination in 1966?

9. Do the local pasture committees have any control over this policy and, if so, how many objected?

Return tabled.

[Mr. Vincent.]

[*Translation*]

WINTER WORKS PROJECTS, PONTIAC AND TÉMISCAMINGUE COUNTIES, QUE.

Question No. 633—**Mr. Lefebvre:**

1. What projects under the winter works program have been accepted for this winter for (a) Pontiac county (b) Témiscamingue county, and what is their value?

2. What was the total amount paid to each municipality, listed separately, of Pontiac county and of Témiscamingue county under the program last year?

3. Have all the municipalities in these two counties been paid for winter works projects completed last year?

Return tabled.

[*English*]

FEDERAL CONTRIBUTIONS TO MUNICIPAL WINTER WORKS PROGRAMS

Question No. 638—**Mr. Reid:**

1. Has the Minister of Labour informed the authorities in the provinces that the government of Canada would make financial contributions toward the cost of municipal winter works programs and, if so, on what date?

2. Was an application received from the province of Nova Scotia for a contribution toward the cost of winter works projects and, if so, (a) what sum was requested for work in each of the several municipalities in Nova Scotia (b) what work was proposed in each municipality?

Return tabled.

[*Translation*]

TECHNICAL TRAINING PROGRAM PAYMENTS

Question No. 665—**Mr. Caouette:**

1. During the last three years, what sums have been paid to each province under the technical training program?

2. What are the criteria which determine the amount to be paid to each province?

Return tabled.

[*English*]

EXTERNAL AFFAIRS

VIET NAM—POSITION TAKEN AT CANADA-U.S. MINISTERIAL MEETING

On the orders of the day:

Right Hon. J. G. Diefenbaker (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, I should like to direct a question to the Secretary of State for External Affairs, asking him if he would outline in general the views expressed by Canada in regard to Viet Nam. I should like to ask him whether, on the basis of the information which he has obtained but without revealing it, he can comment on the dire

and frightening statement made by the Chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee, Senator Fulbright, to the effect that what is taking place now may very well lead to war with communist China.

Hon. Paul Martin (Secretary of State for External Affairs): Mr. Speaker, I am sure the right hon. gentleman will appreciate that, much as I would like to be able to deal fully with his question, it is not possible on the orders of the day to do so. In any event, as my talks with Mr. Rusk must necessarily be regarded as having been of a nature which cannot be fully disclosed, I cannot really answer the question in the detail I should like.

I may say that there were certain aspects of this problem which I frankly discussed with him, ten days ago. My main concern had to do with the Canadian proposition that there should be a negotiated settlement, and that the international control commission was the vehicle which I felt was more calculated to serve this purpose at the present time than the United Nations or any other available medium.

I think the Secretary of State agrees fully that the situation must be brought within the Geneva framework. I indicated some of the steps which Canada has taken to try and bring about understanding in this area along with our two colleague states on the commission. The observation made by Senator Fulbright was one which appeared in the press over the week end, and it undoubtedly covers an area which concerns not only Senator Fulbright but the government of the United States, as it must concern all people in the world at the present time.

I hope there will be an opportunity very soon for the external affairs committee to meet, and I hope my right hon. friend will understand if my answer does not satisfy his question. He will fully appreciate that our procedures as well as the circumstances of the question, important as it is, do not really offer me the opportunity to make a more extended reply.

VIET NAM—SENDING OF CANADIAN TROOPS

On the orders of the day:

Right Hon. J. G. Diefenbaker (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, I am glad that my question did not get a more affable reply than it did get. I would ask the minister whether there is any foundation for the statement, made by one of the ministers of the cabinet in a television appearance the other evening, that Canada made its own policies and did not fall in line with those of the United States. Then the minister went on to say that Canada resisted being pressed into a position of supplying troops for Viet Nam.

Is there any foundation for that suggestion, particularly in view of the words of the communique, which would indicate that if that were so in the past it is not the case now?

Hon. Paul Martin (Secretary of State for External Affairs): Mr. Speaker, I can only say that at the press conference on Saturday afternoon Secretary Rusk himself, without any prompting or questioning, volunteered the statement that the United States had not pressed and was not pressing Canada to occupy a role other than that on the commission. I can tell my right hon. friend, in view of what we have been endeavouring to do in this regard during the past three weeks, that I am sure it would not be in the interests of a negotiated settlement for anyone to press Canada to play a role other than the one we are now seeking to maintain on the international control commission.

INDUSTRY

HAMILTON, ONT.—CESSATION OF OPERATIONS OF STUDEBAKER COMPANY

On the orders of the day:

Mr. T. C. Douglas (Burnaby-Coquitlam): Mr. Speaker, I should like to direct a question to the Minister of Industry. In view of the announcement that the Studebaker company will be closing its auto manufacturing plant in Hamilton, I should like to ask the minister two questions. First of all, has he looked into the reasons for the proposed discontinuance of the company's operations? Second, are the reasons in any way connected either with the United States economic guide lines or with the Canada-United States auto agreement?

Hon. C. M. Drury (Minister of Industry): Mr. Speaker, we have had a preliminary look into this problem and have been able to find no evidence whatever that the decision taken by Studebaker to close its operations in Hamilton was in any way related to the operation of the United States guide lines. Second, so far as the automobile agreement with the United States is concerned, it would appear that the effect of this agreement has largely been to enable Studebaker to continue its operations longer than might otherwise have been the case.

Inquiries of the Ministry

I may say that, seized with the problems of facing Hamilton in this particular situation, the Department of Industry is urgently canvassing the possibilities of alternative industrial use for this plant. At the same time my colleague the Minister of Citizenship and Immigration is urgently undertaking a survey of the proposed release of men by Studebaker with a view to formulating some constructive proposal.

Mr. J. C. Munro (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Citizenship and Immigration): Mr. Speaker, my supplementary question is directed to the Minister of Industry. I wonder whether the minister would give his comments on the suggestion made in the telegram received by the government today from the mayor of Hamilton to the effect that the government consider taking over this industry as a national industry. Further, what action is the government specifically contemplating in the way of adjustments under the T.A.B. arrangements similar to those which are received by other auto workers.

Mr. Drury: Mr. Speaker, the suggestion made by the mayor of Hamilton is an interesting one. Perhaps I would be misleading the house if I were to indicate that there was any likelihood that the government would nationalize this particular concern. In so far as the arrangements under T.A.B. are concerned, this is largely the purpose of the survey which is being carried out by the Minister of Citizenship and Immigration.

Mr. William Dean Howe (Hamilton South): Mr. Speaker, I should like to elaborate on that question by asking the minister when a decision on this question could be made by the government, because it does involve between 600 and 900 men who will become unemployed in Hamilton.

Mr. Drury: Mr. Speaker, I think the government has acted with considerable speed and vigour.

[*Later:*]

Mr. Joseph Macaluso (Hamilton West): I have a question for the Minister of Citizenship and Immigration, in his capacity as minister of manpower. Is the minister prepared to meet, or has he made arrangements to meet, with representatives of the auto workers employed in the Studebaker plant to discuss the placement of these displaced workers, and particularly the placement of those auto workers who, because of their age, will find it difficult to obtain other employment?

[*Later:*]

Mr. Speaker: Order. I understand that when the hon. member for Hamilton West was asking his question the translation system was not operative. This is the report I have received from the table and I would like to give the hon. member an opportunity to ask his question again.

Mr. Macaluso: That is the same information I received, Mr. Speaker. My question is directed to the Minister of Citizenship and Immigration in his capacity as designate minister of manpower. Is he prepared to meet, or is he going to meet with representatives of the employees at the Studebaker plant in Hamilton to discuss the placement of these auto workers, and especially to deal with the placement of those who, because of age, will find it difficult to obtain other employment?

Hon. Jean Marchand (Minister of Citizenship and Immigration): Mr. Speaker, the N.E.S. is already in contact with the company and the unions. We are sending somebody from Toronto today to meet with the unions and the company, and to solve as many problems as we can at this stage.

[*Later:*]

Mr. Max Saltsman (Waterloo South): Mr. Speaker, I should like to direct a somewhat supplementary question to the Minister of Citizenship and Immigration. In view of the frequency with which these lay-offs are taking place would the minister give serious consideration to the setting up of machinery for prior consultation before plants dismiss their employees?

Mr. Speaker: Order please.

[*Translation*]

ADMINISTRATION OF JUSTICE

MUNSINGER INVESTIGATION—REQUEST FOR INFORMATION ON SECURITY MEASURES

On the orders of the day:

Mr. Réal Caouette (Villeneuve): Mr. Speaker, may I direct a question to the Prime Minister?

Last Friday the Minister of Justice (Mr. Cardin) surprised the whole house when he brought out the Munsinger case.

In the interest of justice and truth, does the Prime Minister intend to tell parliament all

he knows about the Munsinger case, so that we might know if the security of the state was in danger or only that of the former minister?

[*English*]

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. I remind the hon. member that the order of business for the house today will be to go into committee of supply to consider the estimates of the Department of Justice, which I hope will take place very shortly. I suggest that question might be asked of the minister at that time by the hon. member for Villeneuve.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Caouette: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a question of privilege.

It seems to me that the Chair allowed the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Diefenbaker) to ask similar questions about the Spencer case, and now I would not have the same rights as the Leader of the Opposition to ask similar questions?

Mr. Speaker: The Chair must give a ruling in each particular case. With regard to the question asked by the hon. member for Villeneuve, the Chair feels that it could be dealt with when the department's estimates are considered.

[*English*]

FINANCE

PARIS MEETING—PERSONNEL OF CANADIAN DELEGATION

On the orders of the day:

Mr. R. N. Thompson (Red Deer): Mr. Speaker, my question is addressed to the Minister of Finance. It concerns the meetings now taking place in Paris between the ten great financial powers of the world. Would the Minister of Finance inform us who are the members of the Canadian delegation to this meeting, and what is their policy as it relates to the maintenance of the status quo, the new suggested gold policy, or some other alternative.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. This question should be placed on the order paper.

Mr. Thompson: Mr. Speaker, I think that this question is urgent.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

Inquiries of the Ministry

TRADE

CANADA-U.S. MINISTERIAL MEETING—STEPS TO OVERCOME DEFICIT

On the orders of the day:

Hon. George Hees (Northumberland): Mr. Speaker, I should like to direct a question to the Minister of Finance. Did the Minister of Finance outline to the United States ministers conference in Washington at the end of last week the definite steps which Canada proposes to take now, to overcome the $1.4 billion current account deficit which this country has with the United States, as outlined by Dr. Andrew Brimmer, Assistant U.S. Secretary of Commerce, when he spoke in Toronto last week?

Hon. Mitchell Sharp (Minister of Finance): Mr. Speaker, I do not know how you answer a question of that kind on orders of the day. The United States is very well aware of the policies of Canada in the field of trade. The United States knows that, in contrast to the policies which have been followed in the past by the previous administration, we made a very successful effort in reducing our balance of payments deficit—

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh.

Mr. Sharp: —while increasing the prosperity of the country, and today Canada's dollar is stronger than it was then.

Mr. Hees: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. In view of the fact that our current account deficit with the United States is greater than their current account deficit with the whole world, has the minister asked the United States government to understand the magnitude of our problem?

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. The hon. member is now entering into argument with the minister.

[*Later:*]

Mr. Hees: I have a question for the Minister of Trade and Commerce. Did the minister point out to the secretary for commerce of the United States, with whom he was talking during the weekend, that Canada's deficit in commodity trade with the United States in 1965 amounted to more than $1 billion, a figure which increased by $300 million during the last year, and did he outline the steps he was taking to overcome this shocking situation?

Mr. Speaker: Order. The hon. member is not asking a question. He is making a speech.

Inquiries of the Ministry

PUBLIC SERVICE

INTERDEPARTMENTAL COMMITTEE ON BILINGUALISM—REQUEST FOR CONSULTATIONS

On the orders of the day:

Mr. R. A. Bell (Carleton): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Prime Minister. May I ask the Prime Minister if he will consider holding consultations with the civil service staff organizations before he and his colleagues reach a final decision in relation to the report of the interdepartmental committee on bilingualism in the public service.

Right Hon. L. B. Pearson (Prime Minister): My hon. friend knows that the interdepartmental committee had consultations with all those concerned. Its report is now before the government. I would be very glad to give consideration to my hon. friend's suggestion.

REPORTED STATEMENTS BY MINES MINISTER RESPECTING BILINGUALISM

On the orders of the day:

Mr. Jack McIntosh (Swift Current-Maple Creek): A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker, to the Minister of National Defence I believe. In view of statements made by the Minister of Mines and Technical Surveys to the effect that all recruits to the civil service will have to be bilingual, is it the intention of the Minister of National Defence to issue the same directives with regard to recruits for the armed forces.

Hon. Jean-Luc Pepin (Minister of Mines and Technical Surveys): I rise on a point of personal privilege. I should like to say some words to the hon. member on—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

Mr. George Muir (Lisgar): A supplementary question to the Minister of Mines and Technical Surveys, Mr. Speaker. Was the minister stating government policy, when he said, as he is reported to have said, that civil servants in western Canada who have reached the top of their departments in that area will not be eligible for senior positions in Ottawa unless they are bilingual?

Mr. Pepin: Mr. Speaker—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. I suggest to hon. members that they refer to Beauchesne, citation 171, which is to the effect that a question, oral or written, must not refer to a speech made outside the house. In the case of a cabinet minister it is permissible to ask the Prime Minister whether such a speech represents the policy of the government. I do not think the question, in the way it was asked, can be accepted at this time.

[Mr. Speaker.]

Mr. Muir (Lisgar): Mr. Speaker, may I put a supplementary question to the Prime Minister. Would he say whether the Minister of Mines and Technical Surveys was stating government policy when he said, as was attributed to him, that civil servants from western Canada who have reached the top of their department in that area will not be eligible for senior positions in Ottawa unless they are bilingual.

Right Hon. L. B. Pearson (Prime Minister): The hon. member referred to a statement alleged to have been made by the minister. Naturally I am not going to comment at this time, until I confirm that statement. It may not have been said.

[*Translation*]

ADMINISTRATION OF JUSTICE

GEORGE VICTOR SPENCER—ALLEGED CONTRADICTIONS IN STATEMENT BY PRIME MINISTER

On the orders of the day:

Mr. Gilles Grégoire (Lapointe): Mr. Speaker, I should like to put a question to the Prime Minister?

Could he tell us whether consultations took place among cabinet members before he contradicted himself a second time Friday and disowned the Minister of Justice (Mr. Cardin) and a few other ministers with regard to the Spencer case?

Mr. Speaker: Order. The hon. member is probably aware that he cannot put questions referring to consultations held among members of the cabinet.

[*English*]

GEORGE VICTOR SPENCER—REQUEST FOR TERMS OF REFERENCE OF INQUIRY

On the orders of the day:

Hon. E. D. Fulton (Kamloops): May I direct a question to the Prime Minister. May I ask him if he is in a position to table a copy of the terms of reference of the inquiry which he said on Friday would be set up in connection with the Spencer case?

Right Hon. L. B. Pearson (Prime Minister): Perhaps the hon. member would wait until we come to the estimates of the department concerned, when I shall have something to say.

Mr. Fulton: A supplementary question. My question is simply whether the Prime Minister is in a position to table the terms of reference; whether they have been set up and

whether we could see them today. This is very important with relation to the discussion later on the estimates.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. I suggest to the hon. member that the first question has been answered by the Prime Minister. I should like to follow up the suggestion I made a moment ago, that this type of question might be asked when the house resumes in committee of supply.

Mr. Fulton: With respect, Mr. Speaker, I think I am right in stating that documents cannot be tabled in committee. I think they can only be tabled in the house. That is why I asked whether the terms of reference are ready; and if so, whether they will be tabled now so that we can have them officially before us.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. If such a statement is made, then the committee might decide at that time to rise, report progress, and table the document. At the moment this is purely hypothetical.

Mr. Fulton: Mr. Speaker, may I ask the Prime Minister whether the order in council has been passed, and whether we can see the terms of reference today?

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. The hon. member has asked a question, and he is not entitled to insist, as he knows very well under the rules, on any specific reply. In fact, he is not entitled to receive a reply at all. I urge him to follow the suggestion I have made in this regard.

NATIONAL DEFENCE

HEALTH AND MORALE OF NAVAL PERSONNEL IN BRAZILIAN WATERS

On the orders of the day:

Hon. Paul Hellyer (Minister of National Defence): Mr. Speaker, some days ago the hon. member for Calgary North asked a question with respect to conditions with respect to and the situation on the R.C.N. vessel *Cape Scott,* now in Brazilian waters. On Thursday, I indicated that I would give a reply today. As the hon. member knows, the *Cape Scott* is a mobile repair ship accompanying the fleet to provide the backup repair facilities required in extended manoeuvres.

According to temperature readings obtained from H.M.C.S. *Cape Scott,* the average below deck temperatures were about 12 degrees higher than the outside air temperatures while the ship was in harbour. The average high temperature for Rio for the month of February is 93 degrees, and in only one area has the below deck temperature risen to above 110 degrees.

Mr. Nielsen: How comfortable.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh.

An hon. Member: Hot enough for the cabinet.

Mr. Hellyer: While operating in southern waters awnings have been rigged to reduce the heat built up by the sun's rays. The ship's hospital is equipped with an air conditioning unit and while the ship is at sea trade winds ease the temperature somewhat. The morale of the ship's crew is good.

BROADCASTING

FOWLER COMMISSION—ACCEPTANCE OF RECOMMENDATIONS

On the orders of the day:

Mr. Robert C. Coates (Cumberland): Mr. Speaker, I have a question I wish to direct to the Prime Minister. Can the Prime Minister inform the house when the cabinet committee studying the Fowler report will be in a position to indicate which of the recommendations of that committee will be accepted by the government?

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. I wonder if that is a question that can be answered at this time. The implication is not clear to the Chair, but it does appear to me that it is the type of question which should wait for a reply, and which should be placed on the order paper.

FISHERIES

SEAL HUNT—ATTENDANCE OF MINISTER

On the orders of the day:

Mr. J. R. Keays (Gaspé): Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the Prime Minister. This house being aware that the seal hunt begins today in the gulf, would the right hon. gentleman soothe our anxieties by denying the rumour that the Minister of Fisheries, who was with the hunters today, was skinned alive.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh.

CANADA PENSION PLAN

DENIAL OF PARTICIPATION TO TAXPAYING SEAMEN

On the orders of the day:

Mr. Lloyd R. Crouse (Queens-Lunenburg): Mr. Speaker, I wish to direct a question to the Minister of National Revenue, of which I

have given him notice. Is it the intention of the government to deprive 160 Canadian citizens who are employed as seamen on gypsum transportation vessels the right of participating in the Canada Pension Plan, while at the same time demanding that they pay Canadian income tax?

Mr. Speaker: I should like to invite the hon. member to place this question on the order paper.

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE

On the orders of the day:

Hon. Michael Starr (Ontario): I wish to address a question to the Minister of Public Works in his capacity as leader of the house. Has the government given any consideration to the statement made last Friday by the Leader of the Opposition, who said we had covered some 15 departments during our consideration of the estimates, and that in order to assure that supply would be available the official opposition would be prepared to give consent to the introduction of the necessary appropriation bill, and then give it first, second and third readings right away.

Hon. G. J. McIlraith (Minister of Public Works): I am afraid the opposition house leader was under some misapprehension as to what the Leader of the Opposition did say on that occasion.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh.

Mr. McIlraith: Well, some of the newspapermen who wrote stories for today's papers were also under this same misapprehension.

An hon. Member: Read *Hansard.*

Mr. McIlraith: Yes, I have read it very carefully in the light of what was said. I have read it several times. In any event, *Hansard* now indicates that the departments which the Leader of the Opposition had in mind at the time were those which had already been passed. I had heard that, and I heard him say at one point that he included the other items in the Department of Justice except, presumably, item one. Then, at another point, I thought he intended to include the other departments not yet passed. Unfortunately, when I checked to inquire what was meant when this second reference was made, I was told it meant only the departments which had already been passed. This does not help materially to solve the very serious problems confronting the government with respect to paying its accounts. The expenditures which are required to be made involve all the departments, particularly the Department of Public Works, as well as those already passed.

Mr. Diefenbaker: Call Public Works immediately this afternoon, so that you will not be troubled.

Mr. McIlraith: That was my request at five o'clock on Friday, and that was the request which was rejected.

In any event, rather than try to discuss the matter here in the house I would prefer to discuss it with the house leaders and consider what our position should be, because it seems to me the suggestion would not meet the problem. However, I will look into it and communicate with the other house leaders.

[*Later:*]

Mr. H. A. Olson (Medicine Hat): Mr. Speaker, supplementary to the question asked by the hon. member for Ontario about the matter of an appropriations bill, I want to ask the government house leader if he has been able to determine what date the appropriations bill is required, so that no salaries, wages or cheques for government services during the current month will be issued later than usual?

Mr. Speaker: Order please. I doubt whether this question is in order because the hon. member is asking for an interpretation of a statute, or for a legal opinion. On the other hand, I realize the importance of the matter, and if the hon. minister is prepared to reply to the question at this time I shall allow him to reply.

Mr. Olson: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, I am not asking for an interpretation. This is a matter of mechanics and I hope the government house leader would know when some cheques may have to be withheld.

Mr. McIlraith: Mr. Speaker, the strict answer to the question is Friday of last week, but that involved relatively small amounts arising mainly out of certain payments to contractors for services rendered. Some of the service work, like cleaning and that sort of thing, is done under contract, and in some of the smaller cases payments have not been made to the contractors. Then, there is the question of casual help, which is spread about the country in different places, and some of this casual help may not have been paid.

When it comes to the main body of the civil service, or what we in Ottawa commonly refer to as the civil service, Wednesday of this week would be the latest possible moment before salaried civil servants would be injured. But long before that, and increasingly each day, other persons are being affected, many of them being people working for the government as casual, prevailing rate employees, or employees of these smaller types of contractors.

FINANCE

PORTER COMMISSION REPORT—POSSIBILITY OF SECURITY EXCHANGE REGULATIONS

On the orders of the day:

Hon. Alvin Hamilton (Qu'Appelle): My question is addressed to the Minister of Finance. It arises from a statement by the Secretary of State for External Affairs that mutually satisfactory arrangements concerning the S.E.C. would be made between the two countries, that is, between Canada and the United States. Does this imply that the federal government is now planning to set up some form of regulatory machinery in relation to a national security commission as recommended by the Porter commission?

Hon. Mitchell Sharp (Minister of Finance): The mutually satisfactory arrangements referred to in the communiqué were mutually satisfactory arrangements concerning the United States law. We took very strong exception to the extraterritoriality of that law, and we are hopeful that this aspect will be removed.

We did not bargain about our own regulations, but we did say that it is our intention to support the passage here and in the provinces of whatever legislative action we have to take in order to ensure that Canadian securities regulations are satisfactory for us.

ADMINISTRATION OF JUSTICE

STEVEN TRUSCOTT—REQUEST FOR INVESTIGATION

On the orders of the day:

Mr. J. R. Byrne (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Transport): I should like to direct a question to the Solicitor General and ask him whether he will order an immediate investigation by royal commission into the bizarre circumstances surrounding the trial and conviction of 14 year old Steven Truscott for rape and murder, so shockingly revealed in a book released by publishers McClelland and Stewart over the week end, in order to rectify what appears to be an astounding example of a miscarriage of justice in the courts of Ontario—

Some hon. Members: Order.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. This question should be placed on the order paper, if it is in order. The Chair will have to look at the question before it is allowed to go on the order paper.

Mr. Bell (Carleton): On a point of order. Would Your Honour at some stage in the future take under consideration the point of order which I raised earlier in relation to parliamentary secretaries making inquiries of members of the ministry?

Mr. Speaker: I might tell the hon. member for Carleton that the Chair has taken that question under consideration. The point has been raised before. It seemed to the Chair, after looking at the precedents and relating our practice to the practice in Britain, that there is an essential difference between the office of parliamentary secretaries here and the position of parliamentary secretaries in the British house, where they are junior ministers.

I suggest to the hon. member that there is nothing in our rules, nothing in our precedents and nothing in our practice, to prevent parliamentary secretaries from asking questions, though I realize there may be a question of propriety in certain instances. This is as far as the Chair can go at this time.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Byrne: Are we, as parliamentary secretaries, to be deprived of our rights as sitting members of parliament?

Mr. Speaker: Order. I suggest to the parliamentary secretary that he read the ruling I have just made when it is printed in *Hansard* tomorrow.

VETERANS AFFAIRS

REQUEST FOR INCREASE IN WAR DISABILITY PENSIONS

On the orders of the day:

Mr. K. H. More (Regina City): I wish to direct a question to the Prime Minister. It arises from the representations he received from the Royal Canadian Legion on November 25 and from other veterans' associations regarding the urgent need for an increase in war disability pensions. Has the

right hon. gentleman replied to these representations, and if so would he indicate to the house the nature of his reply?

Right Hon. L. B. Pearson (Prime Minister): I would have to check into that. It was last November. I will be very glad to table my reply when it is appropriate to do so.

Mr. G. L. Chatterton (Esquimalt-Saanich): A supplementary question: Can the minister tell us whether the report of Hon. Mr. Justice Wood has yet been received and, if not when he expects it?

Hon. Roger Teillet (Minister of Veterans Affairs): I have made inquiries as a result of a question which was asked a few days ago. I am informed that Mr. Justice Wood expects to complete his hearings at the end of this month. I have no indication when the report will be completed, but this work is being done as quickly as possible.

CANADIAN ECONOMY

STEPS TO MEET INCREASE IN COST OF LIVING

On the orders of the day:

Mrs. Grace MacInnis (Vancouver-Kingsway): I should like to direct a question to the Prime Minister. In view of the fact that this is consumer week and that the Prime Minister has personally endorsed it, is the right hon. gentleman planning any action this week to check the rising cost of living?

An hon. Member: Order paper.

Mrs. MacInnis (Vancouver-Kingsway): I give notice that I intend to raise this matter at ten o'clock.

THE MINISTRY

REQUEST FOR COMMENT ON REPORTED RESIGNATION OF MINISTER OF JUSTICE

On the orders of the day:

Mr. Eldon M. Woolliams (Bow River): I wish to direct this question to the Prime Minister, since it raises the question of public confidence in the government, following the news reports on the radio at one o'clock today. Has the Prime Minister received a letter of resignation from the Minister of Justice, or been informed of his intention to resign?

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh.

[Mr. More.]

AGRICULTURE

BONNYVILLE, ALTA.—REQUEST FOR ACREAGE PAYMENTS

On the orders of the day:

Mr. F. J. Bigg (Athabasca): I wish to direct a question to the eastern Minister of Agriculture. In view of the serious crop failure in the Bonnyville district of Alberta, would the minister say whether in the last week he has received a request for assistance by way of acreage payments from the Minister of Agriculture of Alberta?

Hon. J. J. Greene (Minister of Agriculture): Mr. Speaker, I do not believe we received any further request during the past week. I think we received only the original request from the provincial minister last December. However, I shall check, and if there has been any correspondence during the past week I shall let the hon. member know tomorrow.

INCOME TAX

H.M.C. "DOCKYARD"—FAILURE OF PERSONNEL TO RECEIVE FORMS

On the orders of the day:

Mr. J. M. Forrestall (Halifax): Mr. Speaker, I wish to direct a question to the Associate Minister of National Defence. Is the minister aware that prevailing rate employees at H.M.C. *Dockyard* in Halifax did not receive their T-4 slips prior to the end of February, as required by law? If he has been so informed, is the government giving any extension of time for them to file their 1965 income tax returns?

Hon. Léo Cadieux (Associate Minister of National Defence): Mr. Speaker, I am not aware of this situation but I shall be very glad to investigate it and communicate with the hon. member.

LABOUR RELATIONS

REFUSAL BY C.B.C. TO BARGAIN WITH UNIONS

On the orders of the day:

Hon. R. A. Bell (Carleton): Mr. Speaker, may I ask the Secretary of State or the Minister of Labour if she or he can report briefly to the house regarding the labour dispute which has arisen between the C.B.C. and certain of its employees, resulting allegedly from the refusal of the corporation to bargain collectively with several unions which have been certified as bargaining agents?

Mr. Speaker: Order. I wonder if the question is very urgent.

Hon. J. R. Nicholson (Minister of Labour): Mr. Speaker—

Mr. Speaker: Order please. Perhaps the hon. member might indicate the urgency of the question by rephrasing it.

Mr. Bell (Carleton): Well, Mr. Speaker, I venture to suggest, and I am sure the Minister of Labour will agree, it has very considerable urgency in that the present collective bargaining agreements have run out and there is grave danger of problems arising in the C.B.C.

Mr. Nicholson: On the question of urgency—

Hon. Judy V. LaMarsh (Secretary of State): Mr. Speaker, if the hon. member is referring—

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh.

Miss LaMarsh: Mr. Speaker, my hon. friend seems not very clear in what he is talking about, but if he is talking about matters which have arisen in connection with the C.B.C. in Quebec province, of course I am aware of these. That is the only question he asked me. He did not even mention where the labour trouble might be, and of course I could not know every place where there might be labour trouble.

Mr. Bell (Carleton): Mr. Speaker, I asked the hon. lady if she would report.

POWER

COLUMBIA RIVER—REQUEST FOR REPORT OF ENGINEERING BOARD

On the orders of the day:

Mr. H. W. Herridge (Kootenay West): Mr. Speaker, I wish to ask of the Minister of Mines and Technical Surveys a question which comes strictly within the rules. I regret I have not been able to send him notice because I have been sitting here in anticipation since the sitting commenced. Will the minister inform the house when he intends to table the 1965 report of the permanent engineering board on the Columbia?

Hon. Jean-Luc Pepin (Minister of Mines and Technical Surveys): Because the question is asked with so much charm, Mr. Speaker, I shall do it tomorrow.

[*Translation*]

INQUIRY OF THE MINISTRY

On the orders of the day:

Mr. Maurice Allard (Sherbrooke): Mr. Speaker, I wish to address my question to the Secretary of State for External Affairs.

In view of the great interest taken by Hon. Eric Kierans and the Quebec government in American decisions, does the minister or the government plan to report to the Quebec goverment, as soon as possible, on the results of recent meetings between Canadian and U.S. authorities and to communicate their confidence and their optimism to that provincial government?

Hon. Paul Martin (Secretary of State for External Affairs): Mr. Speaker, I presume that the hon. members have had the opportunity to look over the report which I read to the House this afternoon, but I will add, if I may, that I believe the suggestion to be worthy, and I will look into the situation.

[*English*]

EXTERNAL AFFAIRS

INDIA—INQUIRY AS TO ITEMS COMPRISING ADDITIONAL AID

On the orders of the day:

Mr. Reid Scott (Danforth): Mr. Speaker, I should like to direct a question to the Secretary of State for External Affairs. Could he supply the house with the information he is alleged to have given Secretary Rusk, namely the amount by which Canadian agricultural aid to India will be increased?

Hon. Paul Martin (Secretary of State for External Affairs): Mr. Speaker, as the Prime Minister indicated on Friday last, it is the intention of the Canadian government to provide assistance in addition to the total of $25 million that has been made available in accordance with the announcement of this February. The amount of additional aid will be substantial, and over and above this figure of $25 million.

There is soon to be a meeting perhaps in Washington when Canada and the United States hope that other countries, both wheat producing and non-wheat producing, will find it possible to join with us in giving the assistance which India so badly needs at this very critical period. We feel that the course we have taken is one that is calculated to encourage other countries to follow our example.

Inquiries of the Ministry

Mr. Scott (Danforth): As a supplementary question, can the minister inform the house whether or not he gave Secretary Rusk the precise amount by which the Canadian aid is to be increased, information which he has now denied us?

Mr. Martin (Essex East): Mr. Speaker, I gave Secretary Rusk an indication of our intention, but as we have not finally agreed on the amount it was not possible to put it as precisely as my hon. friend suggests.

PAKISTAN—POSSIBILITY OF REQUEST FOR FOOD AID

On the orders of the day:

Mr. Heath Macquarrie (Queens): As a supplementary question, Mr. Speaker, could the minister say whether a request of very recent date has come from another Commonwealth country, Pakistan, for assistance of a similar kind, and what has been the response thereto?

Hon. Paul Martin (Secretary of State for External Affairs): Mr. Speaker, this matter is now being seriously considered.

DIVORCE

REQUEST TO ESTABLISH JOINT COMMITTEE

On the orders of the day:

Mr. Robert McCleave (Halifax): Mr. Speaker, I wish to pose a question to the Prime Minister of which I have given him notice. Would the government consider setting up a joint committee of both houses to consider the matter of divorce legislation?

Right Hon. L. B. Pearson (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, I am grateful to my hon. friend for giving me notice of this question as I was coming into the house, and I can tell him we will certainly consider this matter.

AGRICULTURE

PRINCE RUPERT, B.C.—GRAIN ELEVATOR EXTENSION

On the orders of the day:

Mr. Frank Howard (Skeena): Mr. Speaker, may I direct a question to the Minister of Agriculture? I should like to ask the minister whether he has yet made a favourable decision in respect of the proposed grain elevator extension at Prince Rupert.

Hon. J. J. Greene (Minister of Agriculture): No, Mr. Speaker.

[Mr. Martin (Essex East).]

FISHERIES

ESTABLISHMENT OF GEOGRAPHICAL CO-ORDINATES RESPECTING BASE LINES

On the orders of the day:

Hon. J. A. MacLean (Queens): Mr. Speaker, I should like to direct a question to the Secretary of State for External Affairs and ask him whether, as a result of the ministerial meeting in Washington, the government now is in a position to establish geographical co-ordinates in order to delineate the base lines from which Canada's territorial waters and exclusive fishing zones may be measured.

Hon. Paul Martin (Secretary of State for External Affairs): Mr. Speaker, the negotiations in connection with Canada's proposals with regard to the law of the sea were discussed two weeks ago in Washington. The government of the United States has not yet responded to the proposals we have made, but we do expect to hear from them shortly.

Mr. Lloyd R. Crouse (Queens-Lunenburg): Mr. Speaker, I have a supplementary question. Would the Secretary of State for External Affairs tell the house whether negotiations with all other countries have been completed, and is it only the negotiations with the government in Washington that have not been concluded?

Mr. Martin (Essex East): Mr. Speaker, the Canadian government considers it would prefer, in Canadian interests, to wait until it has a response from the government of the United States before proceeding further with other governments.

Mr. Crouse: I have a further supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Would the hon. minister tell the house how many countries have not yet agreed to these base lines.

Mr. Martin (Essex East): The particular proposal has just been put to the United States.

GRAIN

OATS AND BARLEY—INQUIRY AS TO DATE OF FINAL PAYMENT

On the orders of the day:

Mr. E. Nasserden (Rosthern): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Finance. When may we expect an announcement with regard to the final accounting of the oats and barley pools of the Canadian Wheat Board.

Hon. Mitchell Sharp (Minister of Finance): Mr. Speaker, I am expecting the chairman of the Canadian Wheat Board to arrive, as soon as he can dig himself out of Winnipeg.

STORMS

WINNIPEG, MAN.—REQUEST FOR ASSISTANCE

On the orders of the day:

Mr. Stanley Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Prime Minister and it arises out of the answer just given by the Minister of Finance. In view of the very heavy costs being faced by Winnipeg and its environs as a result of the unprecedented storm over the week end, will the government consider making an offer to assist in paying these costs?

Right Hon. L. B. Pearson (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, my hon. friend of course knows the normal procedure in these matters is for the municipalities to get in touch with the federal government first.

SUPPLY

The house in committee of supply, Mr. Batten in the chair.

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

Legal and other services—

1. Administration including the office of the Superintendent of Bankruptcy, grants and contributions as detailed in the estimates, gratuities to the widows or such dependents as may be approved by Treasury Board of judges who die while in office and authority to make recoverable advances for the administration of justice on behalf of the governments of the Northwest Territories and the Yukon Territory, $2,504,300.

The Chairman: On Friday when the committee rose the committee was discussing item 1. The hon. member for York South had moved an amendment thereto and later requested unanimous consent to withdraw his amendment.

Mr. Lewis: Mr. Chairman, I would like to make clear, in view of the fact that the terms of reference have not been laid before the house and in view of the time which has elapsed, that my request for withdrawal is, with your permission, on the table until the terms of reference are seen by hon. members including myself.

Mr. Pearson: Mr. Chairman, I will do my best to satisfy the very legitimate interests of my hon. friend and other members of the committee in this and perhaps one or two other related matters.

I indicated to this committee last Friday, Mr. Chairman, that in light of the very considerable concern which has been expressed about the nature of the dismissal of George Victor Spencer from the public service and the resultant denial of his pension and other benefits because of the nature of the action taken by the Civil Service Commission, I would favour an inquiry into the nature of the dismissal, particularly because Mr. Spencer for the first time the day before asked for such an inquiry.

The committee may recall that I indicated then, because all we had was a telegram addressed to a member of the house signed by a lawyer in Vancouver and Mr. Spencer, that I would determine myself—having given the commitment myself—whether Mr. Spencer in fact sent the telegram, although I underline that I had no reason to doubt my hon. friend's word, and whether the telegram represented his view in respect of the inquiry. So, I talked to Mr. Spencer by telephone on Friday evening and asked him simply this question, whether the telegram which had been read into the record of the House of Commons, and his name as having signed it, were confirmed by him and whether he confirmed the request for an inquiry in the terms outlined in the telegram. He did confirm both his signature on the telegram and the wording of the telegram with regard to the inquiry that he requested.

Accordingly, Mr. Chairman, an order in council was passed this morning, the text of which I have now before me, having received it a very short time ago. I should like to read that order in council and then, if the committee gives unanimous consent, I will be very glad to table it. The pertinent parts of the order in council read:

(1) that the Honourable Mr. Justice Dalton Courtright Wells, Toronto, Ontario, be appointed a Commissioner under Part I of the Inquiries Act to make such investigation, as in his absolute discretion he deems necessary, into the complaints made by George Victor Spencer as set out in the following telegram of 4th March, 1966:

"I have had a long interview with Victor Spencer with the approval of his solicitor, Harry Rankin. Spencer wants an inquiry of his case, either a judicial inquiry or by parliamentary committee because he does not feel he has been fairly dealt with. His complaint is with the nature of his dismissal and the unfair deprivation of benefits associated with his job such as pension and insurance benefits. He has no complaint with the treatment he has received from the R.C.M.P. but on the contrary feels they have been most considerate with him. Mr. Harry Rankin has also authorized the sending of this telegram."

The order in council goes on, having quoted the message:

—and to report whether, in his opinion, Mr. Spencer has been dealt with fairly and, if not, what rectification appears to him to be fair;

(2) that the procedure to be followed be in the absolute discretion of the Commissioner, including the power to hold the sessions in camera and to

adopt such procedures as the Commissioner considers appropriate for the protection of the security of Canada;

3. that the Commissioner be authorized to exercise all the powers conferred upon him by section 11 of the Inquiries Act;

4. that the Commissioner be authorized to sit at such times, and at such places as he may decide from time to time;

5. that the Commissioner be authorized to engage the services of such counsel, staff and technical advisers as he may require at rates of remuneration and reimbursement approved by the Treasury Board; and

6. that the Commissioner report to the Governor in Council with all reasonable dispatch.

• (4:20 p.m.)

Mr. Chairman, I should like to ask the unanimous consent of the committee to table the document which I have just read into the record.

The Chairman: Order. I think our procedure might be more properly carried out if the unanimous consent of the house were requested when the Speaker is in the chair.

Mr. Fulton: With respect, Mr. Chairman, I think it is important that we have the document before us as soon as possible in order to serve our purposes in the subsequent discussion. I would agree with you, Mr. Chairman, that the proper procedure is to have it produced in the house. May I request that it be done at once, and the Speaker asked to return to the chair immediately for the purpose of allowing this document to be tabled.

Mr. Lewis: Mr. Chairman, I support the request the hon. member has made. We, also, would like to see these terms of reference as quickly as possible.

Mr. Fulton: It would have saved time, Mr. Chairman, if they had been tabled earlier in the day.

Progress reported.

Right Hon. L. B. Pearson (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, I should like to table the order in council which has just been read into the record of the committee.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order. Does the Prime Minister have the leave of the house to table the document referred to?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

SUPPLY

The house in committee of supply, Mr. Batten in the chair.

[Mr. Pearson.]

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

Legal and other services—

1. Administration including the office of the Superintendent of Bankruptcy, grants and contributions as detailed in the estimates, gratuities to the widows or such dependents as may be approved by Treasury Board of judges who die while in office and authority to make recoverable advances for the administration of justice on behalf of the governments of the Northwest Territories and the Yukon Territory, $2,504,300.

The Chairman: Order. House again in committee of supply, vote No. 1, Department of Justice.

Mr. Pearson: Mr. Chairman, I would have been glad to have spared the committee that slight delay except that I received the order in council only a short time ago, found in it a slight typographical error and had to send it back to be retyped. I wanted to make sure that I read the retyped version before it was tabled, otherwise it could have been tabled, of course, on motions.

I think the order in council is very clear in the terms of reference it sets out for the inquiry in question. It is limited in the sense that it emphasizes the employee-employer nature of the inquiry. I myself believe very strongly that it should be limited in this sense. It has been in our minds from the beginning that an ordinary royal commission or commission of inquiry in which security matters concerning this case could have been discussed, even in camera, and where there would be a number of people present, might be prejudicial to the security services of the state.

The Minister of Justice who I believe, Mr. Chairman, in dealing with this matter has been scrupulously fair, honourable and correct in his desire to protect—

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Pearson: —the rights of the individual and the security of the state, has felt that such a limitation would be essential in regard to the security aspects concerned. I hold very strong views on this score myself. But, Mr. Speaker, I feel that the terms of reference are sufficiently wide to deal fairly with Mr. Spencer himself in the kind of request he has made. Indeed, Mr. Spencer has already given himself an inquiry by agreeing to appear on television, where in a very interesting, I think I can use that word, interview—

Mr. Diefenbaker: Was the government consulted on that?

Mr. Pearson: The government was not consulted about this appearance in any way, shape or form and I was just as surprised when I heard about it as no doubt my right hon. friend was. But it was in Mr. Spencer's mind no doubt when he asked for this inquiry, because I have the text of what he said. He stated the following when speaking last night:

> I asked for the inquiry because I thought that there were certain things that happened after I was fired that I did not quite like:

Then the questioner said:

> In other words, you lost your pension rights and your health benefit rights and your insurance rights and your death benefit rights. Is that what you are referring to?

Mr. Spencer said "Yes". Mr. Spencer later in the interview was asked by the inquirer:

> Do you feel that your rights have been violated as a Canadian citizen? Have your rights been violated?

And Mr. Spencer said "No." Those are his words, Mr. Chairman. There was a discussion about the terms of reference of such an inquiry on Friday afternoon in the committee, and I should like to read to the committee the words used in this connection by the hon. member for York South, who moved the amendment in question. I am quoting from page 2228 of *Hansard* of March 4 when the hon. member said:

> It is certainly possible for a commissioner of inquiry to consider in camera the treatment of this man in respect of his insurance, pension and other benefits without affecting the security of Canada. It is certainly possible to give this man justice without affecting the security of Canada, particularly in an inquiry held in camera.

Later in the afternoon the hon. member for York South said this:

> I think the terms of reference ought to be broad enough not merely to enable the judge sitting to say whether or not the action was legal. I do not have very grave doubts about that, anyway, and it is a very narrow thing. The terms of reference should be broad enough to enable the person making the inquiry to say whether, in his view, in all the circumstances of this case, what was done with respect to the insurance and pension was right, in terms of human and decent treatment of an employee of the government.

• (4:30 p.m.)

I believe, Mr. Chairman, that the terms of reference that I have tabled and read to the committee are so drawn as to give the commissioner an opportunity to inquire into this matter in the light of the words used by the hon. member for York South and give Mr. Spencer that kind of inquiry and that kind of protection. I believe that these terms of reference are such that the interests of justice will be served. While there have to be limitations on security investigations it is natural that an inquiry into the nature of his dismissal and the rights which he may claim have been prejudiced by that dismissal should lead into an inquiry into the nature of his offence. I do not believe that it does, and I do not believe it should, substitute the opinion of a commissioner for that of the Civil Service Commission. It should only determine whether the Civil Service Commission had a reasonable basis for its decision, which it made within the law, and as the result of that decision, Spencer was deprived of his job and certain superannuation rights.

Mr. Chairman, there is of course a wider issue in this particular matter that has been referred to on occasions during the discussions. In recent months there has been a good deal of controversy over the handling of security cases generally in this country. The result has been to throw some doubt on measures which have been established over the years to insure the protection of the national security—doubt not so much as to their effectiveness, because I believe myself they are effective, but doubt as to whether they afford adequate protection to the rights of individuals involved.

I should like in this regard to remind the house that on October 25, 1963, I and the then Minister of Justice announced a number of new procedures to apply to public servants whose duties required them to have access to secret and confidential information. I made quite a lengthy speech in the house on that occasion, and the then Minister of Justice made an even longer one. These procedures were put into effect after a most careful and exhaustive review of those which had been in effect up to that time; since 1947. Mr. Chairman, it is this wider aspect of the situation and the more general question of our security procedures that I want to deal with for a few moments.

We did attempt to deal with a certain category of public servants in October of 1963 in a way which would reconcile or balance, if you like, the rights of these individuals with the security of the state. We introduced procedures then, for the first time in our parliamentary history, which I think improved the effectiveness of this reconciliation by establishing a system of appeal against decisions, by establishing a procedure by which a person involved would first be informed that his security or reliability was in

doubt, and by giving him an opportunity to resolve that doubt.

Mr. Chairman, we then improved the effectiveness by also introducing a requirement to insure that a second look would always be taken by a separate body before a dismissal was finally decided upon. This second body was to be a board of review drawn from members of the interdepartmental security panel. Since 1963, Mr. Chairman, this procedure has worked effectively and well.

Mr. Douglas: Mr. Chairman, would the Prime Minister permit a question? I do not wish to interrupt his train of thought, but can he tell the committee how often that board has been used and why it was not effective in the Spencer case?

Mr. Pearson: I cannot tell my hon. friend exactly how often it has been used because I would have to look that up, but this was a procedure designed to deal with members of the public service who had access to confidential and secret information, and who had to be given special clearance before they were given this kind of an appointment.

Mr. Spencer's case does not come within these procedures because of that fact, but his case, excluded as it was from this procedure, because of the nature of his employment and because of certain other considerations, raised a number of broader issues and has caused a good deal of broad public concern.

Mr. Chairman, the government feels strongly that its actions in the case of Mr. Spencer were correct and that he was treated fairly. It was on that basis we took the action which we have taken. On the other hand, it is the responsibility of the government to insure that the public is satisfied that our security procedures on the whole and in general, covering all public servants and others, preserve that balance of national security and individual rights.

The Right Hon. Leader of the Opposition said in the house last Friday the time had come for a full and complete investigation to see whether our security measures are what they should be. I expressed that view in the past and, indeed, in debates we have had on the Spencer case I have said that a full examination of our security procedures is now desirable. My hon. friend, the member for Burnaby-Coquitlam, has raised this at least once of which I know, on January 31, as recorded at page 434 of *Hansard,* and I believe on other occasions, when he referred to questions of security. In answer to his query on the orders of the day, I believe on January 31, I indicated that I was concerned with the individual case but that I was also concerned that the inquiry might be extended to other cases, the examination of which might throw further light on our security matters generally. This has already been under discussion now for many weeks.

I should like to assure the members of this committee that in 1963, we took very seriously the request made by certain members and others outside the house that we go into the whole question of security in regard to confidential information and in regard to the attitudes—perhaps "attitudes" is the wrong word—the activities of security officers on university campuses and the like. We did spend a great deal of time on that with the result that in 1963 we brought in the changed procedures to which I have referred.

Just as we were concerned with these general security procedures and problems at that time, so are we concerned now with doubts about our security procedures generally. In the last month or so especially, indeed this goes back over a year, we have been giving careful consideration to the most appropriate means of re-examining these procedures in relation to the security problem that makes them necessary. Unfortunately there is a very real problem which does make security measures necessary.

We hope to introduce legislation shortly which will establish, among other things, the department of the Solicitor General under a minister who will have responsibility for the R.C.M.P. and for security matters. This will be a responsibility to which he will be able to give considerable time, because this increasingly important aspect of the work of the present Department of Justice will then become the responsibility of a separate minister. The new minister will be able to give much closer attention to these difficult problems than has been possible in the past. A high priority function of the new department will be to examine in detail the problems of espionage and subversive activities, and to determine how best to deal with them.

• (4:40 p.m.)

There is also the question, which has been raised by nearly every member who has participated in the discussion, of section 50 of the Civil Service Act, under which Mr. Spencer was discharged, which does not provide for an appeal, and which was retained in the civil service legislation in 1962 by a

unanimous vote of this house. The civil service legislation will, I hope, shortly—and again I emphasize "I hope shortly"—be reviewed because of the desirability, indeed the necessity, of bringing in a bill to establish, among other things, collective bargaining inside the civil service, a bill which has been prepared. At that time I think it would be well for this parliament to consider not only collective bargaining in the civil service but the sections in the existing legislation, sections 50 and 60, which provide for dismissal of civil servants. This will be another occasion, and an important occasion, to discuss an important matter which has come up in the study of this particular case—the use of section 50 with regard to the dismissal of civil servants.

It is now about 20 years, Mr. Chairman, since a royal commission examined in detail a very serious wartime situation in Canada, one which threatened not only our own security but that of our allies. It was as a result of that inquiry into matters in this security field arising out of the war that most of our present security procedures were established. They have been under review since that time by successive governments and a number of changes have been made, I know, during these years in the light of changing circumstances; I have already mentioned one this afternoon.

In the intervening 20 years, peacetime years technically, so far as Canada was concerned, profound changes have taken place in international affairs, some of a very subtle nature and others quite obvious. Measures taken to deal with a situation prevalent at one time, say 20 years ago, have been shown on occasion to be inadequate or inappropriate to a later situation. Restrictive measures, such as those in the field of security, tend to have their own inertia and to prolong themselves without change after the reasons for their initial establishment may have changed.

We have been aware of this tendency, Mr. Chairman, as have no doubt governments which have preceded us, and we have attempted by continuous review of our procedures in the last three years, as well as by one very important change, to ensure that the procedures which were in operation were appropriate to the conditions of the moment. But by the very nature of the problem based on the fear of subversive action from within our own borders,—and unfortunately there is reason still for that fear—it is immensely difficult to adjust such procedures to the subtly shifting concerns and desires of the people of this country in whose interests such procedures were established. Therefore I repeat that it is desirable that they should be subjected periodically to close examination by an outside objective authority.

Dealing as we are with a matter of national security, which transcends parliamentary and party considerations in the security sense but not in the individual freedom sense, I hope that any approach to this problem in the general field as to what we should do now, in the light of our experience over the years, in national security procedures, should be something on which we in this house would find general agreement.

Therefore, Mr. Chairman, in the light of the public concern which has been expressed, not only over a particular case but over the general situation, and in order to assist the Solicitor General in his particular and new responsibility, the government has decided to institute a judicial inquiry, but not into any particular case. This has been done already through the order in council in connection with the case before the committee. The inquiry will be into the operation of our security procedures generally, with a view to ascertaining firstly whether they are now adequate in light of present circumstances for the protection of the state against subversive action; secondly, whether they sufficiently protect the rights of private individuals in any investigations which are made under existing procedures.

I would not, Mr. Chairman, nor would this committee, desire such an inquiry to be considered in any way a reflection of the present conduct of security investigations. On the contrary, I believe that in addition to reassuring the public in this matter, it would confirm that the Royal Canadian Mounted Police act in this field with great care and great efficiency.

Having taken a decision of this kind in principle, Mr. Chairman, we now have to decide how to implement that decision most effectively by deciding on the nature and the form of such an inquiry. Announcements will be made on that score, Mr. Chairman, without delay. In working out the terms of reference of an inquiry of this kind dealing with national security and security procedures, perhaps it would be desirable for a representative of the government to consult with representatives of other parties to see whether agreement could be reached on the terms of reference to cover this wider question.

The Spencer case with which we have been dealing and which has received so much publicity is only one of many cases which would be relevant, of course, to such a study so far as the procedures adopted in the case were concerned. Many others have occurred since security became a problem. I feel quite certain that any commissioner who was appointed to look into this matter would naturally wish to go as far back as he might want to go in order to ascertain the procedures of the past. Then he could decide how they should be changed, in light of the experience gained over the last 15 to 20 years, to be brought into line with the requirements of the present time.

Mr. Diefenbaker: Would the Prime Minister allow a question at this stage. Would this commission have the responsibility to go into individual cases, and would it have available to it the evidence given before the United States Senate sub-committee on security, which met in 1951 and 1952?

Mr. Pearson: I cannot speak for the commissioner but I am certain in my own mind that any terms of reference of a commission of this kind should make it possible for the commissioner to go into exactly the kind of thing my right hon. friend has mentioned. If there have been hearings held in Washington or London or any other foreign capital which affect Canada, or there are any documents bearing on our security procedures and problems, the commissioner should have the right to ask for them and to study them in camera. I myself have no feeling that he should be limited in any way as to how far back he might wish to go. That is my view of the nature of this kind of inquiry.

Mr. Diefenbaker: Is that on procedure? Is the Prime Minister saying there will be no limitation as to how far back he can go on the question of the procedures followed?

Mr. Pearson: That is right, Mr. Chairman, as well as the effect of these procedures; their adequacy or inadequacy in regard to the security problems of the time, and the responsibility of the government in carrying out these procedures.

I should think that the commission, or if it was one man, the commissioner, should have great discretion in this regard. The terms of reference, if this house agrees he should not be limited in any way by time or the nature of the inquiry as long as it bears on national security procedures and the responsibility of the government for that very important national question.

• (4:50 p.m.)

Mr. Chairman, I have tried to deal with two aspects of this question this afternoon. One, the immediate problem of Mr. Spencer and the kind of inquiry which I believe will meet the necessities of this particular case as they were outlined by me on Friday afternoon when I talked about the new element which had been introduced into this question when Mr. Spencer himself requested an inquiry. He himself laid down the kind of inquiry he would desire to have and he repeated that last night. This would be inquiry into the employee-employer relationship, the nature of the dismissal, and matters which the commissioner would have to look into in order to determine whether the nature of his dismissal inflicted any wrong on him.

Then, the other question, Mr. Chairman, is the general question of national security procedures and what might be done in regard to investigation into that whole, very important field.

Mr. Diefenbaker: Mr. Chairman, in the last few days we have witnessed a change of front and of attitude that gives added weight to the sovereignty of parliament, and the effect of parliament upon a government which, up to the present time, has shown no signs of accepting the suggestions of the opposition.

I say at once that in the field of security the responsibility that rests on the Prime Minister is a great one. If, a few days ago, or at any time during the past two weeks the Prime Minister had taken the stand which he today adopts with such equanimity, and which he and his ministers opposed with such harshness, the debates would not have been as acrid as they have been. However, I want to say that these things were requested by the opposition. They were ridiculed out of hand. These requests were answered by successive ministers speaking for the government, including the Prime Minister, with derision and contempt. But all these things are over.

On Friday, minister after minister stood up and said, "Never, never, never will a judicial inquiry be permitted." "Jamais, jamais, jamais" was the answer on Friday. On Friday three ministers stood up and said "Never, under any circumstances would there be any inquiries permitted or allowed."

Mr. Chairman, not since Saul's journey to Damascus has parliament seen such a welcomed conversion.

I know that it will be embarrassing to the Minister of Justice after he said, "Here I stand." He said, "No change will be made in any circumstances; we are right." The Prime Minister had taken the same stand. Along came the Solicitor General who, with a suavity that appeals to me greatly, spoke against anything being done. The Minister of Citizenship and Immigration made a very brilliant contribution, and ended up by agreeing with the government and the stand that it had taken. I welcome this change of heart from the Prime Minister to the youngest of the cabinet ministers.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Diefenbaker: It just shows the power of parliament to convert what appeared to be the unconvertible, and to bring about such a change of heart that even the President of the Privy Council must marvel. As for the Minister of Justice, I feel very keenly for him, because he stood where the government stood. He stood absolutely firmly and said, "Never." When he went to sit down, the Prime Minister had removed the chair. Everything that he said—and he followed the Prime Minister meekly in this—and that the other ministers said, today is cast overboard. Common sense has taken the place of stubbornness and absolute stupidity.

I want to make one further reference, and it is this: I cannot understand the endeavour to blackmail the opposition. That is what it was.

Mr. Churchill: Shameful.

Mr. Diefenbaker: The President of the Privy Council some days ago told one of the hon. members sitting on this side of the house that if we pressed the Spencer case there would be a revelation relating to what took place during my administration.

Mr. Churchill: Shameful.

Mr. Diefenbaker: Yes. We shall have more to say about that.

An hon. Member: Terrible.

Mr. Diefenbaker: The Minister of Justice looked over at me and said, in effect, "We will fix you." Threats and intimidation, Mr. Chairman, do not work. We do not scare easily.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Cardin: Mr. Chairman, for the past two or three weeks the right hon. gentleman—

Mr. Diefenbaker: Well now—

The Chairman: Is this a question of privilege?

Mr. Diefenbaker: I have the floor. Is the Minister going into another of these tirades? I have that fear.

The Chairman: Order, please.

Mr. Diefenbaker: There is no privilege going back two or three weeks.

The Chairman: The Minister of Justice rises on a question of privilege.

Mr. Cardin: Mr. Chairman, for the past two or three weeks the right hon. gentleman and others on the other side of the house have been making insinuations of all types to the effect that this government was hiding something from the people, and that we have acted in a wrong way. Hon. members opposite have been making insinuations of that sort continuously.

No one on the opposite side of the house, or on this side, ever mentioned anything about blackmail. I have during the course of the debate just asked that the hon. member—

Some hon. Members: Order.

Mr. Cardin: —explain his part—

Some hon. Members: Order, order.

Mr. Cardin: —and go home.

The Chairman: Order, please.

Mr. Diefenbaker: Mr. Chairman—

The Chairman: The Chair is not able to discern any question of privilege in the minister's remarks. The right hon. Leader of the Opposition.

Mr. Diefenbaker: Mr. Chairman, he thought by that—and the threat was made over and over again as to what they were going to do—that they were going to close our mouths. Let me make this statement unequivocally: in no case, and I am naturally bound by my oath as a privy councillor —which apparently did not apply to the Minister of Justice—was there ever any breach of security in this nation in any case referred to or conjured up by him. Second, there was no danger to national security, and I will go into that tonight, in anything that took place.

I would have to deal with some of the criticism of those of us who have responsibilities regarding certain of the procedures that took place.

• (5:00 p.m.)

I am not now dealing with procedures in the detection of wrongdoing. One of the things which has to be examined is the whole matter of wire-tapping, telephone tapping, if this is taking place. I read in the papers that the R.C.M.P. had a secret camera ensconced in some of the lights, and brought about pictures I have never heard of before. I do say this: if that kind of thing is going on, it needs to be looked into and carefully expunged.

Mr. Cardin: What year was that?

Mr. Diefenbaker: What does the hon. gentleman say now, by insinuation?

Mr. Cardin: When was that?

Mr. Diefenbaker: Well, the minister is the man who dropped the insinuation and began the cowardly attack he made. Now, he has to run. Never in the years I have been in the House of Commons have I seen ministers placed in such positions as they are placed in today since the complete turnabout on the part of the Prime Minister. I welcome what has been achieved. We fought for it. We were condemned. They thought by intimidation we could be kept quiet.

Mr. Cardin: Just explain the case.

Mr. Diefenbaker: Explain? I say to the Minister of Justice that all his explaining went out with the refuse today. There he stands, naked and unashamed, deprived of every argument he brought before this house. He said: "This is the position I will take, and no other." But the force of public opinion, the force of right, has brought about on the part of the Prime Minister the decision to take another course.

Last evening I heard Spencer. The Prime Minister said the government was not consulted in any way. I do not want to prejudge any case which might be taken against Spencer. But the mounted police, with the surveillance they placed over him, denied the hon. member for Vancouver East an opportunity to see this man.

Mr. Pearson: They did not.

Mr. Diefenbaker: That is what he says, and he is the one who knows. The Prime Minister does not know. The hon. member does. He tried for hours without success. Suddenly this person who has been out of circulation for three months finds himself persona grata on the television screens of our country.

I add this: reformation, however late, is always welcome. The Minister of Justice said: "I am right. I know I am right. Nothing is going to change." Now it is changed. He was in this fight for ten days supporting the Prime Minister. Now, the Prime Minister in effect says: "Goodbye, Minister of Justice. Your views do not in any way bind me and as far as I am concerned we are going ahead with the necessary action."

It has been an incredible performance all the way along. I will always find it one of those rather unbelievable things—the Prime Minister on the telephone talking to the spy.

Mr. Pearson: He is a spy, now, is he?

Mr. Diefenbaker: I never will understand that. I can only say I am glad to see that the power of argument is not lost in this chamber, that public opinion cannot be ostracized in this chamber. The government has antennae, and even if these do not work for a long while, these enable it to understand—after matters have been brought home, as this has been brought home. The government got the message that the people want the protection and preservation of their security. At the same time they want the maintenance of that degree of freedom which, while not denying security, will not prostitute the rights of citizens.

It is a difficult balance to achieve. To the Prime Minister, I say: I am glad that you saw the error of your ways so definitely and that you were not convinced either by the arguments advanced by the Minister of Justice or by other ministers who spoke. Security is one thing which haunts the hours of a Prime Minister. The problem is before him at all times. I had but one principle when I occupied that position. It was this: there shall be no consideration given to anyone who would undermine the security of the state. That course, I followed. That course was the one which all of us, I believe, in the tradition of our parliamentary life, must follow. All I can say to those opposite who threatened is this, when blackmail failed, the government altered its position.

Mr. Lewis: I agree with the Leader of the Opposition that what the Prime Minister dealt with today were precisely the things which members on this side of the house have been asking about for some weeks. My

own leader, the hon. member for Burnaby-Coquitlam, asked the first question on this subject way back on January 21.

While the Prime Minister was, of course, right in a literal sense when he said he had received no request from Spencer for a review of his case, I respectfully suggest that in the light of the correspondence which was tabled today, neither he nor any one of his colleagues had to be a genius in order to recognize that Spencer and his attorney were not satisfied. Indeed, the first letter which was tabled today, the letter dated December 21 and written by Mr. Spencer's solicitor to the personnel director of the post office, says:

> I understand that Mr. Spencer has spoken to you on several occasions about being allowed to go on superannuation because of his health.

That was the first request made by Mr. Spencer to his superior. Later in this correspondence one finds letters from Mr. Rankin, the solicitor, to people in the Post Office Department and to people in the Privy Council office clearly indicating that Mr. Rankin, on behalf of Mr. Spencer, wanted to know the reasons for his dismissal. He would obviously not direct those questions if Mr. Spencer was entirely satisfied with the treatment he had received. I submit that a careful reading of those letters would have persuaded the government that Mr. Spencer was not satisfied.

• (5:10 p.m.)

It was not necessary for the government to wait for me, as happened in this case, or for any other member on this side of the chamber to get in touch with Mr. Spencer, through some solicitor in Vancouver, to find out what his wishes were. The government could have done that weeks ago. The Minister of Justice, through the R.C.M.P., could have found out weeks ago that Mr. Spencer wanted an inquiry, or that his solicitor was advising him to have an inquiry.

I must say it is an astonishing thing that not only did the government fail to make the simple inquiry I made last Wednesday but it insisted, every minister insisted, that there had been nothing wrong; that Mr. Spencer was happy, and that everything was going to be left as it was, no matter what. Then the Prime Minister on Friday last—and I do not for one moment question his statement—said that my reading of Mr. Spencer's telegram to me into the record was the first time he heard Mr. Spencer was dissatisfied. Undoubtedly that was so but, if it was so, it was the result of obvious incompetence, obvious callousness on the part of members of the government or their advisers who could have found out that simple fact before I found it out last Thursday.

I cannot understand why that was not done, except it be the suggestion I made last Friday that the minister was so obsessed by an obstinate determination not to budge that his common sense left him at that point. If he had not been so obsessed, he could have acted in a proper and humane way.

I regretted very much, Mr. Chairman, some of the things the Prime Minister said in his remarks after he tabled the order in council. It seemed to me he arrogated to himself the right to lay down guide lines for Mr. Justice Wells to follow as commissioner under the order in council, and I submit the right hon. gentleman did not have the right to do that. It was not his business to tell the commissioner what he ought to do or how he should behave himself. It is the order in council that tells him what to do and how he is to behave. The right hon. gentleman had no right to lay down guide lines, and I am certain Mr. Justice Wells, who is a respected member of the bench in Ontario, will go by the order in council and not by any attempt by someone here to tell him what to do.

I submit that Mr. Justice Wells will not be able to do his job, the job that Mr. Spencer asks him to do, unless he makes some investigation into at least the reasons for Spencer's dismissal. It is not possible, as I suggested elsewhere, for Mr. Justice Wells to say whether the punishment fits the crime unless he can make an investigation which will show him, (a) what the crime was, and (b) the extent of the man's culpability in that crime, if there was any.

This is the simple proposition that I am sure was in the mind of the Governor in Council when the order in council was drafted.

I agree that parliament has prevailed in this. Public opinion has prevailed, and remembering that none is so zealous as the convert, I hope the government will proceed in similar cases when they arise in such a way that no one here will be able to criticize it.

I think the debate in the last number of days has been regrettable in many respects, and in some respects was a shameful one. Personal vindictiveness and personal attack have been followed by a return of personal vindictiveness and personal attack. The time

of this parliament was taken up with references and accusations which have nothing to do with the welfare of the people of Canada, or the welfare of people anywhere on this earth, which should be our job. It is regrettable to me as a member of the house that some of those exchanges took place. I hope they are now ended, Mr. Chairman. I hope that the order in council tabled by the right hon. Prime Minister, and the inquiry which he has undertaken to promulgate, will now end the recriminations, personal attacks and personal accusations to which we have been listening for some days, in my case with some shame and some very considerable regret that this kind of thing was happening in the parliament of Canada.

As to the inquiry into the procedures of our security system, that is something which our leader, the hon. member for Burnaby-Coquitlam, will comment on when we see the order in council, or he will designate someone else from our party to do so. I will not say anything about it at this time.

I must say the order in council for the inquiry into Mr. Spencer's complaint, in my opinion gives Mr. Justice Wells all the authority he requires to make a thorough inquiry into that complaint. I took the trouble last night to ascertain once again by a long distance telephone call whether there was any change in the position taken by Mr. Spencer's solicitor, given in the language of the telegram which I read into the record on Friday. I was assured by a return long distance call that there was no change. As I read the order in council the government has said to Mr. Justice Wells, "Here in the language of Spencer himself is the complaint which he makes," and Mr. Justice Wells is given unlimited discretion to investigate that complaint.

It seems to me, Mr. Chairman, I would be merely destructive, negative, and would be wasting the time of this parliament if I did not say that the order in council and the terms of reference are such as to make it my duty to withdraw the motion which I moved. I ask for the consent of the house to do so.

Mr. Churchill: We are in no hurry about it.

The Chairman: Does the committee give unanimous consent?

Mr. Nielsen: No.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Caouette: Mr. Chairman, after hearing the statement of the right hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Pearson) about Victor Spencer, who was dismissed under section 50 on the Civil Service Act and after hearing the usual harangue of the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Diefenbaker), who sought to crush others to prove that he alone was right, I suggest that we must point out in all frankness and in all fairness that it is due to the initiative of the leader of the New Democratic party that the Spencer case was drawn to the attention of this parliament on January 21, 1966. Only then did the Leader of the Opposition intervene. Today, he tries to give the impression that he is the great champion of Mr. Victor Spencer. Mr. Spencer was dismissed under section 50 which clearly stipulates that there is no right to appeal and, in view of the fact that section 50 was passed unanimously by the house, by the Conservative party as well as by all the others, I wonder why the Prime Minister reversed his stand, when the order in council—once again, I am sorry but I have just the English copy—reads as follows:

[*English*]

The Committee of the Privy Council, on the recommendation of the Right Honourable Lester Bowles Pearson, the Prime Minister, advise

(1) that the Honourable Mr. Justice Dalton Courtright Wells, Toronto, Ontario, be appointed a Commissioner under Part I of the Inquiries Act to make such investigation, as in his absolute discretion he deems necessary, into the complaints made by George Victor Spencer as set out in the following telegram of 4th March, 1966:

[*Translation*]

That telegram was read by the hon. member for York South (Mr. Lewis) last Friday.

Mr. Chairman, I am not against the Leader of the Official Opposition raising that matter, even trying to make political hay, in the name of justice in Canada, in the name of common sense, as he said earlier; the hon. member for York South says that abuse was hurled from both sides of the house and that the business of the house was delayed. I say that if such a situation exists with regard to the Spencer case, the opposition parties cannot be blamed, because the government itself is responsible.

The Minister of Justice spends three weeks stating that that he will not appoint a judge or a commission and will not change his mind, and the Prime Minister, about that matter, asserts: "No, Mr. Speaker, no commission will be established to study the Spencer case because it is closed". At a certain moment, on Friday, after standing up to the opposition for three weeks, the Prime Minister declares that a judge will be appointed to study the Spencer case.

Mr. Chairman, I say that the Prime Minister has led his Minister of Justice to the guillotine. It is the Prime Minister who is responsible for this situation, because he does not know how to make a decision when one is needed. He forgets that he is the Prime Minister of Canada and that he may no longer act like a mere diplomat. The Prime Minister must forget that he was a diplomat, he must devote his energies to making decisions.

In the Minister of Justice's place, Friday afternoon, I would simply have handed my resignation to the Prime Minister, because the latter had just placed him in an utterly intolerable situation. I did not understand the attitude of the Minister of Justice at that time.

That the Spencer case should crop up again today, that it should be decided to appoint a judge to investigate the facts, even going back to 15 or 20 years, to determine whether sabotage took place in 1944, 1951 or 1961, it is unthinkable that a Prime Minister should put on such a show at the expense of the Canadian people. We have already spent too much time on that matter and I hope those who are trying to make a political football out of the Spencer case will fail miserably.

We, in this group, want justice. We favour respect of human rights. We want a man implicated in something to have a chance to be heard. Until a man is proven guilty, we want him to have the benefit of the doubt. Apparently, this is not the case with Spencer, because after three weeks of debate and four weeks of questions on the order paper, there is a change of attitude.

It is not my intention to belabour the point. Nevertheless, if this situation is prevailing at present in parliament, the blame should not be put on the opposition but on the Prime Minister who could not take his own responsibilities at the proper time.

The other question in my mind is one mentioned Friday night by the Minister of Justice himself, the Munsinger affair. The Munsinger case was thrown like a charge, without warning, right here in the house, and no details were given. We ask for details. We do not know anything, but we hear all sorts of rumours about that. No charge should be made in this house without proof. Let this whole Munsinger matter be brought before the federal parliament. If there has been sabotage or spying, if ministers were involved, or a former minister of the previous government, as we hear it said in the corridors of parliament, let the light be made, but no one should make all sorts of accusations while talking through his hat. When one makes such a serious charge in front of all the members, one should at least have the courage to give details.

We want equal justice for all, not only for a small group here and there, but for all. If there are things to be revealed in the better interest of the nation, of the Canadian parliament, let them be revealed, let that accusation be cleared up.

I urge the Minister of Justice to do away with discretion. He made charges in connection with a so-called Munsinger case. I ask the Minister of Justice to enlighten us as he is supposed to know something about it. Let him rise and tell us what he knows about the Munsinger case. With regard to Mr. Spencer, he has the opportunity of pleading his case before a judge appointed by the cabinet. And, in that connection, I say to the Prime Minister that Section 50 of the Civil Service Act is pretty worthless. If this section 50 gives no recourse to an accused, let us repeal it; let us keep and use section 60, which gives a right of appeal to an employee who is dismissed from the civil service for certain reasons. Then we will not look ridiculous in the eyes of the Canadian people.

In concluding my remarks, I ask the right hon. Prime Minister to come to a decision in due time so that we may no longer consider that we have been taken in.

• (5:20 p.m.)

[*English*]

Mr. Fairweather: Mr. Chairman, I have a question for the hon. member for Villeneuve. Would the hon. member for Villeneuve permit this question. I have had a debate with myself about modesty, but modesty has lost. The first question on the unnatural surveillance of Spencer was asked by the member for Royal on January 19, the first day on which questions were allowed. I do not care who receives the credit, but I think the record should be straight.

Mr. Thompson: Mr. Chairman, it would seem to me that the situation in which we presently are in this house borders almost on the ridiculous. The estimates for the year practically past have been under debate now for several weeks. There is a financial crisis. There is not money to pay for the administration of government and the situation daily becomes more critical. There is no money for the civil servants, there is no money for the military, and there is no money for the pensioners.

The government stands in complete confusion, after weeks of resisting the demands of the opposition in justification of their position on the Spencer case. Then the Prime Minister chooses to capitulate completely, and in so doing has completely pulled the rug out from under the ministers who have, in making the case, ably carried out the argument of the government. At this point the words that the hon. leader of the official opposition has spoken, while they were hard, do present the actual situation in which we find ourselves.

• (5:30 p.m.)

I find that my sympathies in this situation rest with the three ministers who spoke last Friday and to whom reference has already been made. Certainly the case for the government's position prior to five o'clock last Friday was well presented by these men. In fact I am personally grateful to the hon. Solicitor General for his brevity in explaining the situation as he saw it. Certainly his contribution was most helpful, as was that of the hon. minister of manpower. These ministers, having done this, the picture changed completely because the Prime Minister chose to capitulate to the requests of the opposition. Even the hon. Minister of Justice presented a fairly clear case, which indicated that part of his argument was sound and well taken. If he had not lost his temper in the heat of debate, his position would have been stronger.

Today we find the government almost like a ship in a storm without a rudder. I believe that the general public of Canada are confused as they see the situation. I am not speaking as a lawyer because I am not a member of that profession. I must look at this situation through the eyes with which I believe most Canadian laymen see the situation. It makes one wonder just what is taking place within the ranks of the government at this time.

After all, Mr. Chairman, we have here a man, who, on his own confession, is a Communist collaborator, sympathizer, spy, or call him whatever you wish. He has not been charged with this offence by any member of the government. This is on his own confession. He does not even mind coming before the people of Canada and admitting it on a television program, as he did last night.

This is not a new case. It has been dealt with by four successive Ministers of Justice; first by the hon. member for Kamloops, who last Friday made a very worthwhile temperate and reasonable presentation in the house

[Mr. Thompson.]

of the case as he saw it; and by his successor Hon. Donald Fleming. The President of the Privy Council dealt with it when he was Minister of Justice and now the present Minister of Justice has taken charge of the case. He has been assisted by the Solicitor General since his new duties project him into a case such as that involving Mr. Spencer. In addition, Mr. Chairman, two commissioners of the R.C.M.P. have dealt with this case, Commissioner Harvison and Commissioner McClellan.

For the Prime Minister to take the stand that he has taken, in view of this, even in the face of the demands of the opposition, is something which I say verges on the ridiculous. Then, Mr. Chairman, the record of the previous Conservative government is such that if they had had this case to handle today, they would not have dealt with it in a way too much different from the way it was handled prior to last Friday.

Therefore we find a situation that is not only critical, but it is one to which we must return with a reasonable sense of responsibility in order that we may go on with the business of the house. I believe that the Spencer case is an example of bumbling by the government. We do not share the concern of the other opposition parties that there has been any attempt in this case to hide corruption or skulduggery behind the scenes. As far as we can see, even the words of Mr. Spencer himself, seem to deny this. Thus, we do not consider an inquiry into the firing procedures of Mr. Spencer to be anything but a minute part of the kind of investigation that has been previously demanded, unless we can be assured that the government will now investigate the whole area of crime, not only of crime but of subversion within this country; the impact of international crime and, yes, the question of corruption.

Unless this is done, Mr. Chairman, I do not see how the public of Canada will ever be satisfied or have any assurance that what is being done is the right thing. So, it would seem that it has become evident that in agreeing to this inquiry, the government have forced themselves into a corner where they will have to agree to the setting up of a commission to investigate crime in this country as it relates to every facet of those things that we read and hear about continually through our news media. It is not that we blame the government for the fact that there is crime in Canada. It is not that we blame

them for the fact that world communism might send its agents here to try and subvert some of our governmental employees. What we can and do blame them for is that in the face of continuing appeals from all parties for an investigation of crime in its wider aspects, they have refused to do so. Now they have capitulated in such a way that in my opinion, the ministers who are concerned with this case, particularly the Minister of Justice, has been placed in an untenable situation. It seems almost an impossibility now for the Minister of Justice to carry on and do the work expected of him, while maintaining the confidence of this house and the public.

I do not intend to belabour this matter any further, Mr. Chairman, but in two respected newspapers today there are comments which I believe should be drawn to the attention of the committee. I believe these comments to be indicative of the situation as the general public sees it, putting this matter in its correct perspective. In the first place I would quote very briefly from an editorial in today's Ottawa *Journal*. It begins in this way:

Whether Mr. Spencer had too little or too much justice is something we may learn now that the government has granted the inquiry it should have granted months ago.

The editorial says later:

What possessed the Prime Minister to telephone Mr. Spencer. It is all like a bad movie, a James Bond sillied for juveniles. The R.C.M.P. could have checked Mr. Spencer's wishes as to that telegram, or the parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Justice; or, better still, the Deputy Postmaster General whose department is the only one concerned with Mr. Spencer's complaints.

Mr. Spencer's complaints are not about security or injustice, they are that he was fired by his employer for reasons about which he is not satisfied and on terms which do not satisfy him. The editorial continues:

But no, the Prime Minister himself phones this dubious character and invites Mr. Lewis to listen in—

I think we can be thankful that the hon. member for York South had the common sense to refuse such an invitation. The editorial continues:

—pitiful pantomime of the propriety and processes of government.

We don't know yet whether Mr. Pearson and his government have offended the human rights of a man at the bottom but they have certainly offended the public's right to expect that the men at the top will do the right thing, in the right way, at the right time.

Today's edition of the *Globe and Mail* contains an editorial that I believe is pertinent and relevant as well at this time. It says:

It is impossible to believe that any government would hush up such a scandal—that the Conservatives would have dared to conceal it or that the Liberals would continue the conspiracy of silence only to refer to the sensational story when they themselves were cornered in an embarrassing security debate. If such were the case, substance would be added to the charge of former Justice Minister E. Davie Fulton that Mr. Cardin was making an approach to blackmail.

The editorial says later:

The tragedy, of course, is that we cannot much longer afford such federal blood-letting. Almost no legislation has been passed in this session of our parliament; our government is running out of money and must beg for supply; our provincial governments gain muscle every day while the federal house dissipates its strength.

"When discords and quarrels and factions are carried openly and audaciously," wrote Francis Bacon, "it is a sign the reverence of government is lost."

• (5:40 p.m.)

In such a time, said Bacon, men have need to 'pray for fair weather'. In March of 1966 we are indeed standing in such a need.

So I say, Mr. Chairman, that regardless of these things the right hon. Prime Minister has chosen to capitulate to the demands of the opposition. I do not believe that should have been necessary. I believe the government had, in a lumbering way, presented its case. Nevertheless, the Prime Minister has done this and the hon. member for York South has withdrawn his motion of censure, because that is, in effect, what it was. I think the only action left to us in this house now is to let these estimates pass for this year, so that the business of the government can be carried on with the estimates for the next fiscal year, as well as budget matters and many other items of importance being placed before us.

Mr. Starr: Mr. Chairman, in view of what has transpired in the committee today, and the Prime Minister's statement, we withdraw our objection to the request that the motion be withdrawn.

The Deputy Chairman: Is it agreed by the committee that the motion put forward be now withdrawn?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Item agreed to.

DEPARTMENT OF CITIZENSHIP AND IMMIGRATION

1. Departmental administration, $1,257,800.

The Deputy Chairman: Shall vote 1 carry?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Mr. Starr: Just one moment; let us not get over enthusiastic, Mr. Chairman. There are a number of members who would like to ask questions, and I know a member of this party would like to say a few words at the commencement of our consideration of vote 1. If I may make a suggestion, Mr. Chairman, perhaps you should take your time on item 1.

Mr. Bell (Carleton): The minister is not here, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Woolliams: We do not want to pass his estimates before he arrives.

Mr. Turner: Mr. Chairman, the hon. minister is here.

Mr. Bell (Carleton): Mr. Chairman, is it the hon. minister's intention to make an opening statement?

Mr. Marchand: Mr. Chairman, I should just like to make a short statement at this time. I will be receiving the estimates which are still in my office. I never thought that things would go so fast this afternoon.

[*Translation*]

First of all, Mr. Chairman, I wish to congratulate my predecessor, the present Minister of Labour (Mr. Nicholson), for the progress he achieved when he was Minister of Citizenship and Immigration.

I should like also to pay special tribute to all the former Ministers of Citizenship and Immigration now sitting in this house—I think there are six. Of all ministers, I am probably the one most closely watched by his ancestors knowing that they are all men of distinction, I am glad to pay tribute to them.

Now, as you know, the immigration branch will eventually become part of the department of manpower. In due course, we shall have the opportunity to discuss this aspect of the matter. For the present, concerning immigration, I should like to point out to the house that, last year, 142,000 immigrants entered Canada, an increase of probably 30 per cent over the previous year. According to figures just received for January, another increase of 30 per cent also is shown over January 1965.

There is no doubt that, for the development and growth of Canada, continuing immigration adequate to meet the needs of the labour market is essential.

Now, I do not wish to limit or restrict if you wish, the value of immigration to mere statistics, but the house may be interested in knowing that to bring an immigrant into the country costs approximately $100, while the investment value, that is, the money the immigrant brings with him to Canada, is approximately $1,000. That is to say, last year, the financial investments of immigrants are said to have reached $150 million.

Our immigration is surely not always what we would hope it to be, and for many reasons. As a matter of fact, we are unable to obtain all the skilled labour we would like at present, not through fanaticism or, let us say, owing to a predetermined policy, but because certain countries refuse or are reluctant to send immigrants to Canada. For instance, France rather frowns upon the immigration of its citizens. There is also the fact that we do not have an immigration office in every country of the world. And, finally, I must point out that, at this time, we are not the only country seeking skilled labour. Most European countries enjoy full employment and want to keep their skilled labour, and rightly so, but this obviously puts a limit on our immigration sources.

This is the first time I submit to this committee estimates which are already spent, and were spent by another minister, but nevertheless I shall readily accept the questions you may want to ask.

[*English*]

Mr. Bell (Carleton): Mr. Chairman, I regret very much that the committee is crowded for time in the discussion of these estimates. No department of government could profit more from a thorough and exhaustive examination of its policies and practices, and from a clear directive by the government and parliament regarding its future activities. In my view, the Department of Citizenship and Immigration has suffered from parliamentary neglect with the result that dedicated officers, unable to see in what direction the government and parliament wished the policies of the department to point, have been made to feel like orphans in the storm, not a few of them frustrated and enraged by the persistent shifts, and changes of emphasis in policy.

So, sir, the congratulations I offer to the minister on his maiden presentation of the estimates to parliament must be tempered by the recollection of the manner in which the Department of Citizenship and Immigration has been slighted by the Prime Minister; I may say, even treated with disdain approaching scorn. One need only recall that in a period of only 40 months there have been six

Ministers of Citizenship and Immigration, three Deputy Ministers and one long time Acting Deputy Minister, to realize the handicaps under which the department has laboured. No one has had the opportunity to take firm command, to give force and direction to policies and practices.

Since this government took office there have been four ministers, one Acting Deputy Minister and two Deputy Ministers. The hon. member for Papineau held the portfolio for something like nine and a half months. Then the hon. member for Matapedia-Matane was the incumbent for slightly over 16 months, after which the hon. member for Vancouver Centre was vouchsafed only about five and a half months.

• (5:50 p.m.)

These changes, sir, were not made in the interests of the department or in the interests of the advancement of immigration policy, but solely for partisan reasons in an attempt to solve internal problems within the Liberal Party. What sort of game of ministerial musical chairs is this to play in such a vitally important portfolio? Not one of the ministers, no matter how talented he might be, has been given the opportunity by the Prime Minister to become more than vaguely acquainted with the fringes of the department. It is even more significant that only the hon. member for Vancouver Centre actually believes in immigration as an instrument of national policy, and only he had the enthusiasm and the zeal to seek to formulate consistent policy for the department.

Then, Mr. Chairman, I have the gravest reservations about the absorption of the old Department of Citizenship and Immigration into a new department of manpower and the appointment of a new deputy minister. Far be it from me to object to the appointment of any individual on the ground of active participation in politics. I have never believed that political types should be eliminated from advancement, but the new deputy minister is a figure so controversial by nature, so prone to attract attack, so lacking in knowledge or understanding of immigration, that I confess to believing his appointment a grave mistake and a genuine blow to the public service of Canada.

However, more important than the personality of any individual is the proposed structure of the new department of manpower. When the establishing legislation is before the house I shall have considerable to say on this subject. I want to say only this now in an attempt at this late date to try to convince the Prime Minister that the submerging of immigration into what is basically a labour portfolio is a grave error in national policy.

From my own experience in the portfolio, I know that it was the Department of Labour which consistently and persistently brought pressures to bear to reduce immigration, to cut back, to hold down, and at a time when, in my view, the economy needed the stimulus of expanded immigration. Last year I had the privilege of visiting both New Zealand and Australia and spending considerable time with the ministers responsible for immigration in those countries, and much more time in detailed discussions with their departmental staffs. I was treated with the most exceptional courtesy in both countries, and therefore I hesitate to make any comparisons, certainly ones which would be invidious.

In New Zealand the immigration portfolio is an adjunct of the labour portfolio, both being held by a dynamic and very able minister, Mr. Tom Shand. But in retrospect I am unable to escape the feeling that immigration is much subdued as an instrument of national policy by comparison with Australia, where it is a separate portfolio. Of this I intend to have considerably more to say when the legislation is before the house.

One of the highly unfortunate by-products of this game of musical chairs with the portfolio of citizenship and immigration has been the delay in a white paper on immigration. I believe it was on December 31, 1964 at a press conference when the Prime Minister promised a white paper. He used these words:

> I have asked the Minister to prepare a white paper on immigration policy, immigration administration and immigration procedures, telling what has been done and what is in process, and to have that available if at all possible—and I believe it is possible—at the beginning of the next session of parliament.

That next session has come and has been dissolved, Mr. Chairman, and we are well launched into the next session of parliament. Fifteen months have passed and still no white paper, though the Prime Minister was convinced that it could be ready before the opening of the last session.

The fault is not with the officials of the department. The fault is with the procession of ministers which we have had since December 31, 1964, and the long range interests of Canada have suffered, in my view, by the delays and the neglect in this regard.

So far as the officials are concerned, Mr. Chairman, their files are bulging so full of material that they could produce a white paper in a fortnight. But no minister, and certainly not the cabinet, has taken the time to decide on policy; and so our immigration policy merely drifts.

A further by-product, of course, is the delay in revision of the Immigration Act itself. The former government enacted the new regulations as long ago as January 1962 and decided to postpone a general revision of the act itself until some experience with the regulations could be gained. There has been ample time to observe the new regulations in operation, and the time has come for the minister to proceed with a full scale revision of this obsolete, antediluvian Immigration Act.

This committee will be indulgent, of course, with the new minister today, but I say to him that it expects from him before the next year's estimates are considered the formulation and enunciation of a dynamic but stable long range immigration policy. Dynamic and forward-looking it must be. The development of this nation has suffered greatly from our timidity and vacillation in both immigration policy and immigration programming. In my view we must establish targets and objectives and refuse to be diverted from those targets and objectives by any or every economic breeze.

It is not enough, Mr. Chairman, for this country simply to pursue passive policies on immigration, and as and when our economy creates vacuums for jobs in the labour market which cannot be met internally to seek immigrant workers for such purposes. In terms of the present supply situation for immigrants, this approach tends to be self-defeating. A passive attraction of immigrants —a negative policy—simply does not enable Department of Citizenship and Immigration to compete for immigrants.

Canada has been built on the strength of immigrant people. Therefore, I say let us not be afraid to adopt a positive approach. I have said before in this house, and I will repeat it many times, that I believe the planning of our immigration policy can no longer be formulated on an annual basis. The "feast or famine" approach to immigration, the "tap on, tap off" approach, has been the curse of the department. These approaches will not produce a satisfactory flow of immigrants to Canada, particularly not from our traditional sources. What we need to do—and I earnestly hope that the white paper will advocate this—is to set long range targets and objectives and to stick with them whatever the temporary domestic economic climate.

[Mr. Bell (Carleton).]

I have often stated publicly, and I now reiterate, my personal belief that our immigration policy should be based on an average flow equal to one per cent of the Canadian population per annum, with deviations therefrom in any year of not more than one quarter of 1 per cent. If we are to adopt this as a long range policy, then there is something to fight for in the department of immigration.

There is one further factor I should like to put before the minister as he takes over this portfolio. In my view it is the task of the Minister of Citizenship and Immigration to bring a warmhearted understanding to the cold print of immigration laws. Humanitarian and moral considerations are basic considerations to be respected and to be applied in the immigration administration. I think the fundamental task of any minister of immigration is to maintain a fair, impartial and non-discriminatory administration, coupled—and I emphasize the word "coupled"—with a warm and sympathetic understanding of the basic human problems which are involved.

I hope that as one of the factors in achieving that objective, the minister will seek to extend greatly the authority and prerogatives of the immigration appeal board. In many ways an appeal to that board is now simply a farce. It should be made a real and genuine appeal with proper discretionary authority vested in the board. Unlike some people, I do not advocate the complete abandonment of ministerial discretion. At least a residuum of discretion should be maintained by the minister, for the simple reason that I have never seen any board, commission or civil servant, no matter how senior, who is prepared to stick its or his neck out as far as a politician frequently must and will do. I say that the total abandonment of ministerial discretion would lead to a more rigid, inflexible administration.

• (6:00 p.m.)

One further matter relating to staff, Mr. Chairman. In my view the "on again, off again, gone again, Finnegan" nature, of our immigration policy has had a highly deleterious effect upon the morale of the department. Just as plans are prepared and ready, they are scrapped. It is a tribute to the dedication generally of the staff that wholesale departures of staff have been avoided.

I think that the overseas staff suffers from a major discrimination when compared with the overseas staff of the Department of External Affairs and the Department of Trade and Commerce. I appeal to the minister to use his moral authority within the government to secure for his staff overseas at least the status and prestige enjoyed by the overseas staff of the Department of Trade and Commerce.

I should say that the overseas staff is a dedicated staff. Since I ceased to be minister, I have visited offices in many countries as an ordinary citizen and I have been universally impressed by the calibre of our officers. I hope it will not be invidious to say, that when I visited the office in Hong Kong in the month of September, due to the very great courtesy of the Minister of Labour, the hon. member for Vancouver Centre, I was tremendously impressed by the skill and intelligence under the most difficult circumstances of the staff. I was especially impressed by the fine, understanding leadership of their chief, Mr. Robert Wales. I should say that he and his staff are a credit to Canada.

The minister, sir, will have a more difficult time when his estimates are next before the house unless, in the meantime, he enunciates in a broad, decisive way, a genuine immigration policy for this country. Every day I am impressed by the role which recent immigrants have played in the enrichment of Canadian life and in the advancement of our culture. Each day I have been reminded of how new arrivals, filled with enthusiasm, energy, and the will to succeed have enriched our national life, expanded our Canadian traditions in fields such as science, education, the arts, yes—even in politics. Canada needs more, Mr. Chairman, of these people.

The Chairman: Shall the item carry?

An hon. Member: Six o'clock.

Mr. Starr: Mr. Chairman, before you proceed, may I ask the government house leader if he can tell us in what order he expects to bring up the balance of the estimates of the various departments?

Mr. McIlraith: Mr. Chairman, I have just had it drawn to my attention by the table that the item for the R.C.M.P. was omitted when the committee was considering estimates for the Department of Justice. Perhaps it might be as well, since that item was inadvertently omitted, to put it through now. We want to proceed in this order, apart from that: finish the Department of Citizenship and Immigration. Then deal with the Departments of Health and Welfare, Public Works, the Secretary of State, and Fisheries.

I should like to now call the item that was inadvertently omitted.

Mr. Herridge: No. One or two questions arise under that item.

The Deputy Chairman: In view of the fact that the house is proceeding to consider private members' business, pursuant to section 3 of standing order 15 it is my duty to leave the chair.

PROCEEDINGS ON ADJOURNMENT MOTION

SUBJECT MATTER OF QUESTIONS TO BE DEBATED UNDER ADJOURNMENT MOTION

Mr. Speaker: It is my duty pursuant to provisional standing order 39A, to inform the house that the following questions will be discussed on the adjournment motion tonight: the hon. member for Timmins (Mr. Martin), finance—inquiry as to assistance to gold mining industry; the hon. member for Verdun (Mr. Mackasey), Canadian centennial—suggested restoration of grave of D'Arcy McGee.

[*Translation*]

The hon. member for Nicolet-Yamaska: Agriculture—dairy policy;

[*English*]

It being six o'clock the house will now proceed to the consideration of private members' business as listed on today's order paper, namely notices of motion.

• (6:10 p.m.)

[*Translation*]

FEDERAL-PROVINCIAL RELATIONS

APPOINTMENT OF JOINT COMMITTEE OF SENATE AND HOUSE OF COMMONS

Mr. Maurice Allard (Sherbrooke) moved:

That a Joint Committee of the Senate and House of Commons be appointed as soon as possible to be called the "Joint Committee on Federal-Provincial Relations" to consider all reports dealing with federal-provincial matters in which this Parliament is interested, as for instance the reports of the Bilingualism and Biculturalism Commission, the Carter Commission and other similar commissions, so that the said Committee may make a study of such reports and of the evidence submitted thereto, and that the said Committee have power to call for persons, papers and records and examine witnesses, to report its recommendations from time to time, and to engage the services of counsel, accountants and such other clerical and technical personnel as may be deemed necessary.

Federal-Provincial Relations

Mr. Speaker, among the numerous problems that Canada must face and solve, one is of vital importance. It concerns the future of the Canadian federation.

Since 1867, the two great founding nations of our country and the other groups which came after, have shared an experience which should be analysed today.

Moreover, the federative system itself saw the central and provincial governments change, and that coexistence gave rise to new and controversial aspects in Canadian life.

That is why it is advisable to bring in the open now the grievances and difficulties which exist, so that we may look toward the future with more realism, understanding, efficiency and serenity.

This notice of motion involves Federal-Provincial relations and asks that they be studied, defined and directed. These Federal-Provincial relations are operative in the political, cultural, economic and fiscal fields.

On the political plane, Mr. Speaker, the political system itself is at stake.

The report of the royal commission on the constitutional problems in Quebec, the 1956 Tremblay report, in volume 2, part I, page 98, had this to say about federalism:

> Federalism should consist in a system of association between states where the exercise of state powers is shared between two levels of government, co-ordinated with each other but not subordinated one to the other, with each one enjoying supreme powers in the field of activity assigned to it by the constitution.

The 1867 Constitution did not reflect, in several matters, the principles of true federalism, but gave birth instead to a near federalism.

The principles of a real federalism should contain the ten following characteristics: independent and equal governments; a clearly defined distribution of taxation powers; a balance of power between the different governments; the supremacy of the constitution; the impartiality of the courts; the expression of freedom and security; a pluralist conception of the common good; the bringing closer together of ethnic groups rather than their unification; residual powers left to the provinces; a Senate to which the provinces could also appoint members.

Now, the British North America Acts (1867 to 1965) are wrong on many points: the power given to Ottawa to disallow any provincial legislation; the granting of general legislating powers to Ottawa; letting Ottawa have vaguely defined and almost unlimited powers of taxation; implicitly giving Ottawa the latitude to spend as it wishes; authorizing Ottawa to grant subsidies to the provinces; the overlapping of the parliamentary principle and the federative principle; having senators appointed exclusively by Ottawa; abandoning residual powers to Ottawa.

Those anomalies in the Canadian constitution have allowed the central government, in cases of war or economic depression, to channel into the hands of Ottawa most of the important powers and most fields of taxation, thus going against the spirit and the essence of a true federative system in this country. If we, in the federal Parliament are now asking for the creation of a joint committee of the Senate and the House of Commons, such parliamentary committee would, in a way, become a replica of the parliamentary committee on the constitution at Quebec. The house knows that for more than 18 months the Quebec government, conscious of the changes and of the difficulties which necessarily came about during the century the Canadian Federation has existed, established a parliamentary committee on the constitution and invited individuals, associations and various organizations to appear before that committee in order to explain the nature of their grievances and to suggest in all honesty appropriate remedies. And before this committee on the Constitution in Quebec, the people who appeared precisely emphasized the five political options being considered by one of the outstanding provinces of the Canadian Federation, namely, the province of Quebec, for its political future. While this province is affected by an upsurge of dynamism and restiveness, as far as I am concerned, this will enrich Canada as a whole, and while Quebec is carefully weighing the problems, it should be our duty in Ottawa, in the House of Commons, to take our responsibilities, we legislators of this house and the other place, so that we can enter into an open and free dialogue, in order to define clearly the different positions of federal-provincial relations which will envisage a more efficient and dynamic future for a Canada promised to many prosperous years.

The five following options were submitted to the committee on the constitution in Quebec City: Even though the report has not yet been published, it appears from the discussions that past experience, which I would term a status quo, has not given satisfaction to Quebec, to French Canada. This is the

negative aspect. We shall consider the positive aspect later on. It did not give satisfaction because of the anomalies in the wording itself of the B.N.A. Act and also because this whole experience, in all fairness, has made Quebec and French Canada the losers in several fields.

It should be kept in mind in 1966 that Quebec citizens only control 5 per cent of the economic activity of the whole country and that, in their own province, they only control 10 per cent of the activity of the province of Quebec, and in this bulwark of the French Canadian nation, they hold only 20 per cent of key jobs. Those are obvious and clear facts that can be proven as they were most abundantly before the committee on the Constitution in Quebec. As a result, the whole population—unless I am wrong—no longer will accept the maintenance of an unfair system we have known as political quasi-federalism.

Others spoke of the co-operative federalism. We know that in this house, some members became the advocates of this theory. What is, after all, co-operative federalism, which the Minister of Mines and Technical Surveys recently called harmonious federalism. In short, it is the continuation of this quasi-federalism which Quebec does not consider for its political future, within the framework of a Canadian whole. Why? Because a revision of the Constitution, a literal and written adaptation of provisions according to the problems of 1966 is refused, and efforts are being made to restrict discussions of the problems and evolution of the country and of Quebec in this national whole and only at interministerial meetings and federal-provincial conferences. In other words, these important and serious problems, these political, constitutional, fiscal and economic problems should be left at the mercy of the succeeding governments in Ottawa, subject to the whims of politicians making up those governments.

Well, Quebec refuses to accept this blindly.

The associate states system was also raised before the committee on the Constitution. According to this system, there would be a state of Quebec and another state composed of the nine provinces and the two other territories; each would have absolute power in certain spheres and they would join only in rather general fields, such as banking and external relations.

Of course, this associate states option seems logical, but it does not seem to be accepted or even discussed with the nine English provinces.

• (6:20 p.m.)

There is the other alternative of independence, where Quebec would withdraw from Confederation. Personally, Mr. Speaker, I am for the time being opposed to this formula, for no one has yet established, neither Mr. Chaput, Mr. Bourgault, Mr. Jutras, Mr. Barbeau nor the others, that it would be to Quebec's advantage to secede from the rest of Canada, either on a short or a long term basis. Why secede when, throughout the whole world, with modern evolution, ties are multiplying within a single state, as also between different states?

There remains then the option for a new Canadian constitution that would give Canada a true federalism, a positive and bicultural federalism, which would imply for Quebec, because it is the stronghold of the French-Canadian people, a special status in certain spheres. Here are, Mr. Speaker, serious problems, current problems, contemporary problems, that should be discussed in this parliament instead of letting commissions outside parliament deal with them and adopt a definite position regarding an important situation.

There is also, in this committee, on the political level, the problem of the amendment of the constitution, the Fulton-Favreau formula, which has been agreed to by nine provinces and postponed indefinitely, after having been seemingly accepted by the Premier of Quebec.

At the meeting of this committee, the Quebec Minister of Justice could be invited to set forth his main grievances, so that we could see on what basis he objects to an amendment of the constitution.

The federal-provincial relations that the committee could consider would also extend to cultural relations. The Laurendeau-Dunton commission on bilingualism and biculturalism has already filed its first report and the conclusions are expressed thus:

> Canada . . . is passing through the greatest crisis in its history. The source of the crisis lies in the province of Quebec.

This is not sham, Mr. Speaker. There is a serious crisis, and why? Because French Canadians in Quebec and outside Quebec feel deprived, they suffer from discrimination, they ask only for equal treatment throughout the whole country. They ask no favours, and, in spite of the recent claim of Miss Charlotte Whitton, former mayor of Ottawa, they are not seeking to dominate Canada, far from it; they only want to be treated on an equal

footing, and it is in the province of Quebec that minorities are placed on an equal footing. Since 1867, our compatriots we like, the English Canadians, are treated on an equal footing; they are not made to pay double taxation for their own schools. But, in other provinces, French Canadians do not receive equal treatment. It started in 1871, when New Brunswick prohibited French tuition in the schools; then, Manitoba followed in 1892, and Ontario in 1917, through its Regulation No. 17. But, the province of Quebec never did anything like that.

Consideration should certainly be given to these problems right here in parliament, in order that Canadians sprung from the two main cultures, the two great founding nations, may feel at home everywhere in this vast country of ours and live with the feeling that we are all equal and brothers.

The economic aspect of our federal-provincial relations could also be discussed to advantage there. We received the first report—and there will be others—on economic matters, the report of the Economic Council of Canada. It seems that there will soon be published a report on the economic questions examined by the province of Quebec.

We know that in Canada, there are roughly five great economic areas. Canada is a vast territory. Due to its small population spread over such a vast territory, Canada has been a challenge to intelligent people who are faced with economic and industrial differences as well as varying amounts of natural resources.

That is why we should read those reports, call witnesses, discuss things together and assume our responsibilities in order precisely to find a *modus vivendi* to establish in our country, in every part of Canada, a stable and happy prosperity.

Finally, the federal-provincial relations could be analysed with regard to taxation. Once the legislators of our country have solved the problems of economic, political, constitutional and cultural relations, it will be necessary to set the basis of assessment with regard to priorities which will be established and understood between the various legislatures.

That is why, Mr. Speaker, such a committee is useful. I am quite aware that some hon. members might oppose it, but I believe that we have come to a crossroad of our life as a nation, and that nobody would have anything to lose by accepting the setting up of such a committee, so that we the representatives, may work together all across Canada toward a clearer definition of our political, cultural, economic and financial thinking, in order to get ready for a constitutional conference, because some provinces are ready for such a discussion while we are not.

[Mr. Allard.]

Mr. Speaker: I must interrupt the hon. member as his time has expired.

[*English*]

Mr. Hugh Faulkner (Peterborough): Mr. Speaker, I find myself in the invidious position of agreeing with a lot of what has been said by the hon. member for Sherbrooke (Mr. Allard) but disagreeing with the resolution. In his far ranging address which offered a number of potential solutions to the problem, but that dealt very briefly with his notice of motion which specifically recommends that a joint committee be established to deal with subject matters already discussed by royal commissions. I think his proposal would simply involve a rehashing of work already done by royal commissions, and in that sense is unnecessary and redundant, even though many of the things which he said in his speech on the more general subject did make a lot of sense. However, I intend to deal with his notice of motion.

The fact that the problem is a serious one is generally agreed by members on both sides of the house. We have had notices of motion presented by the hon. member for Peace River (Mr. Baldwin), demanding a white paper on the subject, by my distinguished colleague from St. John's West, dealing with the field of education, which is indirectly involved in the same general question, and by the hon. member for Burnaby-Richmond (Mr. Prittie). Therefore on both sides there is a consensus that this is a serious problem.

One of the cornerstones of the problem is that within our federal system, jurisdiction is either overlapping or in some measure confused. We really do not know where jurisdiction should lie in such matters as water resources, conservation and education, but we do know that decisive government action is required in these areas. However, there is dispute as to which level of government should take that action. In my view we will never get decisive government action from a meeting of minds of 11 representatives from 11 different governments. However optimistic we might be, I do not see how we can possibly hope that a consensus will be arrived at by dominion-provincial conference on a long term basis with respect to a wide range of subjects.

In the debate on the Speech from the Throne I expressed my misgivings about federal-provincial conferences, these ad hoc arrangements designed to deal with fundamental problems, and I still have those misgivings. I do not see how we can hope to resolve a lot of the problems associated with our federal system by such conferences, and in my view it is necessary that we try to clarify federal and provincial jurisdictions. We need to undertake a total view of the disposition of authority and responsibility, something I also mentioned in the Throne Speech debate.

It seems to me imperative that jurisdiction between the provincial and federal level be both separate and discrete, that is, discernible one from the other, and the concept of co-operative federalism, although it played an important role in a recent stage of our evolution, is one about which I have certain misgivings. I say that conditions of survival for a viable federal system involve certain prerequisites.

• (6:30 p.m.)

In the first instance there must be a certain uniform pattern of distribution of authority between the provincial and federal governments. It is to me inconsistent with a viable federal system that certain authority will exist at the federal level, whereas that same authority in the case of a particular province would be undertaken by a particular province. This introduces an inconsistency in the distribution of power and one which I think in time will undermine the federal system. It is for this reason I have said outside the house, and would like to say inside the house, that I particularly am opposed to the concept of a special status for any province, and I would include of course the province of Quebec.

It seems to me the very concept of a special status will accomplish the very objective that the concept itself is trying to obviate; namely, the two nations theory. It seems to me that eventually two nations will result from applying the concept of special status.

Furthermore, it is heretical, in this sense, that so long as you accept the proposition of a special status for Quebec you are implying or directly saying that Quebec is the instrument, and must be the instrument, of the French-Canadian population of this country. That identification is anathema to me and it is heresy to any legitimate federalist, if I may be presumptious enough to go that far. It is a thing which worries me. I reject the idea that somehow the expression of French Canadians must be in any way exclusively identified with the provincial government of the province of Quebec.

The second need for a viable federal system—and particularly of our own federal system—is of course the need for a re-distribution of authority between the federal and provincial governments to bring our federal system in line with 20th century problems. The distribution we are working under today applies to conditions which existed a long time ago. I have suggested that we should have a constitutional conference. I am not sure this is a sound suggestion,—it may prove to be traumatic—but certainly a constitutional committee of the house would make a great deal of sense to me to deal with this problem of the distribution of authority so that that authority can be placed clearly at one level. I am thinking of such things as the responsibility for water resources, air pollution and things of this nature.

Finally, I would like to deal with another dimension of this problem which I think in this house we have not discussed, because after all it is not a constitutional problem. It is our problem, namely, that in a viable federal system there must be a policy initiative at the federal level. I was interested in the remarks made by the member for Peace River when he discussed his particular notice of motion on February 14 at page 1182 of *Hansard*:

> Let the government of Canada take the initiative for once. Let them be strong, decisive and resolute.

These are fine sentiments.

> Who knows, they might even seize upon this as an opportunity to test the bold and excite the daring. I am sure if they do so they will secure from many members,—

I am assuming that applies to both sides of the house.

> —certainly from me, such measure of support as they may require.

The fact of the matter is that was said sometime ago, almost a month ago. Since that time this house has been pre-occupied with last year's estimates. It seems to me to be inconsistent that the hon. member for Peace River can encourage the federal government in these terms to take an initiative in that direction which will excite the bold or challenge the daring, whichever way he put it, and at the same time persist in discussion of last year's estimates. This may be the assessment of a new and naïve member, but it

seems to me this is totally inconsistent and that it is imperative—and again this may be presumptuous for a new member to suggest —that we progress with the legislative burden we have inherited, as the hon. member for Red Deer (Mr. Thompson) pointed out to this house this afternoon. It is wrong and hypocritical to admonish the government for failure to take initiative in policy matters when on the other side of the house there is a refusal to allow the government to get into that field. We know the legislation is ready.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. I would suggest to the hon. member that he now is straying away from the resolution which is before the house and which we should be considering at this time. I invite him to return to the subject matter of the motion.

Hon. Jean-Luc Pepin (Minister of Mines and Technical Surveys): Mr. Speaker, may I ask the hon. member to define more clearly what he has in mind?

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. The hon. member who has the floor has not indicated his willingness to be asked a question at this time.

Mr. Faulkner: Mr. Speaker, I would receive the question.

Mr. Pepin: Thank you. I was very interested in some of the things the hon. member said with regard to pollution, because obviously I am very much involved in that. He said that the jurisdiction of the federal government and of the provincial governments could be defined very clearly in that field. I think he said that. Would he expand on this suggestion.

Mr. Faulkner: That is not exactly what I said. What I intended to say is that it is necessary, for decisive legislative action in this field of pollution, that the jurisdiction be clarified and be precise. The reason I said that is I do not feel the consensus of eleven heads of government so-called is the best way to deal with these immediate problems, and that presently is how we are trying to do it. The brunt of my argument is that the legislative demands upon this house are such that we must have clear authority and clear jurisdiction. This is equally true at the provincial level. It seems to me the present motion does not really help us much in arriving at this goal which would be a *sine qua non* of a viable federal system.

[Mr. Faulkner.]

Mr. David MacDonald (Prince): Mr. Speaker, I rise to make one or two comments on this motion. First of all I would like to concur most heartily with the great amount of good sense and intelligent comment made by the previous speaker, except for the comment he made when he seemed to wander away from his sound good judgment. He previously has wandered more than once, because he still is sitting on that side of the house.

I want to speak very feelingly because, coming from the smallest province in this dominion, I know that we have participated in federal-provincial conferences which have tried to place a good deal of responsibility and decision making in the hands of a new institution. Earlier in this parliament it was recorded that we had something like 130 or more federal-provincial conferences last year. A small province such as Prince Edward Island finds it almost impossible—and indeed I would say impossible—to try to institute a new program, either in the field of welfare, community development, or perhaps education; it is difficult to institute these programs so that they will have equal value to a province the size of say, Ontario, and the province of Prince Edward Island.

I say it is impossible because we must realize there obviously must be a different kind of administrative set up for a small province than for a larger one, if both are to be effective. We have seen the kind of situation at federal-provincial conferences where the financial solution is adequately suited to the ability of the larger province but certainly not financially suited to a province like Prince Edward Island. In many cases it causes great harm.

• (6:40 p.m.)

But it was assumed that by the implementation of these programs things would happen which really did not happen. It is therefore of great concern to me that there be appointed at the very earliest possible date some responsible body that would deal with this problem. I think it is most fitting and appropriate that such a body involve the parliamentarians of this country, because I believe there has been a great sense of helplessness on the part of the representatives of the various constituencies throughout this country in their being, shall I say relegated to the minor position of approving *faits accomplis* on questions that have been grappled with, are on the threshold of implementation,

and then as a sort of an afterthought are presented to parliament.

Time and time again we find that decisions which have been arrived at months or even years previously finally come before us in suggested legislation and are presented to this house for approval. In my opinion this is not the basic responsibility of the people's representatives. Surely then, we need to take a long, hard look at how we can restructure our relations and responsibilities both federally and provincially.

I think we should not fear change simply because its new and should not promote it simply because it is novel. Rather we should realize that much of the structures of government that were laid down almost 100 years ago now were laid down for an almost entirely different kind of world. The provinces did not then have nearly the kind of responsibilities which they have today, because in those days we were not able to communicate by word of mouth or be transported from one place to another in the way that is possible today. We are in a new age and we must not be hamstrung by decisions made by legislators in this house almost 100 years ago.

I think we must act, and act soon, or we shall make a mockery of the institution that we call parliament. I believe this very strongly, Mr. Speaker, because coming from a province in which in many ways we are still deprived of the rightful benefits that belong to a Canadian citizen, it is important to me that we face this question.

Mr. J. B. Stewart (Antigonish-Guysborough): Mr. Speaker, the motion before the house is couched in terms that would lead one to expect a little different type of debate. I shall turn later to the motion before the house, for I think there is much in it that deserves some direct comment. Before doing that I wish to make some remarks in the vein of the debate up to this moment.

There has been a strong tendency of thought in some quarters to commend a unitary system of government while federalism is derided. The confusions and difficulties of federalism are called frequently to our attention.

I was very interested to listen to the concise and succinct remarks of the hon. member for Prince (Mr. MacDonald). I could not help thinking as he spoke that he comes from the one province in Canada which above all others should rejoice in our federal system and in the fact that we did not over the years become more and more unitary in our constitution. I suggest to you, sir, that if over the years our constitution had become more and more unitary we would have had an increasing concentration of economic wealth and political power in Quebec and Ontario. It has been federalism which has permitted the extremities of the country to some extent to counteract this pull toward the centre.

When I think of the Premier of Prince Edward Island coming as one of the 11 heads at a federal-provincial conference I can see the advantages to that province of the federal-provincial conference. Despite the small population of Prince Edward Island, the premier of that province is one among eleven. Of course, Mr. Speaker, the same is true of the premier of my own province. Those of us who come from the smaller provinces ought not to be too scornful of the institution of the federal-provincial conference. We ought not to yearn too much for the fleshpots of a unitary system of government.

Having said that, Mr. Speaker, I wish to turn to the motion before us. It proposes the establishment of a joint committee of the Senate and the House of Commons to consider all reports dealing with federal-provincial matters in which this parliament is interested. In other words, this joint committee is in a sense to prepare a report on reports. We are to be second-guessing the commissions established by the Governor General in Council. We are to prepare a more refined, a more sublime, a more elevated report; a report not to the Governor General in Council but, instead, to the two houses of parliament.

I do not think this would be a desirable undertaking. When a commission is established its membership is selected, presumably, on the basis of expertise and knowledge. The commissioners are supposed to know a great deal about one particular subject, finance, let us say, biculturalism, or some other topic. I do not see how we politicians, amateurs, can undertake to prepare a more refined report on their reports.

The second criticism I have of the motion is that we, by adopting it, would be establishing a kind of parliamentary study group. I assume that all members of the other place and this house read the reports prepared by the experts and examine them diligently. But why should we want to do additional and more recondite research? Under the motion

we are to have the power to call for persons, that is witnesses, papers and records and to examine those witnesses. We are to take the matter, in a sense, one more step in the process of refining. This would be very interesting for the members of such a joint committee—and if this motion should pass I want it recorded that I should like to be one of the members of the committee. It would be very edifying. But I do not think the establishment of the committee would be justified merely on the grounds of the edification of certain members of the other place and this house.

My third contention against the motion is that the establishment of such a committee would be contrary to the normal processes. These commissions are established by the government, by the Governor General in Council, and make their reports eventually to the Governor General in Council. The government is charged with the duty of governing; consequently, it has to decide what to do with the recommendations contained in a report from such a commission. It has to decide what action it should take independent of parliament, or, when parliamentary action is necessary, what action to recommend to this house and to the other place. That is the normal process; and I think it is the process that should be followed.

There is a tendency—we all slip into it from time to time—to think of ourselves in this house as being charged with a constitutional duty to govern the country. That is not a valid description of the constitutional position. The government of the day has that duty and responsibility. Our job here is to co-operate with the government in certain legislative activities and to act as a kind of board of auditors on the work of the government. We are not a congress. The government is not our executive to whom we give instructions. The government is not a body that we order to do things.

• (6:50 p.m.)

The government is charged with the job of governing. It comes to this house with certain requests for acts, certain bills, and we either co-operate or we do not co-operate. But we are not charged under our constitutional system with the work of a congress. I think this motion points toward what I would call congressionalism. It contains the assumption that we should set up a committee whose job it would be to take the initiative in these constitutional questions, important as they admittedly may be.

[Mr. Stewart.]

The final point I want to make is that even though this committee would be simply, in terms of the motion, a committee to consider all reports in the area of federal-provincial relations, it would, I think almost inevitably, as time went on, become a kind of constitutional convention developing within the two houses of parliament. I am not one to argue that a constitutional convention is absolutely undesirable, but that is another question. But if we do want a constitutional convention, I suggest we ask for it directly.

If we want a constitutional convention I think we should start by attempting, not in any great detail but with a considerable amount of frankness, to define its terms of reference. I do not think we should undertake to establish a constitutional convention indirectly in the guise of a committee set up to consider all reports dealing with federal-provincial matters.

I promised myself I would stick very closely to the terms of the motion before the house, but there is one obiter dictum that I cannot resist. I think the Minister of Mines and Technical Surveys was implying what I have in mind. It is all very nice to imagine that if we were to sit down to carve the constitutional pie anew, we would be able to do it neatly and cleanly and have a tidy division of power. I think that is just not going to happen. No matter whether we go on in our present pattern using the various devices that we now use, no matter whether we do have at some time a constitutional convention, things are not going to be done very much differently in so far as tidiness is concerned. We are going to have overlapping jurisdictions. We are going to have jurisdictions that interlock. The fabric of our national life from ocean to ocean is too closely interwoven for any easy delineation of the separate fibres. I say that, sir, by way of general comment on the debate brought on by this very interesting motion.

[*Translation*]

Hon. Martial Asselin (Charlevoix): Mr. Speaker, I will say only a few words so that I cannot be accused of killing this resolution. But here is what I should like to point out: we heard on both sides of the house arguments for a conference that would study anew the fundamentals of our constitution.

Reference has been made to co-operative federalism. However, as the hon. member for Sherbrooke (Mr. Allard), pointed out, it has been rechristened a while ago, since the

Minister of Mines and Technical Surveys (Mr. Pepin) called it recently in Montreal the federalism of harmony.

It has not been too successful since its creation. Since co-operative federalism was conceived and created by the present government, I think there never have been so many discussions about the constitution as at present with the provinces.

When I heard earlier the hon. member for Peterborough (Mr. Faulkner) say that he did not want Quebec to have a special status, I think that he misunderstands the meaning of a special status. I believe all the provinces, at some time or other in the last few years, have enjoyed a special status with regard to the central government. Any province wishing to withdraw from certain taxation fields was free to do so, and the province of Quebec, perhaps more than any other, often preferred to have the fiscal equivalent rather than participate in joint schemes administered by the federal government.

Is it recognition of a special status for Quebec in Education when Quebec claims the Federal government is not to intervene at all, and when, as is well known the provinces have exclusive jurisdiction in education. This means that in exercising its exclusive rights in education, Quebec is respecting the constitution.

Ontario, Manitoba and Saskatchewan could exercise the same option. When our English speaking members claim that under co-operative federalism, Quebec has been granted special status, I think they are mistaken.

Before time allotted to this motion runs out as I do not want to be charged with killing the motion of the hon. member for Sherbrooke, I want to say that it is time the central and provincial governments meet once and for all, to discuss together constitutional differences they are faced with.

The constitution will soon be 100 years old; it has seldom been touched during its existence.

[*English*]

Mr. Stewart: Mr. Chairman, I should like to ask the hon. gentleman whether he really thinks our constitutional arrangements can be discussed and settled once and for all, or if that really is not just a kind of pious hope in which we all indulge? Does he think it is realistic?

[*Translation*]

Mr. Asselin (Charlevoix): Mr. Chairman, naturally a conference alone will not settle all our constitutional problems, but the very suggestion of the member for Sherbrooke for the formation of a joint committee of the House of Commons and of the Senate to study this question and the report on constitutional law is, in my opinion, an excellent way of beginning the study of the problems which concern the provinces and the federal government.

That is why, Mr. Chairman, I wholly support the measure introduced by the hon. member for Sherbrooke.

[*English*]

Mr. Speaker: Order. The hour set aside for the consideration of private members' business has expired. The house will now resume the business interrupted at six o'clock.

SUPPLY

The house in committee of supply, Mr. Rinfret in the chair.

DEPARTMENT OF CITIZENSHIP AND IMMIGRATION

1. Departmental administration, $1,257,800.

Mr. Scott (Danforth): Let the record show that there are no ministers present.

Mr. Churchill: The cabinet has collapsed.

• (7:00 p.m.)

Mr. Starr: Mr. Chairman, do you know whether the cabinet knows that private members' hour ends at seven o'clock?

Mr. Stewart: Mr. Chairman, I believe there may have been some slight confusion caused by the fact that today the committee proceeded beyond six o'clock, I believe until about seven minutes after six.

Mr. Starr: Very well.

Mr. Orlikow: Mr. Chairman, it is not my intention tonight to make a lengthy or detailed analysis of the department. After all, we are dealing with last year's estimates which to a large extent have been passed. We have a new minister, and I hope that in the near future this year's estimates will go before the standing committee which will be able to give the minister and the department the kind of searching examination that I think is long overdue.

I must say I was disappointed in the very general statement which the minister made. I had expected and I still expect some very excellent leadership from the minister. But I must tell him that the kind of speech he made has been made by every minister of citizenship and immigration appointed since I came to the house.

Talking of ministers of citizenship and immigration, I could not help but be struck by the speech of the hon. member for Carleton, a former minister. What he said in effect, in his speech was: "Do as I say, but don't do as I did". If there was one thing which was characteristic of immigration policy while the hon. member for Carleton was minister, and also the minister who preceded him, it was the fact that they did not clear up any of the basic problems which the department faced then and still faces now. While I have not the figures here and do not want to precipitate a long and acrimonious debate on this department, the fact is that in the years in which the former government was in power we had some of the lowest rates of immigration that we have had in the last 25 years.

This was because to a large extent, I suppose, we had large scale unemployment. Naturally when you have large scale unemployment the people who have to work for a living are sometimes not too happy about immigration. They look on immigrants as prospective competitors for jobs. The way to get the co-operation of labour is to have full employment. Then the working people do not worry about immigrants who come to Canada and compete for jobs.

The tide has turned. Immigration figures are now up but not up to the level which, I suppose, many members would like to see. I think this is partly due to the fact that in Europe and those countries to which we have traditionally looked for immigrants there has been full employment for about the last ten years. Up until this year Canada had pretty heavy unemployment while Great Britain, Germany, the Scandinavian countries, Holland and Belgium were experiencing prosperity with full employment. Therefore it has not been too easy to encourage people from those countries from which we have traditionally received the bulk of our immigrants. We have had to turn, and we have turned with some success, to countries such as Greece and Portugal for our immigrants.

I am not being critical in this regard. I think we ought to open the gates to immigrants from many countries who in past years we have seemed to discourage. But I am concerned about the fact that morally, and I think even legally, it is the responsibility of the federal government to bring people here. After all, the federal government encourages them to come to Canada. It is the federal government which has immigration offices in most countries in Europe, the Middle East and Asia. It is the federal government which informs these people of the kind of living they can expect here. Yet having brought them here and encouraged them to come, once they arrive to a large extent they are forgotten.

[Mr. Orlikow.]

I have before me an editorial which appeared in the Toronto *Globe and Mail* for February 18, 1966 entitled "Victims Of Language". It reads in part as follows:

> An informal survey of Toronto secondary schools has uncovered evidence that immigrant children with language difficulties are being encouraged to leave school.

Then the editorial goes on to say a little further on:

> As a consequence, hundreds, perhaps thousands, of boys and girls, many of them of university calibre, are succumbing to pressures to drop out. Whether the pressure originates in the family or in the school, whether it is overt or implicit, is immaterial. The fact remains that they are being denied the opportunities of a full education.

The editorial concludes by stating that the provincial and municipal governments have a responsibility to see that this kind of thing does not happen.

I suggest to the minister and the government that the federal government has a responsibility in this regard. I am not going to minimize the difficulties which are created for the federal government by the fact that education is the responsibility of the provinces and I am not suggesting at this time that this situation should change. But I do suggest to the minister that if in its wisdom, and I think with the agreement of the Economic Council of Canada as well as business, industry and labour, the federal government believes that we need an aggressive and active policy of immigration and that we need to encourage people from countries in which the mother tongue is neither English nor French to come to Canada, then it must somehow find ways to help the young people who accompany their parents and who are not fully conversant with the English language to overcome their language deficiency. If we do not do so then these people will become the future unemployed, the future poverty cases, the people who will inevitably become a charge on the state in generations to come.

I suggest that the minister might well look into this matter now. As one of the ways of combating poverty in the war on poverty, which so far has really been a war of words, the government might consider co-operating with the provincial governments in this respect.

I am bitterly disappointed that the government has not yet seen fit to bring out its white paper on immigration which was promised.

Mr. Scott (Danforth): It is yellow with age.

Mr. Orlikow: The hon. member for Danforth says it will be yellow with age. That may well be the case if we continue to change ministers. That white paper was promised before some of us came here in 1962.

• (7:10 p.m.)

It is not only our immigration policy which needs to be looked at but the Immigration Act and the regulations also need to be completely revised. There has not been a year in which there has not come to light a glaring example of error, mistake and confusion caused not simply because there may be an official somewhere in the department who does not like a particular immigrant because of his colour or race but by the fact that such difficulties are inherent in the Act as it is today. I am not going to analyse the present Act and the regulations. That has been done many times by many members. The minister needs only to look over old issues of *Hansard* to find those difficulties listed.

I am not certain whether I agree with the hon. member for Carleton with respect to the minister requiring to have discretionary power. When we talk about cases we are not complaining, I certainly am not complaining and I do not think any other member is because the minister or the deputy minister has not been co-operative. In fact, I can honestly say, coming from a constituency which is largely ethnic, its people being non-English and non-French in origin, that I have handled a large number of cases since I have come here and in all of them I have had the utmost in co-operation from the minister and former ministers, the new deputy minister and former deputies. I cannot think of a single case I brought to their attention where I was certain they were wrong that they did not accede to my suggestions.

When a member of parliament has to intervene I think something has gone wrong. A member of parliament should not have to concern himself with these problems, though I do not mind doing it. But the law and regulations should clearly set out the position of the Canadian government. They should indicate that we want people generally to come to Canada, that we want qualified people to come to Canada, that we want people to come regardless of their race, colour, origin or religion. If the government would make its position clear then most of the difficulties which have arisen and which hon. members have dealt with would disappear.

I know it is said that we do not have the kind of problem we used to have. It is said that we do not keep people out because of the colour of their skin or their ethnic background. Personally I do not think the situation is as bad as it used to be. Discrimination certainly is not as open as it used to be. In this regard may I bring to the attention of the new minister one paragraph from a speech made at the University of New Brunswick on May 20, 1965, by the Prime Minister of Trinidad and Tobago, Mr. Eric Williams. Here is a prime minister of one of the Commonwealth countries, one of our associates. I want the minister to listen to what the Prime Minister of Trinidad said:

> Today the world has worked out the curious hybrid of juridicial equality of states and racial inequality of peoples. Australia is determined to remain white; Canada eases its conscience by accepting a handful of domestic servants; the contemporary slogan is "keep Britain white", the very Britain which was built up by African and Asian labour in Africa, Asia and the West Indies. Whatever the Commonwealth may be in theory, it is in practice being increasingly tainted with a racial limitation. Viewed in historical perspective the Civil War in the United States is still raging.

That is a sad commentary for the prime minister of one of the Commonwealth countries with whom we are associated to make about Canada. It may be that is not correct, although I think it is. If it is not, then I think it is incumbent on the minister, on the department and on the government to clear up the situation, to issue a white paper and to bring in amendments to the Immigration Act and the regulations so that this kind of thing will not only disappear but so that it will become known to the people concerned that in fact our immigration policy is one which ignores questions of race, colour, and religion. I suggest to the minister that if this world is going to remain free, if this world is going to remain democratic, we must convince those people who are not white, who after all far outnumber those who are white, that we in fact believe them to be the equals of the white peoples.

There is just one more question I wish to raise very briefly. On February 16 the minister answered a series of questions I put on the order paper with regard to the problem being encountered by foreign doctors coming to Canada, particularly non-white doctors from Asia and Africa. In the answers which

the minister gave, and I am sure he will remember them, it is indicated very clearly that the federal department is carrying on an aggressive policy, of which I am not critical, of encouraging skilled people which of course includes doctors.

We have a shortage in this country of medical doctors. We are encouraging doctors from Africa, Asia and the Philippines to come to this country, as we should. I know that the problem is not a simple one to solve. I know that the licensing of doctors comes under the jurisdiction of the provincial medical bodies responsible for this matter. For example, in the province of Ontario the Ontario College of Physicians and Surgeons is responsible. I am satisfied that if the minister will look at the records and at the correspondence between his departmental officials and the Ontario medical authorities, he will find that the Ontario College of Physicians and Surgeons is carrying on an open and deliberate policy of refusing to permit doctors from Africa and Asia to practise in Ontario. This is the worst kind of discrimination.

These doctors are encouraged to come to Ontario and to work in Ontario hospitals, to staff hospitals, to head departments and to do all kinds of work for which doctors get very little money and which other doctors do not want to do. But when a doctor from Asia or Africa wants to practise privately he is told that because his medical college does not have the qualifications of others he cannot even write the examinations which are set by the medical council.

It is not true that Asiatic and African colleges are not qualified to maintain high teaching standards. Records kept by the Medical Council of Canada indicate very clearly that doctors who have come from India and Pakistan and have written examinations here have constantly done better than many others. I am speaking from memory but I think that in the neighbourhood of 80 per cent or 85 per cent of these doctors who have written examinations have passed them and have been ready to practise and have been able to practise in every other province but Ontario. Doctors from other countries such as Germany and France have scored much lower marks, perhaps because of language difficulties though I do not know. But they have been permitted to write the examinations set by the Ontario College of Physicians and Surgeons and go into private practice in the province of Ontario if they so wished.

[Mr. Orlikow.]

I have before me a letter I received yesterday from a Dr. Conde. I am not going into details but I will send the minister copies of this correspondence. This doctor came to Canada after graduating from a university in the Philippines. He worked satisfactorily at the Hamilton General Hospital. He then practised in Manitoba, wrote examinations in British Columbia and then practised in British Columbia. He is now practising in the province of Manitoba.

• (7:20 p.m.)

Nevertheless, he has been refused permission by the Ontario College of Physicians and Surgeons to write their examinations and practise in Ontario. He has been told to go back to medical college, study there and then become an intern before he may be allowed to practice. This is at a time when this province like every other province in this country is crying for doctors, not in the cities, of course, but in the small towns and villages where no doctor can be induced to practise.

I recognize that this is primarily a responsibility of the provincial government. I know that the government of Ontario has set up a committee or commission to look into this question. But as long as the federal immigration department continues its present policy—and the answers I have received to my questions indicate that it will—it is not enough to wash our hands and say this is a provincial responsibility. As long as we are encouraging doctors to come to Canada we have a responsibility to see that every doctor who is qualified, regardless of whether his skin is red, black, yellow or white, will have the same right to practise as any other doctor.

I have tried to raise two or three questions which I think are important and which I hope the minister will examine with the energy and the ability I know he possesses. I hope that by the time the standing committee meets the white paper will be tabled and the amendments to the immigration law which have been so long awaited as well as the amendments to the regulations which are so necessary will be brought down so that a year from now the long and acrimonious, though necessary, discussions which have taken place when the estimates of this department have come before the committee in past years will no longer be needed.

Mr. Cowan: Are we on item 5 or on item 1?

An hon. Member: Item 1.

Mr. Cowan: I have a number of questions I should like to ask the minister. They relate

directly to citizenship. I might as well ask them on vote 1.

I happen to be a personal friend of Roy Thomson, best known today as Lord Thomson of Fleet. He is a natural born Canadian having been born in the city of Toronto. I should like to ask the minister how a natural born Canadian loses his Canadian citizenship when the Queen of Canada sees fit to confer a peerage on him. Do we write him a letter telling him he is persona non grata with the Canadian government? Do we ignore him? Or do we refuse to send him $75 a month after he is 70 years of age? How is a native born Canadian deprived of his citizenship? I have one or two other questions on the same lines. Shall I ask the other questions now?

Mr. Marchand: I will take all the questions and answer them together later.

Mr. Cowan: Here is another question for you. The king of a European country of great note in world affairs a little while ago conferred the Order of the Phoenix on a well known native born Canadian, Premier Jean Lesage of the province of Quebec. Will Mr. Lesage be deprived of his Canadian citizenship?

Here is the third question. A very close friend of mine who is a naturalized Canadian has been offered a senior decoration by a foreign government and hesitates to accept it because he does not wish to lose his Canadian citizenship. When we deprive a native born Canadian like my friend Roy Thomson of his citizenship because he accepts a peerage from the Queen of Canada, what hope is there of a naturalized Canadian retaining his citizenship if he accepts a foreign decoration from the head of another government? My friend is fearful on this score because he recognizes he is a naturalized Canadian whereas Roy Thomson and Premier Jean Lesage are native born. Which example would we follow, the one set in the case of Roy Thomson or the one set in the case of Jean Lesage, if my friend accepts a foreign decoration this spring?

Mr. Winkler: Mr. Chairman, my intervention will be very brief. I should like to call the minister's attention to an article which appeared in the Toronto *Telegram* on December 30, 1965 having to do with a doctor, originally from Hungary and latterly from Austria who became a Canadian citizen on the basis of his residence here from 1949 to 1959. Because he had been unable to earn his livelihood in Canada he then went back to Austria where he was gainfully employed. I will read part of this article:

> A short time ago he applied for a new passport at the Canadian Embassy. He got the passport. But he was told he would lose his citizenship if he didn't return to Canada within 10 years.
>
> Officials here explained that under the Citizenship Act naturalized Canadians had to give up their citizenship if out of the country for more than 10 consecutive years.

The article goes on to quote an authority within the department as saying:

> Certainly it is true that in this regard naturalized Canadians don't have the same rights as people born here.

My contention is that we are making second class citizens of people who have come here and been accepted by the Canadian government. The doctor to whom I have referred, Dr. Devladar, is reported as saying:

> I am proud of my Canadian citizenship and I don't want to lose it.
>
> Canada is a free country, and very democratic. I can't understand why it is that Ottawa authorities are still clinging to these discriminatory, obsolete regulations.

According to this article the doctor stated that neither the United States nor Australia adheres to similar regulations. The article concludes:

> The government apparently has had its own misgivings about the second class status accorded naturalized Canadians.
>
> In Throne Speeches in 1963 and 1964 it promised to introduce legislation giving full equality and rights to all Canadian citizens wherever they were born.

I bring this matter up now because the minister might care to clarify the situation when preparing the white paper or be prepared to give it consideration now during the passage of these estimates. I have had a number of letters from constituents on this point. A number of good and honest citizens who have been granted citizenship through naturalization regard this as an important matter. I have one letter before me now which is relevant to this issue. It illustrates the significance of this matter to good and honest citizens who are making a valuable contribution to this country. My constituent says:

> I read tonight with regret in a Toronto newspaper that the government of Canada regards me as a second class citizen. This is because I was born in another country. When I came to Canada in 1928 I came at the direct invitation of a country which was at that time looking for new citizens.

The situation is the same today.

• (7:30 p.m.)

Now, after 37 years and the holder of a certificate of Canadian citizenship for many years I find that I do not enjoy all the privileges of a Canadian who happened to be born here and had little choice, while I chose Canada as my country at its direct invitation.

As my representative at parliament I would respectfully ask that this situation be remedied as soon as possible through promised legislation. You are aware that it is not likely to seriously affect my position as a citizen, but there is a very distinct reluctance in any citizen to find himself referred to as "second class."

Without unseemly boasting I might state that I feel that I have been a useful citizen, sharing in any community effort in any place in which I have lived since coming to Canada. No citizen could be more proud of this great land than I, nor love it more.

For this and many other reasons I feel that complete and unrestricted citizenship is my right, not only for myself but for my sons, and for my dignity as a very happy member of so great a nation.

Because such legislation was promised some time ago, I believe in 1964, because nothing has been done to date, because the situation has been drawn to the attention of the public, I, on behalf of many citizens who find themselves in exactly the same circumstances, ask the new minister to take this matter under consideration and rectify the wrong which these people feel has been done them.

Mr. Herridge: Mr. Chairman, I first want to congratulate the minister on his appointment and say it is very interesting to see on the front benches sitting on his right a gentleman whose life has been spent with management and on his left a gentleman who has been with organized labour most of his life. I think it indicates we have a democratic country.

I too can say that during my nearly 21 years experience in the House of Commons I have dealt with hundreds of people who wanted to bring immigrants to this country and it has never cost anybody, in the 21 years I have represented Kootenay West, a cent to consult their member of parliament for advice because I know what the law is, I know the regulations, and I know the people to whom representations should be made, whether it be the minister, the board or officials of the department.

During the hearings in connection with the Columbia River Treaty in the External Affairs Committee we were promised that it would be the policy of the B.C. Hydro Power Authority not to allow anyone to be employed on any project on the Columbia River who had not been a resident of Canada for at least 60 days. That promise is not being kept and I bring it to the attention of the minister, because organized labour and local residents are quite concerned about it.

What is happening is that citizens of the United States come into Canada as landed immigrants. They fill out the necessary forms and the next thing we know they are employed on the High Arrow, Duncan or Mica dams. The United States foremen in charge of these jobs send to the United States for their pals when they want them and their pals come in and go to work at once. Even though there is good employment in the district there are occasions when local and other residents do not get an opportunity to obtain employment, and this causes concern to them.

We had the same situation during the building of the gas pipe line. Hundreds of people came in from the United States as landed immigrants. They worked on the pipe line and as soon as the work was completed they returned to the United States. Prior to coming to Ottawa for the opening of this session three or four men who are working on these jobs spoke to me and told me, "These Americans are laughing at our regulations which permit them to come in under these circumstances. They tell us frankly they intend to return to the United States, that they are not real landed immigrants."

I bring this to the attention of the minister in order that he may check the situation. During the building of the pipe line project I asked the R.C.M.P. to check these people's car licences. On that occasion they came into Canada for the three, four or six months and practically all their licences were visitors' licences. They did not think enough of Canada to purchase a regular licence.

I think something should be done to make certain that these people who come into Canada as landed immigrants are really landed immigrants and that they intend to settle in Canada. The minister should have another look at whatever form is signed to make certain these people pledge themselves, so far as humanly possible, to come to Canada with the intention of becoming Canadian citizens.

Mr. Brewin: Mr. Chairman, I have been interested in the subject of immigration for quite a long time, indeed for a long time before becoming a member of parliament. We have had a whole series of ministers of immigration and I have been testing my memory to see if I can remember whom they have been during the time I have been interested in this matter. There was Hon.

Walter Harris, then the present Minister of Transport who stayed until the government changed, then the present member for Kamloops, then Hon. Ellen Fairclough, then the hon. member for Carleton, then the present President of the Privy Council, then the present member for Matapédia-Matane, then the present Minister of Labour, and now we have the present Minister of Citizenship and Immigration. During the short time I have been in the house the list includes at least five or six ministers.

Every time the new ministers have risen, bright with promise, full of enthusiasm, and announced bold, new plans for a new Immigration Act that would remove all the troubles of the past. They have said they would publish new white papers and all difficulties would be removed. I say to the present minister that hope springs eternal. If he only stays in the job long enough, and I hope he insists on doing so, he finally may be able to produce the necessary changes in the Immigration Act, in the regulations, and in many of the practices carried on under the act.

Since the new minister has occupied his present position but briefly and no doubt thinks problems of manpower are vastly important, it would obviously be unfair to expect him to jump in and deal with all immigration problems, but I would tell him that the root of the troubles which have blackened this department for years has been the failure to adopt the basic principle of granting a proper hearing to would-be immigrants.

We have had the power of ministerial discretion and we have had so-called appeals. The courts have said that our procedures in immigration matters are hugger-mugger and farcical. The Supreme Court of Canada has dealt with these matters and has said that the way in which would-be immigrants have been treated has not been in conformity with the basic standard required by the act, namely, a fair hearing. Yet we are still continuing these farcical procedures.

We still have questions asked of would-be immigrants, such as, "Do you have an immigrant visa from the department", when everyone knows they have not got it because the department has not issued visas to them. In addition, the department will not tell them why. They just say, "You do not meet the regulations under the act". Whatever else is dealt with in the white paper I tell the minister this problem must be dealt with.

• (7:40 p.m.)

If we want to abandon the idea of giving any hearing, let us be honest and say so. Let us say that it is left to the minister's discretion and there is no such thing as a hearing but give the reasons for so saying. So long as we pretend to give consideration to bringing immigrants into the country and to people who are trying to bring their relatives here, if we are going to give them a hearing it must be a proper and fair hearing. The minister will find that there still is a section in the Act which includes the right to pass orders in council to exclude people of different ethnic origins. This is in the Act, but right in the regulations there is a double standard. If you come from Asia or Africa you are in a lower class; you can only bring in restricted relatives. It is not necessary now to go into the details of that. If you come from Europe or some parts of America you can bring in a wider range of relatives.

What possible justification can there be for this discrimination? I know it is not put on the ground of race but we know the people who live in Asia and Africa and we know those who live in the continent of Europe. We do not apply the same standards. This is in the regulations. I think it is regulation 33. To this very day some people do not have the right to bring a relative to this country and I believe this is a continuing discrimination. I wish the minister would take a careful look at this matter and I would hope that he would deal with it in the white paper.

One other thing in respect of immigration on which I hope we can obtain a decision from someone is this: As the minister will have found out, for many months now and perhaps a year or two the government have been saying they were going to make up their mind on what to do in the case of visitors who come into this country as visitors with non-immigrant visas, and apply to stay in this country. As the minister knows, there is a great backlog of cases awaiting decision while the department makes up its mind in respect of what to do with these visitors.

I know this problem contains difficulties. You do not necessarily want to have the same harsh rules in respect of the examination of those who come in as visitors but, on the other hand, once they come in as visitors, become engaged to a Canadian citizen, secure a job or are otherwise admissible there is the question of whether they must be sent back for a long period of waiting in their country of origin.

This is a serious question because if an immigrant enters in an easygoing way he bypasses those who remain in their country and comply with the regulations in the normal manner. I appreciate that this is not fair, but at the present time the Immigration Act gives such visitors the right to stay in this country. There are, however, hundreds of cases, and I have 20 or 30 of my own, where people have been told "We cannot decide on your status; we will not let you in or turn you out; we have not made up our mind". I hope the minister will be able to come up with a policy in respect of these visitors. I tell the minister it is common knowledge among some ethnic groups that would-be immigrants should not try to obtain an immigrant's visa through the normal channels but rather should gain admittance to this country as visitors because they perhaps may be able to stay here. I know this is not a very nice problem.

I will conclude by asking the minister whether he has yet received the second report that was sought from Mr. Joseph Sedgwick of Toronto. Those who were in this house before will recall a time when there was quite a problem concerning people who were kept in detention for long periods awaiting a decision, and at that time Mr. Sedgwick was asked to furnish a report to the government on this matter. At the same time, when the present Minister of Labour was minister of citizenship and immigration he was asked to deal with the question of procedure on appeals and fair hearings and I know he went into that matter very thoroughly. I would ask the minister whether that report has yet been received and, if not, when does he expect it to be received? If it is available, will he make it available, as was the previous report, to the members of the house? I am sure it will be helpful.

I say to the minister that, notwithstanding the important responsibilities which devolve on him as minister of manpower, in dealing with the human and economic problems involved in immigration he will find not only a fascinating task but also a most demanding one. I think this is a field in which the long promised reform is overdue. When we talk about fair hearings and justice to others we must have regard for the principles involved and clear up these difficulties so far as immigration is concerned.

I wish the minister good luck in his task. I hope that when the white paper is prepared it will be thoroughly studied by a committee and that this will be followed by a thorough investigation of the Act and regulations and the many points which need change. There are antiquated phrases like "insane" and such things in the Act which have no application today. The minister has undertaken a big task and I hope he will be able to carry it through.

Mr. Saltsman: Mr. Chairman, I have some brief statements to make tonight regarding the mobility program and the manpower program under the new department. I had a rather lengthy speech prepared but I am going to save the minister and myself from that in the interests of getting these estimates through as quickly as possible.

There are a number of things which concern me at this stage and I should like to bring them to the minister's attention. Before going into that, first of all I should like to congratulate the minister on his appointment. I might add that perhaps very few ministers who have ever received such an appointment have been met with such hope and optimism as has this present minister and his department. We know he has a great deal of experience and some of his initial statements in respect of a mobility program and manpower program are very encouraging.

I would particularly like to commend the minister on the statements he has already made in respect of the continuance of the unemployment insurance benefits during the period of retraining. I also would like to indicate our approval of his apparent decision to increase the grants for persons undergoing retraining. I think both of these measures are very important and very necessary and certainly will help to ensure that the retraining program—

The Chairman: Order. I regret to interrupt the hon. member. The topic of manpower came up under the Department of Labour. At present we are studying the estimates of the Department of Citizenship and Immigration. I should like to bring this to the attention of the hon. member.

• (7:50 p.m.)

Mr. Saltsman: Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman. I shall adapt my remarks to conform with the rules. I think the congratulations which I extended apply equally to this as to the other department. I should like to raise a number of questions with the minister on the question of immigration. I have in the past raised with the present Minister of Labour the question of Portuguese immigration

into Canada. I am very much concerned about this matter and would like to obtain an answer from the minister in regard to whether he has increased the number of his officers overseas in order to help Portuguese immigration.

These people have done a fine job after immigrating to this country. They have proved to be first class citizens. The industries in my riding are most anxious to see that as many Portuguese as would like to come to Canada and are qualified to do so are permitted to come here. We are hopeful that the long delays of the past, sometimes as long as two years, may be over now and that the admission of relatives and new immigrants is expedited.

One of the suggestions I should like to make to the minister, which is in harmony with the suggestions made by the hon. member for Winnipeg North, is that more attention be given to the matter of immigrants coming to this country in terms of providing some measure of protection to them as they join the work force. As a member of an immigrant family myself, perhaps it is just as well that my mother got off the boat in time or I would not have been a natural born Canadian. I am very much concerned about the exploitation of immigrants that has taken place. They have come over here and have not been informed about trade unions or about their rights as far as voting is concerned. I think this is a very important matter and the minister has a responsibility in this regard.

The minister has a responsibility to immigrants coming to this country who do not speak English or French to see that brochures and pamphlets are distributed or courses arranged for them informing them of their rights and in particular encouraging them, I hope, to join a trade union that will protect their rights regardless of their origin.

I have had numerous occasions to get in touch with the office in Waterloo and I should like to go on record at this time as indicating how thoughtful and helpful this office has been to immigrants coming into my riding and how considerate they have been in looking into any of the problems that have been brought to their attention. I would also point out that the office in Kitchener is deserving of equal praise. I should like to close, Mr. Chairman, with the hope that the minister will rise to the challenge that some of his predecessors perhaps did not meet, and I wish him well in his new job.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Vincent: Mr. Chairman, before the minister begins answering some of the questions put to him, I should also like to ask him two or three questions which he can answer at the same time as the other ones.

At the beginning of his remarks, the minister said that certain difficulties were encountered in having immigrants come to Canada, and more particularly qualified labour. Among other examples, he quoted France, a country which would be reluctant to have its qualified labour emigrate to Canada. Could the minister tell the house whether, in his opinion, our present immigration services in France are adequate and whether he has had any opportunity to discuss, with the Quebec provincial authorities, this matter of immigration from France? Could the minister also tell us whether the government of "La Belle Province" intends to set up immigration offices in France in order to look itself after immigration or still promote the immigration of certain persons considered as skilled workers?

I have a last question to put to the minister. During his discussions with provincial authorities, if he had any, did the minister emphasize the fact that if our services are divided between the federal government and the Quebec government, it might be detrimental to the interests of both governments because they would compete with each other to obtain skilled labour from other countries?

[*English*]

Mr. Peters: Mr. Chairman, I should like to say just a word about a matter that concerns people in my area. This problem is the same as that mentioned by the hon. member who just spoke and has to do with provinces, areas and certain industries bringing immigrants into this country for specific purposes. I hope the minister will give some consideration to the hardships worked on people brought into this country under these conditions. I am speaking particularly of the need that is apparent in the mining industry for immigrants of a special category and the persuasion being used by the immigration department and in many cases the province of Ontario—I refer to immigrants from England and Scotland in particular—by means of advertisements that in my opinion do not present a true picture and are not in keeping with the facts that exist in this country. The immigrant does not find this out until he

comes to Canada and this creates great disillusionment on his part. It also seems to me that it is not in keeping with good immigration policy.

If the areas that need immigrants cannot appeal to them honestly and place the correct facts before them, then probably immigration to these areas should not take place. The mining industry over the years, the gold mining industry in certain areas and particularly certain mines, have used a pretty unfair method of getting people to work in this country. This method has meant that these immigrant employees have become tied by contracts entered into by reason of their being advanced money for transportation and other considerations with the stipulation that they must stay in the area for a set period of time.

While this is all well and good if the immigrant knows what the conditions will be and what the stipulations are, immigrants have reported to me that the conditions which have been presented in this advertising—I have seen newspaper advertisements that bear out the statements of many immigrants—have not been found to be factual and this has created a great deal of resentment on the part of these people.

This type of advertising also means that in many cases the immigrant will stay for the length of time agreed upon but leave immediately that time has expired. The situation is then made that much worse. This type of policy also produces criticism in the countries from which the immigrants come because this situation is pointed out in correspondence with the people at home.

• (8:00 p.m.)

In the matter of immigration I also hope the minister will give some consideration to a fairly specific problem that has been raised by the Federation of Agriculture. I refer to the problem raised by the Federation of Agriculture whereby there has been no definite arrangement made in the immigration law through which transient employees can come to Canada for the purpose of picking berries, harvesting tobacco and other products, and under which the department can supervise accommodation made available and wages paid to these transient workers. These people enter Canada for a certain period of time specifically to carry out this kind of work. I might point out that on occasion there is a great shortage of this type of labourer. Some of these transient workers come from Mexico, work in the United States and then come to Canada to take advantage of the later season here. However, when they reach the Canadian border they find that the same type of arrangement available to them in the United States is not available to them in Canada.

The Federation of Agriculture is of the opinion that much of the difficulty in finding workers in specific agricultural fields would be alleviated if assistance could be provided these transient workers when they cross the border from the United States to Canada. I believe that if that kind of arrangement could be made it should be undertaken by the Department of Citizenship and Immigration.

I intended to mention some other specific problems with regard to immigration and offer some suggestions, but I know the minister is not directly responsible for these estimates and I will therefore defer my remarks until the house has an opportunity to look at those estimates for which he is responsible.

Mr. Haidasz: Mr. Chairman, I do not want to delay the passage of the estimates of this department but I should like to say that I associate myself with the views expressed by the hon. members for Waterloo South and Greenwood in extending congratulations and best wishes to the new minister of this important portfolio. I should like to bring once again to the minister's attention the grave concern expressed to me by Canadian citizens originating from countries of central Europe, who have found it very difficult to sponsor immigrants or visitors from those countries to Canada. I should like to ask in particular whether the minister or his predecessor have held or intend to hold any discussions with representatives of the governments of central European countries in order to facilitate the processing of applications of immigrants from those countries. I say that this has raised many problems, and in view of the delicacy of the matter and the representations made to me I should like to know whether the minister is in a position at this time to make a statement on this subject.

Mr. Marchand: Mr. Chairman and gentlemen, I was very impressed by one remark made by an hon. member concerning the life expectancy of a minister of immigration and I may say I am a little bit worried.

Mr. Knowles: This time the department is being done away with.

Mr. Marchand: The hon. member for Winnipeg North was disappointed with the

few remarks I made at the beginning of the consideration of my estimates. I may say that I am also disappointed, but they were short on purpose. He will admit, however, that I took only a few minutes of his time whereas he took about twenty minutes of mine.

Mr. Winkler: That is not unusual.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Marchand: There are a few points, Mr. Chairman, on which I would like to dwell in reply to questions. First of all, there is one that struck me and I should like hon. members to understand that their words touched me. It is the issue of discrimination in immigration. Undoubtedly, discriminatory provisions remain in the act, and I believe there will shortly be means to eliminate such discrimination in a democratic country like ours.

There are historical reasons for that. Doubtless, many historical reasons explain the situation, but I feel the past should be obliterated and we in Canada should be in a position to accept immigrants whatever the colour of their skin, their religion their race and their language. That is basic.

Now, I believe it was the hon. member for Carleton who referred to a general immigration policy, that is that policy which is to be adjusted on a short term basis, as opposed to a long term one that would take into account the normal, gradual and continuous development of Canada.

On this point, I am in complete agreement with the hon. member for Carleton. Our policy cannot be a short term one, because then it easily becomes absurd. Since we do not know about the short term movements and can hardly forecast them, as the hon. member said, we spend our time opening and shutting the tap; but since our forecasts were wrong, the tap is always opened or shut at the wrong time.

Therefore, I think that we will have to disregard those short term movements and try to elaborate a policy—I am not saying that we will not make mistakes—which will at least be a little more in agreement with our ideas and our views about the future of Canada.

The hon. member for Nicolet-Yamaska (Mr. Vincent) talked about immigration. He touched upon a sensitive subject, in view of the ethnic composition of Canada, namely immigration from France or French speaking countries compared to immigration which might come from other countries, such as England.

That is a problem which exists in Canada and it might be better to talk about it since it exists.

There is no doubt that our facilities are much better in England than in France as far as personnel and offices are concerned.

But, in spite of that, it remains that France is still a country which does not favour immigration, and the French people themselves do not emigrate easily, especially at this time because there is full employment in France.

But there is no doubt that there is something to be corrected, and we will try to correct it. However, as I was saying at the beginning of my remarks—I did not say much but at least I said that—we cannot decide alone where we will take our immigrants, because it is necessary that immigrants should want to come and that the countries where they live should also be ready to let them come.

Therefore, we will have to submit and accept the situation as it is.

We have improved our offices in Portugal. I think that last year immigration from Portugal increased considerably; it might increase again during the current year.

I will try to be as brief as possible for reasons that you understand as well as I do.

There was something said also about a policy—I think it was the hon. member for Greenwood (Mr. Brewin) who spoke about the situation of visitors in Canada.

I think that very soon, and I hope that it will be within a few weeks—that depends of course on the house because it might also be in a few months if incidents such as those we witnessed today and last week should happen—we will be able to deal with this situation under which visiting Canada has now become a normal means of coming as an immigrant.

It is a hypocritical situation but what is the reason behind it? Undoubtedly, it is due to a number of difficulties in the countries where those immigrants come from. But, at the present time, there is no doubt that many people who come to Canada to stay come as visitors, because it is easier or because we do not have in their mother countries facilities where they can pass the required examinations before coming to Canada.

It is a hypocritical situation which explains why in Canada there are probably several thousands, possibly tens of thousands of visitors who came to Canada with the intention of staying.

We shall probably advise you, since it can be done according to the rules, on a policy to deal with this situation.

It is utterly unbearable. Mr. Chairman, as long as I am Minister of Immigration, which will probably not be for long, but still while I am, we shall attempt to set up a policy. But once it is drawn up, we shall have to accept it.

At the present time, Canada is in danger of losing control over its immigration policy. We will need a better control than in the past. Whether it is conservative or liberal according to the wishes of the people or the House of Commons, we will have to come to a decision, but once it has been decided, we shall have to stand by it, because, as things are now, we do not know where we are going and have not known for years.

In my opinion, Mr. Chairman, we shall have to try and make adjustments.

Now, I believe that the hon. member for Carleton (Mr. Bell) dealt a little with the criteria that should be used in setting our immigration policy in Canada.

Until now, the main criterion has been professional skill, that is the means to earn a livelihood, an educational background and also what is called sponsorship.

He said that, traditionally, the Department of Labour has been opposed to immigration. What he meant, no doubt—and he may correct me if I am wrong—is that this stems from the influence exerted by labour unions on the Department of Labour which has been rather conservative in the field of immigration.

It is a fact that labour unions are conservative in this respect.

They are conservative to the extent that there is unemployment in Canada, that is to the extent that they feel immigrants will add to the number of unemployed in Canada; well, labour unions will protect their membership first, and I can readily understand that.

But in a normal full-employment situation, I know of no labour unions in Canada that would oppose immigration, provided that there is no increase, through immigration, in the number of unemployed on the Canadian labour market.

Therefore, I believe that so long as we have a normal employment situation, there is nothing to fear from the labour movement; they will agree to immigrants coming to enrich the economic and cultural life of Canada.

[Mr. Marchand.]

Therefore, this is a matter of maintaining a proper balance, but it is obvious that Canada needs qualified labour, and emphasis should be placed on this. But, at the same time, we must realize that by accepting immigrants in Canada, we accept human beings, that is people who may have relatives—wives, sons, mothers, etc.—and that they may be interested, once they are established here, to have their relatives come too, which means that immigration cannot be exclusively selective. It must also be human.

All these factors must then be combined. I think that for the last few years, on the whole, these factors have been taken into account, but perhaps our immigration policy has not yet been properly defined.

There have been complaints that the white paper—

• (8:10 p.m.)

[*English*]

Complaints have been made that the white paper is not yet ready. I am going to do exactly what former ministers of immigration have done and tell the committee that I am going to try to have it ready as soon as possible.

[*Translation*]

There is something new.

[*English*]

I would also do something new. I will be in a position later this week, I hope, to table the Sedgwick report which I trust will help us solve the problem of the appeal board and the discretionary powers of the minister of immigration. I think it will be tabled this week, so this is something new. I think it will also help me to convince hon. members they should wait a little longer for the white paper.

Mr. Bell (Carleton): We will wait ten days.

Mr. Marchand: Ten days is a little short. The hon. member for York-Humber asked some questions about Lord Thomson. I do not know this case personally but I am informed that he voluntarily became a British subject and this is why he lost his Canadian citizenship.

[*Translation*]

As far as the hon. member for Nicolet-Yamaska (Mr. Vincent) is concerned, it is true that Ontario has immigration offices in England while the province of Quebec has none, neither in France nor elsewhere.

Now, I have yet to meet with the provincial authorities to come to an understanding with them. If the province of Quebec should decide, like Ontario, to set up immigration offices, I think it is up to the Quebec authorities to contact us, because under the Canadian constitution—and let us say that for once that seems rather clear—the federal government's jurisdiction has precedence in matters of immigration. Therefore, that means that if Quebec wants to become interested in the problem of immigration, it is up to that province to contact the federal government. We would be very glad to discuss the matter with the provincial authorities in order to find out what their intentions are and to assist them in achieving their objectives.

• (8:20 p.m.)

[*English*]

There are a few other questions, Mr. Chairman, but if you will allow me I would prefer to answer them in writing. I know that immigration problems are very inportant. The hon. member for Greenwood said that for many years he has been told by ministers of immigration that everything would be corrected and yet nothing has been done. I can state tonight that it will be the same in a year or two. In the meantime we would hope to try to improve the situation now existing. I think that by proceeding along those lines some day we shall have a sound immigration policy.

Mr. Bell (Carleton): Mr. Chairman, in his reply the hon. minister has been sufficiently provocative that I am tempted to follow him in some of the matters which he has raised. I resist that temptation, however, because I am as anxious as he is to see these estimates put through tonight. I want to refer to one matter only and that, without recapturing any of the atmosphere of this afternoon, is the matter of security.

The minister appreciates that both in immigration and in citizenship the whole subject of security is a very difficult one. Indeed it is probably the most difficult one which the Minister of Citizenship and Immigration has to face. There are many times when he must wrestle with his conscience as he reads reports in front him. In view of the fact that the Prime Minister this afternoon has suggested that there will be a commission which will investigate security problems, I wonder if I might put to the minister—I do not ask him to reply or necessarily to commit himself

—a request that he will insist with his colleagues that the whole subject of security as it affects immigration to this country and as it affects the grant of citizenship in this country be among the terms of reference of the commission which the Prime Minister proposed.

I believe that this would give some hope to quite a number of people who have been in difficulties in matters of citizenship. There are on the files of the Department of Citizenship and Immigration views which I have expressed in relation to this matter, which views perhaps are unorthodox. I do not think that necessarily questions of security are a reason for depriving persons of citizenship who have been in this country for many years. I should like to see the question of possible membership in organizations which, if persons were coming from abroad, might be considered of a very delicate nature in the security light, considered in a somewhat different light in relation to the question of the application of citizenship.

I spent many hours myself in wrestling with my own conscience in relation to this subject. Speaking for myself, I should be delighted to appear before any commissioner and tell him my experiences in this field as a minister. I think it would be wise and sound for this question to be part of the terms of reference of the commission proposed this afternoon by the Prime Minister.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Marchand: I thank the members of the committee and I will be very brief, Mr. Chairman, but that matter troubles my conscience very deeply too.

Like the hon. member for Carleton (Mr. Bell), I feel the need to say that I am not any more at ease that he is; I try to see under what standards, at a given moment, citizens or immigrants are turned down and I am a little lost, because there is as much subjectivity in considering those standards. At one time, people can be turned down or accepted in a discretionary manner without knowing exactly what the deeper reasons are, because there are in our laws—and that is true on both sides of the house—sections which are difficult to apply. I must admit that I can say a lot of things because I am new here and people will say: "He did not know, he did not understand the difficulties".

Let us say that I would rather state that there was basic hypocrisy, because we wanted to discourage only one kind of people,

without naming them, mentioning them. As a matter of fact, I remember coming across cases where people were accused of doing certain things. I would study them and say to myself very frankly: If I were not already a Canadian citizen, I would not be accepted in Canada, because I did all those things myself in the past.

In any case, I think that is a very important matter which should be cleared up, so that we will no longer be in the dark and we will know exactly why we turn down those people, in short, we will know the true reasons why we turn them down or refuse them their rights.

Let us say that my conscience was deeply troubled about certain things which happened, and the federal officials are not responsible, because I think they try to be as generous as possible; but it seems that there is some confusion in the application of the act and of our traditional policy in that field.

A while ago, I stated categorically that the federal government had priority in the field of immigration. That does not mean that, should a conflict arise between the provincial and federal governments, the latter has the priority. I wanted to make that clear, in order not to create a new problem between Quebec and the federal government.

[*English*]

Mr. Winkler: Mr. Chairman, I want to ask the minister if he can give me some sort of answer to my question dealing with the deprivation of rights of people who are naturalized Canadians. I believe in 1963-64 in the Speech from the Throne it was mentioned that legislation would be brought in to clarify and rectify this situation.

Mr. Marchand: Yes, Mr. Chairman, we are going to bring in amendments dealing with that situation. We agree that it is nonsense at present. Once a citizen is naturalized I think that he should have the same rights as all other Canadian citizens. I think that even if the white paper has been postponed a little, and I do not want to tell you how long I think it will take, we shall do something. In the meantime, I think that we can bring very important amendments before the house.

Mr. Howard: Mr. Chairman, I am only going to raise two matters at this time relating to questions of citizenship and immigration that are involved when a person becomes a citizen. In the first place, I think we all agree that a person in applying to become a naturalized citizen is really showing an expression of faith in that he wants to become part of this country and become one, with the rest of us. Such an application is an expression of faith because it is voluntary and because it is not a requirement. Because of that I think we are somewhat rigid in maintaining the five year residence requirement. The period of five years may have had some value in the past even though then, as now, it was an arbitrary figure. I know of many people who have come to Canada in recent years who are patiently and sometimes impatiently waiting for the day when the five years of residence will be up so that they can make an application to become Canadian citizens. There would be no difference whatever in their value to themselves, their value to their families or to this nation if they were permitted to make application for citizenship after say two years rather than after five years.

I think we should look closely at the arbitrary five year requirement with a view to reducing it somewhat for persons wishing to make applications to become citizens. Whatever length of time is established it will be an arbitrary figure. There will be some fixed length of time involved. I am rather partial to a two year period or a three year period, which is approximately half that existing at the moment.

• (8:30 p.m.)

I know that in recent years there has been a tremendous influx into Canada from all parts of the world of people who have come here to settle down, raise their families and become an integral part of our nation. They are only waiting for the day when they have fulfilled the requirement of five years residence. I seriously urge the minister, in his easy and frank approach to these questions, to concern himself with this matter along with the others he has to consider. Possibly in one of his weekly or monthly statements he can tell us that the residential requirement will be reduced to something like two years or three years, admittedly an arbitrary period just as any other period would be arbitrary.

With respect to the mechanism by which a person becomes a Canadian I should like to suggest to the minister that there is a marked difference between the approach taken by the various Citizenship Courts, a marked difference in the attitude of the various judges who hear and determine applications for citizenship.

A case comes to mind of a judge we had at home who was considered so rigid and so difficult in his insistence on applicants naming all the great lakes and rivers of Canada, geographical nonsense of that kind about which many native Canadians would be uninformed, that many new Canadians refrained from making application for citizenship because they knew of the difficulties their friends and relatives had experienced when appearing before him. A change was made in the judgeship. This gentleman was moved or promoted to another post within the judicial structure. He was replaced by another judge, one who brought a kindly, gentlemanly and pleasant approach to his consideration of these applications. The approach of this second judge is the one which I think should be followed. His concern is not so much with an applicant's knowledge of the geography of the country or his ability to recite the number of provinces and so on. He is concerned about the expression of opinion and feeling on the part of the applicant. He goes further than what may be memorized; he seeks to look into an applicant's heart and mind, to find out the nature of his expectation and desire to become a Canadian citizen.

I use the example of these two judges, not naming them, to show the minister how there can be such marked, almost extreme differences in the approach taken by Citizenship Courts when considering applications. I admit at the outset that it is impossible to set down a set of rules for such cases as if one were introducing tests to determine an applicant's fitness for a driving licence. Nevertheless I believe an attempt should be made to set down guide lines or general criteria for judges in these courts to follow so that there might be some uniformity in the treatment of individuals who voluntarily make applications to become citizens with the rest of us.

These are general thoughts I pass on to the minister. They have been mentioned to many of his predecessors. I hope the present minister will remain in his post long enough to do something about them or that if he leaves he will be able so to imbue his officials with these concepts that whoever replaces him will have no choice but to carry on the policies which he has developed along these as along other lines.

Mr. Marchand: On that point, the hon. member probably knows that the citizenship branch is supposed to be transferred to another department in due course. I know that my colleague, the Secretary of State, will be happy to be convinced by the hon. member that what he has said is the right thing.

Mr. Winch: In view of the fact that we have in the chamber this evening the present Minister of Citizenship and Immigration as well as the former minister there are one or two remarks I should like to make without keeping the committee too long. I made a statement during the last parliament and I want to repeat it now for the benefit of the new minister. In the 13 years I have been in the House of Commons the present Minister of Labour, formerly the minister responsible for citizenship and immigration, showed more humanity in my opinion than any other minister of citizenship and immigration I know of.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Winch: I hope the humanity and understanding which the former minister showed in relation to the matters I discussed with him—I have many cases from my riding —will be continued by the present minister. The points I should like to bring to the attention of the present minister are similar to those which I drew to the attention of his predecessor. First, I do not like or appreciate in any way the policy which has been followed both by Liberals and Conservatives of permitting applications for citizenship to be denied, even after they have been recommended by the courts, without the person concerned or the member of parliament acting on his behalf being told why.

I represent, as I have said, a riding where there are a great many people of varying ethnic origins. What happens when relatives wish to visit them? What happens when sons and daughters wish to visit their parents in Canada? A visitor's visa is denied them without any explanation being given. If these people wished to become landed immigrants there might be some reason for these refusals. But when they ask only for a six month visitor's visa to see parents or other relatives whom they may not have seen for 30 years I can see no possible reason for denying them a visa and refusing to give any reason.

I am sure the present Minister of Labour, formerly minister of citizenship and immigration, knows what I have in mind. A landed immigrant who has been in Canada for five years may make a successful application for citizenship to a court. Then the authority in Ottawa says no. Surely the person concerned is entitled to know the reason for not granting citizenship in such cases and surely the

member of parliament who is asked to look after the case is entitled to know, even in confidence, the reason for refusal.

• (8:40 p.m.)

There are three people in my constituency whose relatives would like to get visitors' permits to see their mothers, sisters or brothers, and when the answer is no surely they are entitled to know the reason or, if necessary, their member of parliament should be given the reason in confidence. This matter has concerned me during the 13 years I have been in this chamber. It is absolutely unfair that a person should be denied citizenship after spending five years in Canada and that his relatives should also be denied the right to visit Canada on visitors' visas.

There was one case I tried to handle for five or six years. I could not get anywhere but the present Minister of Labour, when he was minister of citizenship and immigration, showed his humanity and said the persons involved should be let in and they were. I am asking that this trend be continued by the new minister or at least he should give us the reasons people are denied their rights and found guilty without the opportunity to answer the charge that must have been laid against them.

Mr. Macaluso: Mr. Chairman, I want to deal with Citizenship Courts first. I must echo the words of the hon. member for Skeena and say, speaking from my own experience in the Hamilton-Niagara peninsula area, that I completely agree with them. I have before me a booklet entitled "Guide to Canadian Citizenship," some 90 pages long. At the end of each chapter there is a list of questions, the answers to which an immigrant is supposed to know. In the preface it states:

> When your examination takes place the judge may ask you questions on any of these subjects as a means of testing your knowledge of Canada and Canadian institutions.
>
> At the end of each section of the booklet you will find a number of questions. The answers to many of these questions will be found in the text of the booklet. Other answers you may discover by reading or asking your friends.

That is very illuminating.

> It is most important for you to understand that the questions in this booklet are not necessarily the ones that will be used by the judge in your court examination. They are simply to test your knowledge of what you have read.

And at the bottom it says "Good luck". I say that many of the people who appear before Citizenship Courts need all the luck they can get to pass the examinations because there are some questions to which not even the Court Presidents know the answers. I tell the minister and the minister-designate that a serious look must be taken to ensure uniformity across the country concerning questions asked by Citizenship Court Presidents.

I submit that some of the qualifications of these Court Presidents are certainly not ones which fit them for the posts to which they have been appointed. If you think I am being overly harsh, Mr. Chairman, let me state that I intend to be in some respects. I have complained for three years about the Citizenship Court in my area and from personal knowledge I say a serious look must be taken at the appointments made to the presidencies of these courts.

From personal experience I know of the very arrogant approach which some Court Presidents have taken to immigrants, so arrogant that the immigrants' friends and relatives refuse to apply for citizenship because of the insults received. I know of a case where only one question was asked of the applicant but he was turned down and abused. I can understand the qualifications so far as language is concerned, but when the county court judges were handling citizenship applications we did not receive the complaints we are receiving today. There is a difference. Many representations have been made on this matter. I am sure the hon. member for Carleton, when he was minister of citizenship and immigration, was aware of the complaints made regarding Presidents of Citizenship Courts. I know personally that such complaints were made to him by a former member. This is a matter which I intend to bring up in a more detailed manner when the estimates of the department next come before us.

Something else which has been bothering me for many years is the question of Chinese immigration from Hong Kong. Not too long ago a statement was made in the House of Commons providing for an amnesty and an extension of time to enable Chinese people to come forward and clarify their status. Many of the Canadian Chinese community did so voluntarily, but an incongruous situation has arisen when these self-same people, having clarified their status and having received their certificates of Canadian citizenship, try to bring their relatives from Hong Kong. They are told they do not meet the requirements of the Act because they made a false statement at the time the sponsoring relative came to Canada. Even though the sponsor's status has been clarified, the proposed immigrants are

refused admission. I ask the minister to look into this serious matter. It is a ridiculous situation.

There is another matter I should like to bring to the minister's attention. I believe many hon. members spend more than enough time on immigration questions concerning their constituents and I feel there are cases where this is not necessary because it is due only to the red tape, bureaucracy and arrogance of staff in various offices and branches of the department.

In many cases where people have come to a member's home or office seeking to have representations made on their behalf, not overly representations but with respect to normal applications and procedure and assistance, we have found that some of these people come back to us and say something to this effect, that when they went to the department of immigration they found that the clerk, officer or administrative official dealing with the case, when he discovered an M.P. had been approached, took an altogether different approach. They were told in effect, "Your member of parliament cannot help you. You should not have gone to him. It is too bad."

Mr. Winch: Or, "You should go to a lawyer."

Mr. Herridge: When there is no need.

Mr. Peters: If there was no money they would not help. They are a bunch of gangsters.

Mr. Herridge: Pay $300 to get into Canada.

Mr. Winch: Arrogance is right.

Mr. Herridge: When they are already paid as members of parliament to do the job.

The Chairman: Order.

Mr. Macaluso: Those are not my remarks, Mr. Chairman. I am only saying many members of parliament only wish constituents did not need to come to them to get action but many of these people come to us because they do not understand what is happening.

• (8:50 p.m.)

Many members of parliament advise these people in good faith to deal with the officials in the immigration department in their own particular communities, and when these persons come back and relate to us that a particular officer or official has been arrogant and abusive to the particular person who had the nerve to see his member of parliament, then I suggest something is wrong and the matter should be looked into very carefully by the minister.

I do not intend to take up the time of the house any longer on these matters but I do intend to deal with them at length when the estimates come forward again. However, I should like to bring this matter to the attention of the minister at this time. I echo the words of the hon. member for Skeena when he said that something must be done about the Citizenship Courts.

Mr. Nesbitt: Mr. Chairman, I should like to say just one very brief word. I could not help but listen with great attention to the remarks of the hon. member for Skeena and the member for Hamilton West concerning the procedures in the Citizenship Courts. A long step forward was made in this regard when the courts were placed in areas rather than in counties, because in one county a judge may have been good and in another county not so good. In respect of guide lines and methods in Citizenship Courts I should like to mention to the new Minister of Citizenship and Immigration that the methods and procedures used by His Honour Judge Campbell Calder in the London Citizenship Court in my area could not be carried out in a better or more practical way. They are a credit to the office he holds.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Asselin (Charlevoix): Mr. Chairman, I only wish to say a few words. I shall not be as long as the hon. member for Hamilton West (Mr. Macaluso), because I do not want to be accused of delaying the estimates of the Minister of Citizenship and Immigration (Mr. Marchand). I also wish to congratulate him on his appointment to his new position; I hope that he will perform his duties satisfactorily.

In his opening remarks, the hon. minister said that there were 148,000 immigrants to Canada last year. He also pointed out that there were certain difficulties concerning immigrants of French origin.

Could he tell me the percentage of immigrants of French origin who came to Canada last year and to what parts of the country they were directed?

This question may involve statistics and the minister probably cannot answer me today, but I should like him to give me this information in the next few days.

Mr. Marchand: Mr. Chairman, I could give them in writing tomorrow if the hon. member so wishes.

Mr. Asselin (Charlevoix): Mr. Chairman, I would also like to know why it is so difficult

to bring French speaking immigrants. Is it because the officers of the Department of Citizenship and Immigration care very little in having French speaking immigrants? I would ask the minister to give me reasons for such difficulties.

Mr. Marchand: Mr. Chairman, may I answer something in this regard? It may be at the time the hon. member was at lunch but when I spoke about my estimates, I gave the reasons why this is so.

Mr. Asselin (Charlevoix): Mr. Chairman, I am aware of those reasons, but I feel there may be others for the Minister to discover upon inquiry with his officials. I should be pleased to know of other reasons as I am convinced there are some.

The minister also replied to the question put by the member for Nicolet-Yamaska (Mr. Vincent) concerning the possibility of concurrent jurisdiction between the provinces and the federal government in the field of immigration. The minister somehow did not think too clearly in this respect; at the outset he said immigration comes under federal jurisdiction, but later on he changed that, saying that there could be concurrent jurisdiction in the case of Quebec where, at the present time, the Minister of Cultural Affairs seems greatly interested in this matter. An act has been adopted in Quebec, as the minister knows. In that case, must the provinces get in touch and co-operate with the federal Department of Citizenship and Immigration with regard to this important question of immigration?

Mr. Marchand: Mr. Chairman, the province like the federal government has jurisdiction in the field of immigration. But section 94, if my memory serves me correctly, says that in the case where the provincial legislation conflicts with or contradicts the federal legislation, the federal government takes precedence.

I said the same thing twice, but I meant to clear it up.

Mr. Asselin (Charlevoix): Mr. Chairman, can the minister tell me whether the Quebec government got in touch with him about the establishment of an immigration service in Quebec?

Mr. Marchand: Mr. Chairman, Quebec did not get in touch with us.

[Mr. Asselin (Charlevoix).]

[*English*]

Mr. More: Mr. Chairman, I have just one or two matters for the minister. First of all, I should like to express my agreement with those who have raised various problems in respect of the Citizenship Courts. There should be some unification of approach to the granting of citizenship to immigrants so there will not be discrimination and hardship in respect of the questions asked of these people and their knowledge concerning Canadian citizenship. The former minister of citizenship and immigration knows that last winter I raised this matter with him. I am dissatisfied with the way these courts have been extended. I know the new minister will be interested in this. I know we are catching up gradually but I hope the government will see that these courts are extended as quickly as possible.

A matter has come to my attention concerning a particular case. I will not mention the name but I should like to tell the minister about the facts of this case because I do not believe his departmental officials can cope with the matter. I want to say that there is no recrimination against the officials. Personally I have had very good co-operation from the ministers and any officials with whom I have had to deal either here in Ottawa or in my constituency of Regina. The case concerns two children who were born out of wedlock and a subsequent marriage. The law says that only the mother may apply for citizenship for the children. In this case, regardless of what kind of citizenship court we have, personally I do not think the mother ever will qualify to become a Canadian citizen and yet she is a good mother and it is a good family. In Saskatchewan either the mother or father has authority for these children but I am told that under federal law the mother only can be granted the right to ask for citizenship. The father is a citizen. He wants his children to be Canadian citizens. They are good children and will make good citizens.

Unless some change is made, in my opinion there is no hope of these children ever becoming Canadian citizens. I bring this matter to the attention of the minister because I think that if I have a case like this there must be other cases throughout the country. I see no reason in a particular case like this and under these circumstances why an application by the father on behalf of these

children should not be recognized and citizenship arranged. I should like the minister to look into this.

Mr. Peters: Mr. Chairman, the matter raised by the hon. member for Hamilton West is a very interesting one which I think warrants some comment because over a period of time we have seen a change in this regard. I should like to congratulate some of the senior officials of the Department of Citizenship and Immigration and the former minister of citizenship and immigration on the change which has taken place.

There is no question but that many sections of the Act lend themselves to misinterpretation. For many years there has been—and I think this is a fact—a great predominance of attention to legal arguments that have been used on behalf of certain classes of citizens in certain fields and the department itself has not used any discretion. In many cases this created terrific hardships.

• (9:00 p.m.)

I think the minister is to be congratulated for the changes that have taken place. I have had considerable experience with some of the senior officials of the Department of Citizenship and Immigration and have found some of them to be completely unsympathetic. But I have found in recent months that many of the officials are much more sympathetic and willing to pay some attention to many of the wishes of the ministers of this department. I have been in the house since 1957 and I think each and every minister has said that changes would be made in many of the fields that have been discussed this evening and in every case these changes have not come to pass.

I think it is safe and fair to say that some of the senior officials of the department are now paying some attention to the desires and wishes expressed by ministers and supported by most members of parliament. They have given consideration to the fact that the legislation has not been presented and are really paying heed to some of the suggestions that obviously will be included in the legislation when it is introduced. I believe the previous minister is entitled to a considerable degree of credit for the changes that have been made in the department and its personnel. I think it would be unfair to leave the impression that perhaps many hon. members have, namely, that all the officials of this department are not as honest as they should be and have not used discretion in cases where discretion should have been used.

This was true in many cases in the past and over a period of years to my knowledge, but I am of the opinion that the previous minister was a credit to the department and assisted many Canadians and other people wishing to bring their families into this country. I certainly hope the attention that has been paid to the human element involved in immigration cases will be continued. Immigrants have not always told the truth. They have been advised by officials not to tell the truth because if they told the truth they would not be able to do certain things. This is why we got into the terrible mess with regard to the Chinese communities in this country. Over the years a lie was compounded by dozens of people until they reached the stage where they really did not know who they were and what their relationships were. Consequently we found brother marrying sister and other relationships that created an impossible situation. To a large extent I blame the officials of the department who over the years have made this situation possible. If necessary I could give the details of some of the stories in connection with this department with which many hon. members are familiar. These cases occurred a few years ago and are no credit to the department.

To my knowledge most of these abuses have been corrected and I am quite proud of the change that has been made and the human element that has now been introduced into the field of legislation. At all times the human element should be a deciding factor in immigration cases and I hope the new minister and those now responsible in the department will continue to give this type of understanding which I think is very necessary in this particular field.

Mr. Howard: Mr. Chairman, a moment ago I asked the minister some questions about two aspects of citizenship policy. He replied in the vein that I should know what his reply was, but he answered that the citizenship branch was being transferred to the Department of the Secretary of State for administration by that department. Could the minister tell the committee when the decision was made to make that transfer and whether it involves only the citizenship branch?

Mr. Marchand: It involves only the citizenship branch, Mr. Chairman. I do not know exactly when the transfer will be made. It

will have to be approved by the House of Commons. With regard to the first question put to me, I think we all agree that there should be some uniformity in the Citizenship Courts. I know this is something on which the department has been working, and we shall continue to work in this direction. It has been announced that the citizenship branch will be transferred to the Department of the Secretary of State. This transfer will be effective when the House of Commons approves of it.

Mr. Bell (Carleton): What about the citizenship registration branch? Will that branch be transferred also? Will both branches be transferred?

The Chairman: Order, please. The hon. member for Skeena.

Mr. Howard: I did not ask when the transfer would take effect; I asked when the decision was made to make the transfer. May I follow that question with one other thought before the minister replies. It is my understanding that under the Transfer of Duties Act this sort of transfer could be made by order in council as was the transfer of the Indian affairs branch to northern affairs. The minister shakes his head and says no, that it must be done by statute. I accept the shaking of his head to this effect. When was the decision made to make the transfer?

Mr. Marchand: It was announced when the Prime Minister announced the creation of the department of manpower. He announced at the same time that the citizenship branch was going to be transferred.

Mr. Cowan: Mr. Chairman, an hour or so ago I asked the minister a three part question regarding foreign decorations. I received a passable answer to the first of the three questions. I was told that Lord Thomson of Fleet, who was decorated by the Queen of Canada, had chosen to become a British subject. I also asked a question as to what happened in the case of Premier Lesage of Quebec who accepted the Order of the Phoenix from the King of Greece. Did Premier Lesage become a citizen of Greece?

Mr. Marchand: No, not that I know of.

Item agreed to.

DEPARTMENT OF NATIONAL HEALTH AND WELFARE

Administration—

1. Departmental administration, $2,330,100.

The Chairman: Order. The committee will now proceed to the consideration of the estimates of the Department of National Health and Welfare, Item No. 1, to be found on page 284 of the blue book. Shall vote No. 1 carry?

Mr. Rynard: Mr. Chairman, is the minister not going to make a statement?

Mr. MacEachen: Mr. Chairman, I do not propose to make an extended statement. I hope to have an opportunity to reply to any questions or points that may be raised by members of the committee following their participation in the debate. All I wish to do is tell the committee that I welcome this opportunity to appear before the committee in my new role of Minister of National Health and Welfare and pay tribute to my predecessors in this portfolio on both sides of the house.

I have learned since going into the department about their leadership and appreciate what they have done as much as I appreciate the excellent work being done in the department by the staff of the Department of National Health and Welfare. If hon. members wish me to direct my attention to any particular points which are raised I shall be glad to do so.

• (9:10 p.m.)

Mr. Rynard: Mr. Chairman, first of all I should like to congratulate the minister on his appointment to the Department of National Health and Welfare. I do not know whether this is a rest from labour or how he got this appointment but I am very glad to see him associated with this department. I was also very pleased to see the hon. lady member for Westmorland appointed as his Parliamentary Secretary and I am sure she will make a very capable assistant. This situation is all the more charming because the hon. gentleman is a bachelor. I am sure the hon. lady will help smooth out the difficult ruffles because ladies usually tend to lend a more sympathetic ear to human problems, with which the Department of National Health and Welfare is very much concerned. In all seriousness, Mr. Chairman—I have now been distracted from my speech, and am slightly embarrassed—I should like to congratulate the minister and his lovely assistant.

At this point I want to deal briefly with medicare and some of the problems inherent in it. Medicare was a plank in the Liberal platform, added very hastily and proclaimed across this country in a promise that we would have an almost universal medicare plan, 95 per cent, by 1967. In this regard I have grave doubts.

I am sure the minister is sincere. I have been following some of the speeches he has made outside of the house but I sometimes wonder about his success in this regard, particularly when I think back to a platform of Mackenzie King in 1919 which has as a Plank free hospitalization for Canadians. I was in the house in 1958, 39 years after that promise was made, when the Conservative government passed an Act now known as the Hospital Insurance and Diagnostic Services Act. This became a *fait accompli* in 1958, as I say, 39 years after that promise.

I do not believe this government intends to take as long to implement their promise regarding a medicare service but I have some doubt about the 1967 target for several reasons. I do not think the way they went about this would lend itself to success. They held a meeting here in Ottawa and said they would pay the average national per capita cost of medical services across Canada at the rate of $28, but that is also the average cost in the province of Quebec. I do not even hint that Mr. Lesage was consulted in this regard, but that was not the average cost in the province of Ontario nor in many other provinces. The average cost in this province was $42 per capita, and I suggest the reason for this—this would apply to the province of British Columbia and other provinces—is that fees and para-medical services are higher. Ontario is a high cost province and I suggest it was not much wonder why Ontario and some of the other provinces did not accept this idea, particularly the province of Ontario which pays 45 per cent of taxes in Canada.

In view of these facts I am sure it is no wonder that Ontario launched its own medicare program. It is a plan that starts at a base which can be built up. This in my opinion is what is necessary in Canada in the position we find ourselves today with a shortage of doctors, para-medical services, hospital beds, research, medical schools and teachers. In my opinion it is supreme folly to say that we can have a complete medicare service in 1967. It is utterly impossible to expect such an accomplishment when one considers that the work load of general practitioners is greater than they can handle today.

I should like to suggest to the government that it take a look at what the province of Ontario has done. It has adopted a medicare scheme that will cover almost two million people. This is a plan related to Physicians Services Incorporated in the province of Ontario which pays 90 per cent of medical fees and is totally acceptable to the doctors of this province. When the Ontario plan comes into effect on July 1, 80 per cent to 85 per cent of its people will be covered by public carrier or private carrier.

I should like to suggest to the federal government, keeping these facts in mind, that it could go ahead and pay the per capita costs to the province of Ontario and to other provinces such as Alberta and British Columbia. In support of this suggestion I should like to quote from a statement made during the last election campaign, as reported in the Calgary *Herald* for November 1, 1965:

> Agriculture Minister Harry Hays said today. . . . "If Alberta should decide to stay out of any national (medicare) plan, then I'm sure some way can be negotiated to make sure the people of Alberta don't lose any of their rightful tax benefits.

I suggest that is a pretty clear indication of straight thinking so far as the province of Alberta is concerned, enunciated by a former minister.

I should also like to point out that the former minister of trade and commerce, the present Minister of Finance, is reported in the Ottawa *Citizen* of November 5 as having said in Toronto on November 4:

> Trade Minister Sharp told an all-party rally Thursday, November 4, a Liberal government may have to delay introduction of a national medical care scheme because of a shortage of doctors and nurses. "I don't know if we'll be able to reach that (1967) target."

The minister goes on to say:

> The doctor-nurse shortage would be given immediate attention by the next government following the federal election Monday.

I should like to hear from the minister as to what he has done regarding the doctor shortage.

The former minister of national health and welfare, as reported in the Canadian Press article of September 24, said:

> —the goal is to have at least 95 per cent of the people of a province covered, but if that cannot be achieved initially, 90 per cent will be acceptable and there may be flexibility in the 90 per cent figure.

I suggest that both those statements contain commonsense facts.

I should now like to refer to the Hall Commission report which pointed out that there was an acute shortage of doctors, and that this plan could not be implemented at once. It pointed out that it should be started although it could not be implemented immediately because of a shortage of doctors, dentists and para-medical services. The re-

port suggests, however, that this plan should be at least started. The people should not be cheated. They have been promised something and the government should go ahead with that promise. The government must start to make an effort to increase the number of doctors—not next year but now.

In this regard the government must take steps to provide four additional medical schools before 1971. We must have 500 new medical students each year in each faculty of medicine across the country. There has been a little diffidence in this regard. Some medical schools have not been able to get their quotas of students in past years. Only 7 per cent of grade 13 students is all we have been able to attract to medical faculties and that is not enough to attain the 500 new students per year which are required. I should also like to say that when we attain this 500 students per year figure it will take seven to eight years before they begin to practise medicine. I might say in this regard that we doubled the per capita grants to universities. I think in 1959.

• (9:20 p.m.)

Above all, when we get these 500 students per year it will be seven or eight years before they can be put to work in the medical field. This is not good enough. Even if the government were going to embark on medicare four years from now, they should now be creating a crash program in our medical schools, and there is no reason this cannot be done.

In 1940 a crash program was started across the land to produce doctors. The doctors were produced and medical schools were open all year round. Why should these expensive buildings and facilities remain idle during the summer months? This is a waste which at the moment we cannot afford either from the standpoint of producing doctors or cost. The minister will say we have not got the teachers to do this but we found a great many teachers between 1940 and 1945 in our forces overseas, so I suggest this would be a pretty lame excuse. In addition, through research we should be able to produce quicker and more modern methods of teaching. We could use closed circuit television in our medical schools to release teachers for research work which would make this country great. We could have special centres for special diagnostic work and information.

There is no question that we must have teachers and in this regard I think we could use some certified general practitioners.

[Mr. Rynard.]

When I went to medical school one of my greatest teachers was a general practitioner. I believe we could use these doctors today to get us out of this crisis, and I do not think any problem would arise. We have to get students, universities and teachers before we can produce any more medical doctors. I would say to the minister, do not deceive the people by saying that you are going to bring in this plan and provide full service because it simply cannot be done.

I should like to say a few words on the question of hospital beds. I am sure the minister is well aware that only this past month Mr. Robarts presented a report to the Ontario house from the Ontario Hospital Services Commission which stated there were not enough beds for the people who need them. This is a very serious problem and may mean that lives are lost.

The minister will probably reply that this is not his responsibility. But let me tell him that when the Conservative party came into power in 1958 it immediately doubled hospital grants for beds. Since that time nothing has been done. Our party provided for interns' quarters, for nurses' residences, for laboratories and for physiotherapy units by way of grants to each service.

I do not want to berate the minister on this subject but I would draw to his attention, because he is new to the job, that I found when I looked up the record that in the last eight years the provincial government of Ontario has increased its grants three times. Therefore I think you will agree, Mr. Chairman, that there is a serious deficiency on the part of the federal government which should be remedied at once. As I say, Ontario's government increased its grants three times, and building costs have risen from $10,000 per bed eight years ago to $20,000 to $25,000 today. During the last year I was told by an architect that hospital building costs in one city have risen 30 per cent. I am sure the minister will recognize that some of this increase is due to taxes imposed by his government.

So I just draw the attention of the minister, Mr. Chairman, to the necessity for action by way of providing beds. I would ask him whether he does not think it fair or right to plug these loopholes before embarking on a full scheme of medicare which he cannot fulfil and for which he is going to charge the people of Canada, leaving doctors overworked and patients frustrated with poor attention.

Another problem is that we have been a long way behind in many things but as we look back over the years we find that in 1951 we graduated from our medical schools 34 doctors more than were graduated in 1961 and this in spite of the fact that, excluding immigrants, there was a natural increase in population of over three million people. This is an astonishing thing. Neither governments nor universities have taken the necessary steps to correct this, and this inaction has left us in a very serious predicament. During that period of time we have had between 500 to 600 immigrant doctors per year, 90 per cent of them from the U.K. These people are well trained and a great asset. Most of them left the United Kingdom because of the introduction of state medicine and they came to this country. I should like to put on the record the fact that these doctors represent a gift of about $3 billion by way of earning power in this country over their natural lifetimes.

This money, Mr. Chairman, would build a lot of universities and schools and would provide for a lot of the research so badly needed in this country. I should also like to point out to the minister that in this country we spent last year on medical research approximately $10 million while the United States spent $1 billion. I say that is just not right. How in the world are we going to get highly qualified teachers and keep them in our universities and schools if that is all we give them for research? I hope the minister does not do this year what he did last year when he spent only 60 per cent of his budget which was approved for research purposes, leaving 40 per cent of it to go by the board. The consequence was that 40 per cent of the people who would have conducted that research were left to go to the United States or elsewhere, which is not good enough. That is why I say to the minister in a spirit of kindness that these are loopholes in his department that must be plugged.

Another loophole in his department is the handling of mental health cases. The federal government does not contribute to the cost of beds in mental hospitals. It is a fact that 50 per cent of the hospital beds occupied in Canada today are filled by patients with mental disease. I would suggest that the government must do something to remedy this situation. The federal government should recognize support for mentally ill patients just as for physically ill patients. Are these people going to be covered under the medicare plan? At the moment the federal government does not contribute to the cost of their hospitalization or provide hospital beds. Are these people going to be ruled out under medicare? These questions must be answered and we must straighten out the position of these people.

• (9:30 p.m.)

There are a lot of other matters on which I could dwell but I will cut my speech a little short and go to the question of research. We are spending only $1 million on research into mental disease. I am sure that the minister knows as well as I do that we are spending, I think, $54 million in defence research and we are only spending $1 million for mentally ill people. The brain is the finest creation of the Creator, and it is not being accepted when a person, a physical being has anything wrong with hin, that money should be spent on him. One million dollars only is being spent on research in this field. When you think of the terrific economic loss that it means to the public and to the families of those people who are sick mentally, you realize that we should be spending $10 million or more on research into mental disease.

I want to say one thing more to the minister and then I shall expect some answers. I realize that this is a new department for the minister. I have always respected him and thought of him as a reasonable man. I will expect when he looks at this question of mental illness that he will come back to his estimates with an altogether different viewpoint than expressed in some of the things I have read. It seems to me that his attitude is to seek full medicare or 90 per cent medicare coverage by 1967. I shall have more to say about this to the minister. I will not say anything more now except that I think we are ten years behind where we ought to have been in starting medicare. I think we have not many potholes or loopholes to clear up, but we may be or going to get into trouble. We may break or do considerable harm to our medical profession. We may harm those who are carrying the load, which is another thing you have to think about, and lower seriously the medical standard that we now enjoy.

I would ask the minister from Nova Scotia if he knows what the president of the Nova Scotian medical society said? He said that the situation is so serious with regard to the shortage of doctors in general practice today

that, "We must consider shortening the course to four years." That comes from the minister's own province. I would submit to the minister that he talk to Dr. Gorman, who is very well known, to get some of his viewpoints on this very important subject.

I also want to say that we are spending about one hundredth per capita of the amount spent in the United States in research. We are away down the scale compared with most of the have countries of the world. We are away down the scale compared with Great Britain. Research in universities is the science that brings to light new products, new ideas, new drugs, that finds out new diseases and finds out how to treat and cure chronic diseases.

Research is of inestimable value. I want to point out that we are still benefiting from the research done by Banting and Best at the University of Toronto in 1923 in the discovery of insulin. If we do not want to remain hewers of wood and drawers of water we shall have to put money into research. So long as we are prepared to let the United States do our research, so long, Mr. Chairman, will we remain hewers of wood and drawers of water.

Mr. Knowles: Mr. Chairman, I welcome the minister to his new post in the Department of National Health and Welfare and I should like to congratulate the hon. member for Westmorland on her appointment as Parliamentary Secretary to the minister. I should also like to join with the minister in the tribute that he paid to the efficient and hard working staff that he has in his department. I have been around here now for a few years and I have got to know a few civil servants. It happens because of the committees I have been on and particular interests I have had that I have got to know the members of his staff, and the work that they do in a special way. I want to say that in my view his tribute to the work they do was well deserved.

I said at the outset that I welcomed the minister to his new department. I am sure that he will not be surprised if I remind him that in the department he left, he left behind a number of items of unfinished business. I will not recite them now because it would be out of order to do so. I recited them the other night when the estimates of the Department of Labour were before us. However, he is already aware of the fact that, if he left behind some items of unfinished business, he inherited some when he came into the Department of National Health and Welfare. I do not detract for a moment from the good job that his predecessor did, with a little help of course, in getting the Canada Pension Plan onto the statute books. However, there were a few items that even she was not able to accomplish in the last parliament.

Mainly, what I want to do in these few minutes in which I now choose to speak is to remind the minister of these items and to urge him to get cracking on them.

First of all, and I say this briefly because my colleague, the hon. member for Vancouver-Kingsway will deal with this as well as other matters in greater detail, he must not ever get the notion that the old age security pension can be left where it is, at $75 a month. The fact that this house made a decision the wrong way on a couple of motions earlier in this session does not settle the issue so far as the Canadian people are concerned. All the arguments that were used last session to the effect that the pension package would have been a better one if we had matched the Canada Pension Plan with $100 a month as the old age security pension not only still stand but are given greater force by the increase in the cost of living which has taken place since that time.

I urge the minister to realize that he simply must cope with this issue. It is just as urgent a matter as were the important matters that he had to deal with when he was Minister of Labour.

Mr. Churchill: May I ask a question?

Mr. Knowles: Certainly.

Mr. Churchill: Has not the minister already committed himself in the public speech that he made the other day?

Mr. MacEachen: No.

Mr. Knowles: I should like to talk about that later, but without transgressing on the ground that I know my colleague from Vancouver-Kingsway wants to cover I may say that in our view a pension increase should be an increase. There should not be any tests or strings tied to it. We will develop that later, but we think it would be a mistake if you spoiled the old age pension program that was built on a universal basis by having tests or strings attached to it.

The second item, Mr. Chairman, about which nothing has been done for a long time, although it has frequently been raised in this

house, is the question of the amount of the family allowance payments. It is true that the youth allowance was added in the last parliament, but the amounts that are paid under the Family Allowances Act are still those that were set when the legislation was first passed back in 1944. The only change made in all those years is that instead of having four rates there are only two. But those two rates are rates that were set in 1944 and came into effect on July 1, 1945. That is an item of unfinished business on which we will expect action from this minister.

The minister also knows that left over from the last session is the Canada Assistance Plan. I know that this leads us into questions of policy that are close to the question raised by the hon. member for Winnipeg South Centre a moment ago. At any rate, there certainly are some aspects of the Canada Assistance Plan which in my view would represent a forward step in social security, and I regret that no action was taken about this legislation at the last session.

• (9:40 p.m.)

As I recall the legislation it was promised it would be brought down last session. And I believe during the election campaign last fall two or three Liberal speakers referred to the Canada Assistance Plan as though it had actually been passed. Some of their research people had to let them know that it was merely on the list of things yet to be done. That is where it remains. We were told that the target date for this legislation to be in effect was April 1, 1966. Well, today is March 7 and the minister will obviously have to hurry up. I would remind him that this does happen to be a month in which there are 31 days. This gives him an extra day. He will know what I am referring to. Another item on the list was the health resources fund, the target date for which was January 1, 1966. This date has already gone by, so even the fact there are 31 days in March will not help the minister to meet that target.

These are in outline some of the items of unfinished business which this minister has inherited. If he is to earn the bouquets that are coming his way he must see to it that action is taken on all of them.

The other subject, the important one to which the hon. member for Simcoe East devoted the greater part of his remarks, is medicare. Though I have saved it to the last of the items which I am reciting tonight I hope the minister will recognize that it ought to have top priority in his scheme of things. I must say at the outset that I am in disagreement with the hon. member for Simcoe East. He will not be surprised at that. However, whereas he was trying to persuade the minister to depart from the medicare election promise of the last two or three campaigns, I stand here again to urge this Liberal Minister of National Health and Welfare to take steps to implement the promise which his party has made over the years.

Mr. Rynard: I wonder if I could make a correction? I said that we should have started this scheme 10 years ago. I am all in favour of this. But I want to fill up the potholes so that we will be ready to go ahead and not deceive the people. The hon. member could not have been listening to me.

Mr. Knowles: I was listening carefully. That was one of the points the hon. member made, and I made a note of it because I wanted to draw attention to the inconsistency of telling the government it was 10 years behind the times and then urging it to slow down, to wait another 10 years or another 47. I want to say what hardly needs to be said because it is a principle which has been recognized time and time again and it has been documented extremely well in the Hall report—that in this field of medicare there is no room for any kind of means test such as one finds in the plan which has been brought into effect in this province. In the Ontario plan a division is made between those who have one level of income and those who have another, thereby introducing into this important social legislation a basis of discrimination which will before long, I believe, prove just as damaging to the dignity of human beings as the means test was for the many years when it was applied to determine eligibility for old age pensions.

I urge the minister to face the fact that precisely because Ontario and other provinces have come along with inferior plans is no reason for the federal government to go slowly. On the contrary, this is all the more reason for the federal government to move faster. Indeed, the fact that some of the provinces have come in with other plans underlines the mistake which has been made by the federal government in delaying. Had action only been taken in this area a long time ago we should be a lot better off.

Speaking of the hon. member for Simcoe East and inconsistencies on his part to which I wanted to draw attention, I note he complained because Mr. King delayed for so

many years with regard to hospitalization as one aspect of national insurance—delayed and delayed until it was left to a Conservative government to implement the first hospital insurance plan. I think that for the record it should be pointed out that the Liberals brought in the legislation just before they were defeated in 1957 but it took the Conservatives to make the necessary amendments so that the legislation could be implemented.

The hon. member complained that Mr. King was so slow. But tonight he employs the very arguments that we used to hear from Mr. King. He used to tell us it was no use having hospital insurance until we had the hospital beds. Now, tonight, the hon. member who condemns Mr. King is saying it is no use having medicare until we have all the doctors and all the facilities necessary for carrying it out. I suggest that one of the things which led to an increase in the number of hospital beds and to the building of hospitals was precisely the growth of hospital insurance and I contend that the same would happen in the field of medicare. I urge the government not to retreat by one iota from the four points the Prime Minister laid down in July, 1965. Personally, and speaking for this party, I would like to see the Hall report implemented in full. But at least those four points which the Prime Minister laid down last July are good and provide a basis for a good medicare scheme in this country. Let me repeat them.

First, it was proposed that the contribution by the present government to provincial schemes would require that coverage in the province be universal; second, that the coverage would take into account the broad range of medical needs required; third, that the plan should be government operated; fourth, that the plan should be portable among the provinces of Canada. I suggest that nothing less than this is good enough and I urge that action on this kind of plan be taken during the present session.

The hon. member for Simcoe East, drawing attention to the change which had to be made in the Hospital Insurance and Diagnostic Services Act, reminded us of the fact that the Liberal government of the St. Laurent day stood for a long time on the position that it would not move into hospital insurance until a certain number of the provinces representing a certain portion of the population would enter this field. For some time the present government was taking a similar position with regard to medicare. Recently, however, the government has moved away from that position, and I hope it stays away from it.

What the government should do now, I strongly suggest, is to bring in this legislation, put it on the statute books and make it available to the provinces as they are prepared to come in, even if there are only two or three provinces at first. That is the only way in which hospital insurance got going and I suggest it is the only way in which medicare will get going. I am glad to get the minister's attention at this point. I urge him to take action on these lines. I hope he will not take the position that with the hon. member for Simcoe East urging him to go in one direction and the member for Winnipeg North Centre urging him to go in another, he can try to go down the middle. There is no middle way between a means test and universality; there is no middle way between a partial plan and full coverage. We suggest that if the government is worth its salt this is the area in which it must act during this session. I know that the minister and the former parliamentary secretary to the department, the hon. member for Hamilton East—the present parliamentary secretary has not been there long enough—do not like being reminded of the years, the decades, the eons of time it has taken to get action out of this government. We are talking about things which were started before those three, the see no evil, speak no evil, hear no evil trio over there, were even born. This is a fact we have had to live with, the myth that the Liberals would move in the direction of social progress.

• (9:50 p.m.)

The Canadian people have had to assume that because the Liberals were in power they were getting things that they were not getting at all. We think the time has gone for the Canadian people to be asked to live under that myth and that the time has come for action in this terribly important field of medicare.

The minister does not need to worry about the unfinished business he left behind in the Department of Labour. A new minister can take that on, but he has some pretty important items in this department upon which I hope he will act. I urge him to do so without delay.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Caouette: Mr. Chairman, while we are considering the estimates of the Department of National Health and Welfare, I wish for a few minutes to call the minister's attention on the statements we made and reiterated over and over again in the course of every

session, in particular since 1962, on the importance of increasing family allowances in accordance with the cost of living index.

We did the same thing or, rather, we took a different stand when the increase of parliamentary idemnities came to a vote.

Mr. Boulanger: This is demagogy.

Mr. Caouette: In spite of assertions that this is demagogy—and the hon. member for Mercier may go and say in his constituency that we are acting as demagogues—it still remains that parliamentary idemnities were raised from $10,000 to $18,000. On the other hand, family allowances have remained at the same level as in 1945, that is 21 years ago.

Today, the Quebec Minister of Health says that the province must get back family allowances, but nothing is being done.

The minister keeps mum about his plans and about a possible linking of family allowances to the cost-of-living index; indeed, the federal members of Parliament asked for an increase in the parliamentary indemnity because they said that the cost of living is not the same today, or was not the same last year, as it was in 1945 or 1950. Everybody knows that.

But, we, as legislators, must recognize that the cost of living, for our Canadian families, is not the same thing in 1966 as it was in 1950 or in 1945 either.

We voted for the motions for an increase for our aged people in Canada. We want family allowances to be related to the cost-of-living index.

In other areas, we frequently have to call on the Department of National Health and Welfare for subsidies to cultural centres in our section of the province. In this connection, the minister is not too much in a hurry. I understand that he has switched to another department. He did a wonderful job in the Department of Labour and I hope he will do the same in his new department.

Cultural centres exist not only in Montreal, Ottawa, Toronto, Winnipeg or Vancouver. Other parts of the province and of the country require the same attention from the federal authorities. And the hon. minister is surely conscious of those needs or, at least, we are bringing them to his attention.

Then, he must give us answers or try to do the impossible so that our constituencies may get a fair treatment.

Another point to which the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Knowles) just called the minister's attention is the famous medicare plan that for many years members of the New Democratic Party have been clamouring for and which was set up in Saskatchewan with great difficulty because of the manifold and real obstacles brought about by common sense and then, they had to change their mind.

What we suggest as a Canadian medical plan is called the health dividend. Instead of the government setting up a government insurance company which would employ doctors and tell them how to treat sick and disabled persons in Canada, or persons in need of a medical plan, we suggest that the government should issue a national health voucher to every Canadian family.

It could be $150 per family and from $90 to $100 per bachelor in the country. With this voucher, the Canadian citizen, family head or bachelor, could select his insurance company, the medical plans or plan already in existence. It can already be secured through private industry, from any insurance company, the *Artisans canadiens français,* The Canada Life, The Crown Life, The Mutual Life, The Sun Life, it doesn't matter which; all these companies are organized to assure people and provide them with medical insurance. It is available in group insurance.

Mr. Lewis: For profit motives.

Mr. Caouette: I hear the hon. member for York South say: "for profit motives". When the hon. member for York South needs a doctor, he is not concerned with the doctors' profits, because when he wants a doctor, it is the doctor he is interested in and not the doctor's profits. He is concerned with the care the doctor can give him.

It is natural for companies to make profits. When enthusiasm and initiative are taken away in a society, we retrogress instead of progressing. That is exactly what the member for York South wants to do; that is exactly what is happening in Russia, which we visited last year.

Mr. Chairman, that is not what we want. I think that the citizen should have freedom of choice with regard to medical insurance. He chooses the plan he wants; he chooses his doctor. That is what is important in a democracy: to give citizens freedom of choice.

The plan which we suggest, the health dividend, would mean insurance jor all citizens. It would cost the government about 35 to 40 per cent less than medicare or a national health insurance plan in Canada.

And that is what the people from the New Democratic Party and the social democratic party, or the socialist parties of Canada, cannot understand. What matters to them is that the government controls the individual in his home, in society, everywhere. This is not what we want. We want the individual to remain independent, people to be respected, and in order to give them that respect and security, they must have the financial means which to choose what they want, because it is the human being himself who has to determine what must be done and what is good for him. It does not rest with the government to do that for him. Let us respect that freedom.

An hon. Member: It is ten o'clock.

Another hon. Member: Ten o'clock.

Mr. Caouette: Mr. Chairman, I am told that it is ten o'clock; I want to call your attention to this fact.

The Chairman: Shall item 1 carry?

Carried.

An hon. Member: Ten o'clock.

Mr. Caouette: Mr. Chairman, may I ask you to call it ten o'clock.

[*English*]

Resolutions adopted in committee of supply this day reported and concurred in.

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE

Mr. McIlraith: Mr. Speaker, when we finish the estimates tomorrow I should like to call item No. 16, the motion to set up the joint committee of the Senate and the House of Commons to consider penitentiary matters; item No. 18, the motion for the joint committee on consumer credit; item No. 21, the motion for the joint committee on the parliamentary restaurant, and item No. 11, second reading of the bill to extend the Bank Act, not necessarily in that order. This is a short bill which merely extends the time to permit consideration of the amending bank legislation.

• (10:00 p.m.)

Mr. Arnold Peters (Timiskaming): Mr. Speaker, may I ask the house leader what consideration has been given to the establishment of a joint committee on divorce?

Mr. McIlraith: Mr. Speaker, that matter is under consideration now. The suggestion has come from the other place that, instead of having the private members' bills considered by the standing committee of the House of Commons on Justice and Legal Affairs, we should withdraw them from that committee and have them considered by a joint committee of the Senate and the House of Commons. It is a matter of having the necessary resolution put on the order paper and if there is general agreement in the house, or appears to be, having them withdrawn from the committee on Justice and Legal Affairs to be referred to the new joint committee.

[*Translation*]

PROCEEDINGS ON ADJOURNMENT MOTION

A motion to adjourn the house under provisional standing order 39A deemed to have been moved.

AGRICULTURE—INQUIRY CONCERNING NEW DAIRY POLICY

Mr. Clément Vincent (Nicolet-Yamaska): Mr. Speaker, last week, in terms which are quite in fashion these days, I put the following question to the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Greene):

> As the new dairy year is starting in a few days, is the minister in a position to tell us where we stand in the count-down before the launching or the placing into orbit of the new dairy policy which is intended to guarantee Canadian milk producers a minimum price of $4 per hundredweight for industrial milk?

Mr. Speaker, you know that the dairy industry in eastern Canada is of vital significance to the farm economy of this country, and particularly to our farmers and dairy producers. We also know that dairy producers in the eastern section of this country are most anxious to hear about this new policy which was supposed to be announced very soon.

Tonight, I shall try to give the hon. parliamentary secretary to the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Beer) the dates on which the dairy policies were announced since 1958-59.

During those years the dairy year began on May 1, but we all know that last year, the former Minister of Agriculture anticipated by one month the start of the dairy year 1965-66.

For the year 1958-59, the new dairy policy was announced on April 7. For the year starting May 1, for the period 1959-60, the policy was announced on April 23; for the year 1960-61, which started on May 1, the policy was announced on April 13.

In 1961, the policy was announced on April 20, for the year 1961-62 starting on May 1.

In 1962, the policy was announced on March 22. It was revised on April 9, 1962, and on April 27, the policy for the dairy year 1962-63 was again revised.

In 1963, the policy for the dairy year starting May 1 was announced on April 29, and it will be remembered that, on that occasion, hon. members representing rural counties had received numerous petitions and protests from dairy producers who had been informed of the new dairy policy only a few hours before the new dairy year.

In 1963, we could expect a late date, because a general election had been held on April 8 and the minister had just then been appointed. But in 1964, the policy was announced on April 29, a few hours before the new dairy year, that is on May 1.

Last year the policy was announced on March 26, and this was an improvement, although it was announced a month and a few days before the beginning of the new dairy year. In spite of that, last year protests were raised against the policy and we could read in the Canadian press, more especially in the *Terre de Chez Nous,* some editorials of this kind:

After enticing but vague promises will there be disappointing and harsh facts?

Mr. Speaker, I am interested tonight, as are all hon. members and especially the dairy producers, in knowing—and I think the Parliamentary Secretary will be in a position to give us an idea—when the dairy policy for the new year will be announced in the house, so that we may discuss it and make our proposals before it is brought into force.

[*English*]

Mr. Bruce S. Beer (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Agriculture): Mr. Speaker, I wish to thank the hon. members for directing his question concerning the dairy policy of the government to me at this particular time. He mentioned that he was patiently awaiting the introduction of the new dairy policy of the government. I can readily understand why he would be patiently awaiting the new dairy policy of this government and permit me to review briefly the dairy policy which has been in effect.

The government has had four main objectives for its dairy policy: First, to balance production and consumption; second, to remove the surplus of butter which existed when this government took office, a surplus of some 239 million pounds; third, to increase the production of cheese for which there was a very strong export demand. I know the hon. member will be gratified at having learned in the last year or so that production and consumption have been brought in line and we have been able to increase our production and export of cheese by some 20 per cent. The fourth objective is to improve the price that farmers receive for their milk.

The hon. member will be gratified of course to reflect on the fact that prior to this government taking office the average price farmers received for milk was in the neighbourhood of $3 or a little less and last year farmers in Canada received an average of $3.50. It will be the objective of this government to see that farmers receive a maximum price for their milk at the farm of something about the $3.50 level. This is our aim. I can only tell the hon. member at this particular time that the policy will be announced by the minister in due course. I am sure he awaits it with anticipation and will greet it with great satisfaction.

CANADIAN CENTENNIAL—SUGGESTED RESTORATION OF GRAVE OF D'ARCY McGEE

• (10:10 p.m.)

Mr. B. S. Mackasey (Verdun): Mr. Speaker, the fact that I am grand marshal of the Irishmen's parade this year and that tonight I am speaking about D'Arcy McGee is no coincidence. In this day of communication I think the average youngster is more familiar with the exploits of Davey Crockett than he is with La Verendrye, Radisson, LaSalle and other men whose careers were much more exciting than Davey Crockett's. I think it is safe to say that most high school students are more familiar with the assassination of Abraham Lincoln than they are with the assassination of one of the Fathers of Confederation, Thomas D'Arcy McGee. He was assassinated by a Fenian known as Whelan.

Thomas D'Arcy McGee was first elected to parliament in 1858 as an independent, sponsored at that time by the St. Patrick Society. In a moment of weakness he became a Conservative and it has taken the Irish almost 98 years to forget that blemish on his character.

On the day that Thomas D'Arcy McGee was buried in Montreal one of the largest funerals in Canadian history took place, which is a tribute to the fine relationship that existed between the Irish and French speaking Montrealers. The funeral took place first at St. Patrick's Cathedral and then proceeded

to Notre Dame Cathedral to be repeated. Since then his body has rested at the Côte des Neiges cemetery in Montreal. The tombstone that marks his resting place was, to the best of the knowledge of the historians of the Montreal area, paid for by a family named Wilson and has been maintained through the years by the St. Patrick Society of Montreal. That society has informed me that his tombstone, because of the type of stone used almost 100 years ago, has reached the point where it should be replaced in a fitting manner.

I notice the Minister of Trade and Commerce is in the chamber. Although I am a great supporter of Expo '67, I think in the final analysis our centennial celebration will be of more lasting benefit to Canada than Expo '67. I would therefore urge the Secretary of State that as one of our centennial achievements the federal government should absorb the cost of providing a suitable tombstone for the grave of Thomas D'Arcy McGee. I realize that the Parliamentary Secretary will probably tell me that the proper procedure is for the city of Montreal to sponsor this, with the federal government paying a portion of the cost. I immediately must state that the memory of Thomas D'Arcy McGee does not belong to Montreal and does not belong to the St. Patrick Society. That memory is not the exclusive property of the Irish Canadians of this country but belongs to all Canadians. He was a Father of Confederation and as such I think the federal government has a duty and, in many ways, a privilege to provide a tombstone for the grave of Thomas D'Arcy McGee as a part of our centennial celebrations next year.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Albert Béchard (Parliamentary Secretary to Secretary of State): Mr. Speaker, the hon. member for Verdun (Mr. Mackasey) certainly deserves our congratulations and our admiration for having recalled, on the eve of the centennial of the Confederation, and carried away by his patriotism, the memory of one of the most brilliant speakers of our Parliamentary history, a polished writer and a fine poet, a great administrator, one of the Fathers of Confederation: Thomas D'Arcy McGee, born in the green Erin. My hon. friend's plea comes very appropriately just in time to support a recent request made by the Saint Patrick's Society of Montreal.

The hon. member may be pleased to learn that under a federal-provincial program of per capita grants sponsored by the centennial commission, funds are available for carrying out the type of project he proposes. However, under this program, all requests must first be approved by the provinces and then obtain the approval of the centennial commission.

In the present case, it is not presumptuous to state that the commission would look with favour upon such a request. In fact, the centennial commission recently received a similar project from the Prince Edward Island authorities and it is about to grant its approval.

In closing, may I remind my hon. colleague that a project exists which was announced in 1964 by the Boy Scouts of Canada, with the financial assistance of the centennial commission. Under this project, the boy scouts are responsible for inspecting the tombs of all the Fathers of Confederation, for reporting in what condition they are and for undertaking to restore them if need be.

Once that work is finished, the boy scouts will lay wreaths during the year 1967 and organize ceremonies to which will be invited all the descendants of the Fathers of Confederation, to whom we owe our constitution.

[*English*]

Motion agreed to and the house adjourned at 10.18 p.m.

[The following items were passed in Committee of Supply this day:]

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

Legal and other services—

1. Administration including the office of the superintendent of bankruptcy, grants and contributions as detailed in the estimates, gratuities to the widows or such dependents as may be approved by treasury board of judges who die while in office and authority to make recoverable advances for the administration of justice on behalf of the governments of the Northwest Territories and the Yukon Territory, $2,504,300.

1b. Administration—to extend Justice Vote 1 of the main estimates, 1965-66 for the purposes set out in the sub-vote title relating to a committee on corrections and in the sub-vote title relating to the "statute revision commission", to include grants as detailed in the estimates and to provide a further amount of, $224,100.

1d. Administration, including grants and contributions as detailed in the estimates, $15,424.

5. Combines Investigation Act—Administration, $837,500.

Correctional services—

10. Administration, operation and maintenance including compensation to discharged inmates permanently disabled while in penitentiaries, $28,207,400.

15. Construction or acquisition of buildings, works, land and equipment, $25,622,000.

15d. Construction or acquisition of buildings, works, land and equipment, $2,800,000.

DEPARTMENT OF CITIZENSHIP AND IMMIGRATION

1. Departmental administration, $1,257,800.

1b. Departmental administration, $99,600.

Citizenship—

5. Administration, operation and maintenance including grants and contributions for language instruction and citizenship promotion, and grants to organizations as detailed in the estimates, $2,044,500.

5b. Administration, operation and maintenance including grants and contributions for language instruction and citizenship promotion, $25,000.

Immigration—

10. Administration, operation and maintenance including trans-oceanic and inland transportation and other assistance for immigrants and settlers subject to the approval of treasury board, including care en route and while awaiting employment; and payments to the provinces, pursuant to agreements entered into, with the approval of the Governor in Council, in respect of expenses incurred by the provinces for indigent immigrants and $20,000 for grants to immigrant welfare organizations, $13,898,000.

10d. Administration, operation and maintenance including trans-oceanic and inland transportation and other assistance for immigrants and settlers subject to the approval of treasury board, including care en route and while awaiting employment; and payments to the provinces, pursuant to agreements entered into, with the approval of the Governor in Council, in respect of expenses incurred by the provinces for indigent immigrants, $700,000.

APPENDIX

COMMUNIQUÉ FOLLOWING JOINT CANADA-U.S. MINISTERIAL MEETING

The Tenth Meeting of the Joint United States-Canadian Committee on Trade and Economic Affairs was held in Washington, D.C., March 4-5, 1966.

As background to the discussions on trade and economic matters, the United States Secretary of State and the Canadian Secretary of State for External Affairs reviewed. major recent international developments.

The Committee exchanged views on current developments in the closely related economies of the two countries, noting with satisfaction that both had achieved a record of sustained economic expansion unparalleled in their histories and they looked forward to another year of strong growth. They recognized, however, that maintaining price and cost stability will require close and continuing attention.

The Committee discussed the balance of payments of both countries. They recognized that decisive progress had been made toward reducing the United States balance of payments deficit and reviewed the measures being taken to bring the United States external accounts into balance. In this connection, the Committee noted the measures that have been taken to maintain access to the United States capital market for an unlimited amount of new Canadian securities free of the Interest Equalization Tax. The United States members reaffirmed that, in buying such issues, U.S. investors were completely free to be guided by market considerations.

Canadian Ministers expressed their concern over the possible implications for Canada of the United States voluntary program on direct investment and the relation of this program to the position of Canadian subsidiaries of U.S. corporations. The United States members made clear that the U.S. Government was not requesting U.S. corporations to induce their Canadian subsidiaries to act in any ways that differed from their normal business practices as regards the repatriation of earnings, purchasing and sales policies, or their other financial and commercial activities. United States members re-emphasized the view that United States subsidiaries abroad should behave as good citizens of the country where they are located. Where U.S. companies were in doubt as to these views, the U.S. Government would ensure that any misunderstandings would be dispelled.

The Canadian Ministers expressed serious concern that proposed Securities and Exchange Commission regulations would subject to United States law Canadian companies not deliberately seeking to sell securities in the United States if their shares had happened to be purchased by United States residents. These regulations, moreover, would discriminate against Canadian companies by imposing more severe requirements relative to other foreign companies. Canadian Ministers referred to plans under way in Canada to improve the disclosure of information regarding Canadian enterprises and the regulation of the issue of securities. They strongly urged that the United States authorities refrain from applying these SEC regulations to Canadian companies which do not seek to sell their securities in the United States. The United States members appreciated the concern of the Government of Canada and assured the Canadian members that the most careful consideration would be given to Canadian views in an effort to work out at an early date mutually satisfactory arrangements.

The Committee discussed United States foreign assets controls as they may affect the exports of companies in Canada. The United States members reaffirmed their readiness to consult promptly on any transactions of importance to Canada which are affected by United States foreign assets control. They also stated that regulations over exports of technical data are being revised and that, in light of the Committee's discussions, further consideration will be given to the possibilities of additional modifications of the regulations.

The Committee discussed a number of specific bilateral trade and financial matters on both sides, including Canadian cheddar cheese and Canadian oil exports to the United States, and agreed to keep them under review. The Committee agreed that a joint examination should be made of trade in agricultural implements, tractors, and aircraft for which tariff liberalization would be most important.

They agreed that the removal of unnecessary restrictions on the free flow of goods and services across the border would contribute importantly to the continued prosperity of both countries. The Committee recognized that the Automotive Agreement represents a long stride toward free trade in a basic industry of major importance to the two countries and had resulted in a substantial increase in two-way trade to the benefit of production and employment both in Canada and the United States. Greater benefits are to be expected as industry in both countries adjust their operations to take full advantage of the opportunities afforded by the Agreement.

In the area of international economic relations, the Committee agreed that the Kennedy Round negotiations in Geneva provided an unparalleled opportunity for the substantial liberalization of world trade, which would benefit all participating countries —developing as well as developed. The Committee, therefore, concluded that the highest priority must be given to the timely completion of these negotiations which are now entering their critical phase. They agreed that the Canadian and U.S. delegations would continue to work closely together in the interest of a successful conclusion of the Kennedy Round negotiations, including the negotiation of a world cereals agreement in which the two North American exporting countries have a strong common interest.

The Committee reviewed the trade and development problems of the developing countries particularly in food and agriculture. They noted the food needs in India and the steps being taken by the Indian Government to deal with the problem. Although both countries were providing assistance to India and other developing countries, they noted that more would be needed during the period ahead from other countries. The Canadian members informed the Committee of Canada's recent decision to make available to India a substantially larger amount of food aid.

The Committee discussed the consultative arrangements between the two Governments in the light of the Heeney-Merchant report and agreed on the importance of close and effective working relationships between the two Governments.

The Committee took note of the importance of the work on improving the international monetary system being undertaken by the International Monetary Fund and the Deputies of the Group of Ten. They expressed the hope that the Deputies will be able to reach agreement on a constructive report to the Ministers, which would permit further negotiations on a broader basis.

The Ministers noted with concern the serious problem of pollution of Lake Erie, Lake Ontario and the international section of the St. Lawrence River, as described in the recent Interim Report to the Canadian and the United States Governments by the International Joint Commission. They recorded their support for the recommendations in the report and agreed that efforts in both countries should be coordinated to deal with this problem as a matter of urgency.

The Canadian Delegation was led by the Honourable Paul Martin, Secretary of State for External Affairs, and included the Honourable Robert Winters, Minister of Trade and Commerce; the Honourable Mitchell Sharp, Minister of Finance; the Honourable Charles M. Drury, Minister of Industry; the Honourable Jean-Luc Pepin, Minister of Mines and Technical Surveys; the Honourable John J. Greene, Minister of Agriculture; Louis Rasminsky, Governor of the Bank of Canada; Sydney D. Pierce, Chief Canadian Trade Negotiator; the Honourable C.S.A. Ritchie, Canadian Ambassador to the United States, and advisers.

The United States Delegation was headed by the Honourable Dean Rusk, Secretary of State, and included the Honourable Henry H. Fowler, Secretary of the Treasury, the Honourable John T. Connor, Secretary of Commerce; the Honourable Orville Freeman, Secretary of Agriculture; John A. Carver, Jr., Under Secretary of the Department of Interior; Thomas C. Mann, Under Secretary of State for Economic Affairs; the Honourable Christian A. Herter, the President's Special Representative for Trade Negotiations; the Honourable Gardner Ackley, Chairman of the Council of Economic Advisers; the Honourable W. Walton Butterworth, American Ambassador to Canada, and advisers.

HOUSE OF COMMONS

Tuesday, March 8, 1966

The house met at 2.30 p.m.

ST. CROIX RIVER BRIDGE

STRUCTURE TO CONNECT NEW BRUNSWICK AND MAINE

Hon. Paul Martin (Secretary of State for External Affairs) moved the first reading of Bill No. S-15 (from the Senate), to authorize the construction of a bridge across the St. Croix River between the province of New Brunswick and the state of Maine.

Motion agreed to and bill read the first time.

LABOUR CONDITIONS

PRESSURE TO INCLUDE HALIFAX, SAINT JOHN AND FREDERICTON IN DESIGNATED AREAS

On the orders of the day:

Right Hon. J. G. Diefenbaker (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, I should like to direct a question to the Minister of Industry in connection with designated areas. May I ask him whether he has received any communication or complaint from Mr. John R. O'Dea, president of the Atlantic provinces economic council, wherein he presses strongly for inclusion of the metropolitan areas of Halifax, Saint John and Fredericton in the Atlantic designated areas? Is the government giving any reconsideration to such designation in order to meet the serious situation regarding employment and the lack of it in the three particular metropolitan areas to which I have referred?

Hon. C. M. Drury (Minister of Industry): Mr. Speaker, I have not, to my recollection, received any representations from Mr. O'Dea. I rather imagine that he would be addressing his remarks to the government of Nova Scotia. I think the right hon. gentleman was probably speaking loosely of his knowledge of distressing employment conditions in Halifax, Saint John and Fredericton.

Mr. Thomas M. Bell (Saint John-Albert): A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Would the minister say once and for all, yes or no, whether these cities are in or out of the area industrial incentive plan, particularly in view of the fact that Nova Scotia has introduced its own legislation to deal with the matter? Unfortunately in New Brunswick—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

Mr. Bell (Saint John-Albert): —we have a premier who is not interested in this question.

Mr. Speaker: Order. The hon. member for Burnaby-Coquitlam.

Mr. Diefenbaker: Mr. Speaker, the minister was ready to make an answer, and if he had not answered my question—

Mr. Speaker: Order. The hon. member had what appeared to be a valid question until he ruled himself out of order by adding comments and making statements.

Mr. Bell (Saint John-Albert): Then may I rephrase my question. Will the minister state definitely whether these cities have any hope of being included in the incentive plan this season?

Mr. Drury: Mr. Speaker, I do not know the three cities in question nearly as well as the hon. gentleman does, and he perhaps is in a better position than I to tell what their hopes may or may not be.

[*Later:*]

Mr. Robert C. Coates (Cumberland): Mr. Speaker, I wish to direct a question to the Prime Minister which is supplementary to questions asked earlier today. In view of the fact that there is a continuing appeal for the inclusion of the whole Atlantic area under the designated area policy, will the Prime Minister give consideration to reconsidering the government's policy in this regard?

Right Hon. L. B. Pearson (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, I have nothing to add to what the Minister of Industry has said. My hon. friend should be grateful for what has been done for the Atlantic area in this respect.

Mr. Bell (Saint John-Albert): As a supplementary question, will the Prime Minister direct the Atlantic Development Board to take this matter under advisement, as was indicated by him to the delegation from maritime cities a short while ago?

Inquiries of the Ministry

INDUSTRY

HAMILTON, ONT.—CESSATION OF OPERATIONS OF STUDEBAKER COMPANY

On the orders of the day:

Mr. T. C. Douglas (Burnaby-Coquitlam): Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Minister of Industry. I want to ask him, since the matter was raised yesterday, whether he has been in touch with the officials of the Studebaker Company regarding the closing of their auto manufacturing plant in Hamilton, and has he as a result of any discussions with them any proposals as to what can be done to prevent this plant being closed?

Hon. C. M. Drury (Minister of Industry): Mr. Speaker, I think I mentioned yesterday—I am sorry the hon. gentleman did not hear it—that the Department of Industry was canvassing the possibilities with Studebaker and other companies as to possible alternative industrial uses of the property. At the same time the Minister of Citizenship and Immigration has sent some of his officials to Hamilton to make a survey of the labour that might be available for alternative employment as a consequence of Studebaker closing its operations.

Mr. Douglas: Mr. Speaker, I have a supplementary question. Do I take it from the minister's remarks that no investigation is being made into the possibility of continuing the Studebaker plant as an auto manufacturing company?

Mr. Drury: There have been discussions with Studebaker as to this possibility but I regret that it does not seem to be a likely one.

Mr. E. Nasserden (Rosthern): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Prime Minister supplementary to one already asked. What action is the government taking to keep in Canada the automotive employees of the Studebaker plant?

Right Hon. L. B. Pearson (Prime Minister): This question has already been answered, Mr. Speaker. Everything possible is being done.

Mr. Nasserden: I wonder whether the Prime Minister would tell us one or two things—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

LABOUR CONDITIONS

PROSPECTIVE LAY-OFF OF FORD WORKERS

On the orders of the day:

Mr. H. E. Gray (Essex West): Mr. Speaker, I have a supplementary question for the Minister of Citizenship and Immigration. Is he in a position to report on the team that was sent to investigate the tool and die situation at the Ford Motor Company in Windsor?

Hon. Jean Marchand (Minister of Citizenship and Immigration): Not yet, Mr. Speaker.

[*Translation*]

ADMINISTRATION OF JUSTICE

MUNSINGER INVESTIGATION—REQUEST FOR JUDICIAL INQUIRY

On the orders of the day:

Mr. Réal Caouette (Villeneuve): Mr. Speaker, I wish to put a question to the right hon. Prime Minister. Since the whole Spencer case will be reviewed by the judge appointed by the government, can the right hon. Prime Minister tell us if this judge will also be authorized to look into the Munsinger case, so that the Canadian people and parliament might get definite information on this case?

[*English*]

Right Hon. L. B. Pearson (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, the order in council which has been tabled indicates the work that the commission is expected to do.

EXTERNAL AFFAIRS

PAKISTAN—POSSIBILITY OF SUPPLYING WHEAT FLOUR IN AID

On the orders of the day:

Mr. H. A. Olson (Medicine Hat): Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the Secretary of State for External Affairs. According to the *Globe and Mail* this morning, Mr. Speaker, a senior spokesman for the Department of External Affairs claims that when Pakistan authorities approached Canada for aid on February 10, they were advised that no wheat would be available until July, but that there was wheat flour available almost immediately. Can the Secretary of State for External Affairs tell the house whether any further steps have been taken to provide Pakistan with wheat flour in response to this request for aid?

Hon. Paul Martin (Secretary of State for External Affairs): Mr. Speaker, as I indicated yesterday, this matter is under review at the moment. I would think that some day this week I will be able to give a more definitive reply.

TRADE

REFUSAL TO MILL WHEAT FOR EXPORT

On the orders of the day:

Mr. Eldon M. Woolliams (Bow River): My question is directed to the Minister of Finance. I wonder if the minister would advise the House of Commons if flour mills allegedly owned by firms in the United States are milling flour which can be exported overseas, or are the mills I have referred to still refusing to mill wheat for export?

Hon. Mitchell Sharp (Minister of Finance): Mr. Speaker, I think all mills in Canada are engaged upon the export business to various destinations.

Mr. Diefenbaker: Oh no, no.

Mr. Woolliams: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. I asked a specific question. Are those mills that are owned by United States firms and operating in Canada milling wheat for export, or are they still refusing to mill it?

Mr. Sharp: Mr. Speaker, so far as I know, no mills of any kind have refused all business for export, although some of them, I gather, have been reluctant to accept orders for some particular destinations.

Mr. Woolliams: A further supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. What are those particular destinations? Are they Russia or China?

FINANCE

STEPS TO CORRECT CURRENT ACCOUNT DEFICIT WITH U.S.

On the orders of the day:

Hon. George Hees (Northumberland): My question is addressed to the Minister of Finance. In view of the fact that Canada's current account deficit with the United States for the first nine months of 1965 was $1.3 billion, and it is estimated that the figure will be between $1.7 and $1.8 billion for the whole year—

Some hon. Members: Order.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. I hesitate to send the hon. member to the penalty box but from the way in which the question is framed I would think it could not be answered at this moment. The hon. member knows that questions should attempt not to convey information but should rather seek information.

Mr. Hees: I will rephrase my question. I might point out that the figure I quoted came from the Dominion Bureau of Statistics.

Some hon. Members: Order.

Mr. Hees: In view of the information I have just given the minister—

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh.

Mr. Hees: —will the hon. gentleman advise the United States secretary of the treasury of the guide lines which the Canadian government intends to impose to overcome this most serious situation.

Hon. Mitchell Sharp (Minister of Finance): I am still not sure what it is that the hon. member is asking me—

Some hon. Members: Oh.

Mr. Sharp: —but may I say that the United States was fully informed about Canada's position at the recent meetings, and I think the outcome was eminently successful.

[*Translation*]

SUGGESTED TRANSFERS OF FUNDS BY SUBSIDIARIES OF U.S. INSURANCE COMPANIES

On the orders of the day:

Mr. Gilles Grégoire (Lapointe): Mr. Speaker, I should like to direct a supplementary question to the Minister of Finance and Receiver General (Mr. Sharp). Could he tell us whether subsidiaries of American insurance companies doing business in Canada have asked for transfers of funds from Canada to the United States recently?

[*English*]

Mr. Sharp: I should like to take that question as notice.

OLD AGE SECURITY

REQUEST FOR STATEMENT ON INCREASED PENSIONS

On the orders of the day:

Mr. Eric A. Winkler (Grey-Bruce): I should like to ask the Prime Minister if he is prepared to make some announcement to the house now regarding an increase in old age security pensions.

FISHERIES

SEAL HUNT—POSSIBILITY OF INCREASED QUOTAS

On the orders of the day:

Mr. J. R. Tucker (Trinity-Conception): My question is directed to the Minister of Fisheries. In view of the many questions which have been asked by members of this house regarding the seal fishery and the interest taken by so many Canadians in this activity, will the minister advise us whether he is in a position to report on his trip to the seal fishery and whether, in view of the large

quantity of seals spotted, he is considering increasing the quota from its present level of 50,000?

Mr. Speaker: Order. It is my understanding that the house in committee will be considering the estimates of the Department of Fisheries this afternoon. The hon. member might ask his question at that time.

DRUGS

POSSIBLE PROHIBITION OF SALE OF ANTIBIOTIC THROAT LOZENGES

On the orders of the day:

Hon. J. W. Monteith (Perth): I should like to direct a question to the Minister of National Health and Welfare. Will the minister be taking action along the lines taken today by the United States food and drug directorate in ordering a sweeping removal of all antibiotic throat lozenges on the ground that they do not serve any useful purpose and are, in fact, dangerous to health?

Mr. Speaker: This is a very general question and it appears to me the matter is not so urgent that it might not be placed on the order paper.

Mr. Monteith: Oh no, this action was taken just this morning by the United States food and drug directorate.

Mr. Speaker: Perhaps the event to which the hon. member has referred did happen this morning, but the action he is now suggesting the government might take does not appear so urgent that his question should be asked at this moment. That is the suggestion I make to the hon. member.

[*Translation*]

EXTERNAL AFFAIRS

NATO—POSSIBILITY OF REFORM AS REQUESTED BY GENERAL DE GAULLE

On the orders of the day:

Mr. Gérard Laprise (Chapleau): Mr. Speaker, may I put a question to the Secretary of State for External Affairs?

Could the minister tell the house whether he received a message recently from General de Gaulle about NATO reorganization as suggested by France?

Hon. Paul Martin (Secretary of State for External Affairs): Mr. Speaker, we have not yet received any letter.

[Mr. Tucker.]

[*English*]

HEALTH AND WELFARE

MEDICARE—POSSIBLE SHORTAGE OF DOCTORS

On the orders of the day:

Mr. Heward Grafftey (Brome-Missisquoi): Mr. Speaker, the urgency of my question is based on the fact that the government has plans relating to medicare. I would like to ask the Minister of National Health and Welfare if recently—and I underline the word recently—the government has received information to the effect that Canada will soon be faced with a grave shortage of doctors?

Mr. Speaker: Order please. The question may be very urgent but I bring to the attention of the hon. member that we will also be considering the estimates of the Department of National Health and Welfare later on this afternoon.

DEFENCE PRODUCTION

R.C.A.F. OVERHAUL AND REPAIR CONTRACTS

On the orders of the day:

Hon. D. S. Harkness (Calgary North): Mr. Speaker, I should like to direct a question to the Minister of Defence Production. Is it correct that overhaul and repair contracts for the R.C.A.F. have been grouped into three categories and have been let to three large corporations, two of which are American subsidiaries, with the result that a considerable number of smaller Canadian companies, which are dependent for their existence on this work, are now going to have to close down?

Hon. C. M. Drury (Minister of Industry): Mr. Speaker, I would like to take notice of that question.

THE MINISTRY

POSSIBILITY OF REMOVAL OF UNILINGUAL MINISTERS

On the orders of the day:

Mr. S. J. Korchinski (Mackenzie): Mr. Speaker, may I direct a question to the Prime Minister. Can we expect the Prime Minister to announce cabinet changes to eliminate unilingual ministers, in view of the statement by the Minister of Mines and Technical Surveys that no civil servant can expect to attain a senior position unless he is bilingual?

Mr. Speaker: Order please.

THE BUDGET

INQUIRY AS TO PROBABLE DATE OF PRESENTATION

On the orders of the day:

Mr. Reid Scott (Danforth): Mr. Speaker, I wish to direct a question to the Minister of Finance. Is the minister in a position to advise the house as to the date on which he will be bringing down his budget?

Hon. Mitchell Sharp (Minister of Finance): Mr. Speaker, I am not quite in that position but I hope to be able to make an announcement shortly.

[*Later:*]

Hon. Michael Starr (Ontario): Mr. Speaker, I have a question which I should like to address to the Minister of Finance. Has he yet set a date on which he expects to bring down his budget, and if not can he state whether it is going to be before Easter?

Mr. Speaker: It seems to me this question was asked earlier today.

BANKRUPTCY

APPOINTMENT OF SPECIAL INVESTIGATORS

On the orders of the day:

Mr. Erik Nielsen (Yukon): Mr. Speaker, may I direct a question to the Acting Minister of Justice and ask whether the government has retained or appointed Mr. Jules Chicoine of Montreal, and Staff Sergeant Frederick Plummer of Ottawa as special investigators into bankruptcy rackets in Ontario and Quebec?

Hon. L. T. Pennell (Acting Minister of Justice): I would like to take the question as notice, Mr. Speaker.

EXTERNAL AFFAIRS

SUGGESTED DISCONTINUANCE OF EMBARRASSING PRESS RELEASES

On the orders of the day:

Hon. Gordon Churchill (Winnipeg South Centre): Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the Secretary of State for External Affairs if he will give an assurance that press releases from the Department of External Affairs will not be devised in the future in such a way as to cause acute embarrassment to his colleagues?

Hon. Paul Martin (Secretary of State for External Affairs): Mr. Speaker, I cannot believe my hon. friend would think there would be any release from a department over which I would preside that would have that intention.

Mr. Starr: You read it in the house.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Mongrain: Mr. Speaker, I wish to rise on a question of privilege.

Mr. Speaker: Order. The hon. member could perhaps raise his question of privilege when the question period is over.

[*English*]

CANADIAN ECONOMY

REQUEST FOR REPORT ON INCREASED COST OF LIVING

On the orders of the day:

Mr. E. Nasserden (Rosthern): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Prime Minister. Has the Prime Minister received a report from the cabinet committee set up to study the continuing, alarming increase in the cost of living?

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Cumberland.

[*Translation*]

EXTERNAL AFFAIRS

ORGANIZATION OF MEETING OF TRUCE COMMISSION

On the orders of the day:

Mr. Gérard Laprise (Chapleau): Mr. Speaker, may I put another question to the Secretary of State for External Affairs?

Could he tell the house if the purpose of Mr. Chester Ronning's trip to Viet Nam is to arrange an early meeting between Canada, India and Poland and whether we can hope that such a meeting may take place soon?

Hon. Paul Martin (Secretary of State for External Affairs): Mr. Speaker, I would appreciate it if the hon. member did not ask that question at this time.

[*English*]

HOUSE OF COMMONS

REQUEST FOR REPORT OF COMMITTEE ON ELECTION EXPENSES

On the orders of the day:

Mr. Andrew Brewin (Greenwood): Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct a question to the Prime Minister. Earlier this session the Prime Minister told the house that the committee on election expenditures—I think that

is the right name—was expected to report this month, in March. Can the Prime Minister tell us whether he has inquired into this lately, and whether that report is likely to be made soon?

Right Hon. L. B. Pearson (Prime Minister): Yes, Mr. Speaker. I inquired the other day. I understand the report is practically completed but there remains the translation and printing of it.

WATER RESOURCES

CANADA-U.S. MINISTERIAL MEETING—GREAT LAKES POLLUTION

On the orders of the day:

Hon. E. D. Fulton (Kamloops): Mr. Speaker, may I ask the Minister of Mines and Technical Surveys whether he is in a position to give an outline to the house of his discussion with members of the U.S. government last week with respect to the urgent problem of pollution on the Great Lakes, which the minister told us he was going to take up with them, and with respect to the effects of a law of the United States Congress authorizing a study of the waters tributary to the Great Lakes?

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member is now asking for a lengthy statement on the part of the minister and this cannot be asked at this time.

Mr. Fulton: Mr. Speaker, I was asking whether the minister was in a position to make a report on the matter. The minister can make his report as short or as long as he wishes, so long as it is factual.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member is asking for a report, which report normally would not be expected to be made at this time.

Mr. G. H. Aiken (Parry Sound-Muskoka): Mr. Speaker, I have a supplementary question. Has the minister as yet had any discussion with either the Ontario of Quebec governments concerning the question of pollution?

Hon. Jean-Luc Pepin (Minister of Mines and Technical Surveys): Mr. Speaker, a meeting was held yesterday in my office with the Ontario Minister of Energy and Resources, and his officials. At that time we discussed mostly projects having to do with the Canada Water Conservation Assistance Act. At the end of the meeting there was the beginning of a discussion on pollution, and this discussion is to be followed up in two weeks time.

[Mr. Brewin.]

An hon. Member: Were your conversations in English or in French?

Mr. Pepin: Mr. Speaker, on a question of privilege; an hon. member on the other side of the house asked me whether my conversations with the Ontario officials were in English or in French.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh.

Mr. Speaker: Order. The hon. minister is rising on a question of privilege and I would like to hear it.

Mr. Pepin: Mr. Speaker, the hon. member for Northumberland asked me if my conversation—

Some hon. Members: Order.

Hon. George Hees (Northumberland): Mr. Speaker, on a question of privilege; the hon. member for Northumberland said nothing.

Mr. Speaker: Order, we will hear one question of privilege at a time. Would the minister state his question.

Mr. Hees: He did not say anything.

[*Later:*]

Mr. Fulton: Mr. Speaker, I am sure you will be glad to know that I have discovered a way of putting my question within the terms of reference you gave me. I should like to ask the Minister of Mines and Technical Surveys whether he will make a report to the house at an early date regarding the important matter about which I asked him earlier today?

Mr. Pepin: Mr. Speaker, I will attempt to do that, and I will do so in English because the question was asked in English. I always try to answer in the language—

Some hon. Members: Order, order.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

PUBLIC SERVICE

REPORTED STATEMENT BY MINES MINISTER RESPECTING BILINGUALISM

On the orders of the day:

Hon. Martial Asselin (Charlevoix): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Prime Minister. I wonder whether the Prime Minister is in a position today to make any statement regarding the question I addressed to him last week concerning bilingualism in the civil service?

Right Hon. L. B. Pearson (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, I think I have stated in answer

to the question that I would be making a report on this matter in the house, I hope this week. Yesterday my hon. friend from Carleton asked whether the cabinet committee considered the matter or whether the cabinet had decided whether it would discuss this question with the civil service organizations. I said I would look into this matter to see whether such a meeting could be arranged. I am hoping to have this meeting as soon as it can be arranged. It will be only after that meeting that I would report to the house.

STORMS

WINNIPEG, MAN.—INQUIRY CONCERNING REQUESTS FOR ASSISTANCE

On the orders of the day:

Mr. L. R. Sherman (Winnipeg South): Mr. Speaker, I should like to address a question to the Prime Minister. As a result of conversations I have had today with spokesmen in Winnipeg, I would like to ask the Prime Minister whether he has as yet received any request from the Manitoba government for aid to the storm-stricken southern half of that province?

Right Hon. L. B. Pearson (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, not to my knowledge, unless it came in just before lunch.

Mr. Sherman: Mr. Speaker, I have a supplementary question. Would the Prime Minister be able to say whether he would be responsive to such a request when it comes?

Mr. Speaker: Order.

TRADE

CHRYSLER CORPORATION—ANNOUNCEMENT TO RAISE FUNDS IN CANADA

On the orders of the day:

Mr. H. A. Olson (Medicine Hat): Mr. Speaker, last Wednesday I asked the Minister of Finance if he could ascertain whether or not the Chrysler Corporation intended to raise any of this $15 million in Canada which they had announced for their capital requirements outside of Canada? Would he answer that today and also inform the house whether this practice will be building up.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. This question might be placed on the order paper.

Inquiries of the Ministry

IMMIGRATION

GRANTING OF ASYLUM IN CANADA TO YUGOSLAV SEAMEN

On the orders of the day:

Mr. Eric A. Winkler (Grey-Bruce): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Citizenship and Immigration. Can he tell the house why the 12 Yugoslav seamen who deserted their ship in Saint John were not granted asylum in Canada?

Hon. Jean Marchand (Minister of Citizenship and Immigration): Mr. Speaker, I shall take the question as notice and answer it tomorrow.

Mr. Speaker: It is difficult in a case such as this to determine whether there is urgency. If my understanding is correct, that these seamen have already returned to their country, probably the question should be placed on the order paper.

Mr. Winkler: Mr. Speaker, with all due respect, they were deported last night, to the best of my knowledge without reason.

Mr. Speaker: The question might be placed on the order paper.

AGRICULTURE

CHEESE—DECREASE IN EXPORTS TO U.S.

On the orders of the day:

Mr. A. D. Hales (Wellington South): Mr. Speaker, I should like to direct my question to the Minister of Agriculture, asking him whether he can advise the house what success he met with during his recent discussions with the secretary of agriculture of the United States regarding the very low quota for Canadian cheese entering the United States, especially in view of the fact that there is no restriction on United States cheese entering Canada?

Hon. J. J. Greene (Minister of Agriculture): Mr. Speaker, this was probably the most important topic discussed during our discussions with our United States compatriots. There were some discussions about guide lines and other things, but this was the important subject.

This question involves a tariff matter in the United States, but Mr. Freeman, the secretary for agriculture, is considering the matter. I will be in touch with him and I hope we will have some success in this regard.

Inquiries of the Ministry

BONNYVILLE, ALBERTA—REQUEST FOR ACREAGE PAYMENTS

On the orders of the day:

Hon. J. J. Greene (Minister of Agriculture): Mr. Speaker, while I am on my feet I should like to say that the hon. member for Athabasca asked me a question yesterday which I did not quite hear at the time. He asked whether there had been any request for aid from the province of Alberta respecting the Bonnyville district. I did not catch those words, "the Bonnyville district", and I offer my apology. In this regard there has been no request for aid at any time from the minister of agriculture of Alberta in respect of the Bonnyville district.

Mr. F. J. Bigg (Athabasca): Mr. Speaker, I have a supplementary question for the Minister of Agriculture. I hold in my hand a brief dated March 1, 1966 of the Farmers' Union of Alberta directed to the Minister of Agriculture. I wonder whether the minister has received a copy of this brief regarding this particular subject?

Mr. Greene: Mr. Speaker, I receive many briefs and I cannot recall this specific one. I will check and let my hon. friend know whether I have received it.

POWER

NELSON RIVER—REQUEST FOR REMOVAL OF SALES TAX

On the orders of the day:

Hon. W. G. Dinsdale (Brandon-Souris): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Finance. In view of the severe financial penalties imposed on the Nelson river project by the 11 per cent sales tax on building materials, and in view of the recent unanimous approval of the Manitoba legislation given to a motion calling for its removal, will the minister indicate that early action will be taken in this regard?

Hon. Mitchell Sharp (Minister of Finance): Mr. Speaker, needless to say, I never anticipate any announcement of government policy of that kind.

[*Translation*]

PUBLIC SERVICE

STATEMENT BY MINES MINISTER—BILINGUALISM AS CRITERION FOR PROMOTION

On the orders of the day:

Hon. Martial Asselin (Charlevoix): Mr. Speaker, I wish to direct a question to the Minister of Mines and Technical Surveys.

When he spoke about bilingualism in Montreal last week, did the minister talk about it as a condition for promotion within the civil service commission or as an essential qualification?

Mr. Speaker: Order. That question is out of order.

TRANSPORT

RICHELIEU PROJECT—REQUEST FOR REPORT

On the orders of the day:

Mr. Maurice Allard (Sherbrooke): Mr. Speaker, I wish to direct a question to the Minister of Mines and Technical Surveys.

Is it true that the international committee on the Richelieu waterway has completed its studies? Could the minister report to the House of Commons about its findings?

Hon. Jean-Luc Pepin (Minister of Mines and Technical Surveys): Mr. Speaker, that matter comes under the jurisdiction of the Secretary of State for External Affairs.

Mr. Allard: Then, Mr. Chairman, I shall repeat my question and ask the Secretary of State for External Affairs to answer it.

Is it true that the international committee on the possible project of the Richelieu river waterway has concluded its studies, and is the minister going to report on such studies and findings?

Mr. Speaker: Order. This question as put is out of order. The hon. member cannot ask, as a matter of urgency, whether a report has been completed or whether the minister wants to report at this time, without asking the minister whether he intends to report to the house in due course.

Mr. Allard: Mr. Speaker, I was just going to ask the minister to submit a report to the house in this connection.

Hon. Paul Martin (Secretary of State for External Affairs): Yes, there is a report which will now be considered by the Canada-U.S. joint commission.

[*English*]

AGRICULTURE

MILK—OUTSTANDING SUPPLEMENTARY PAYMENTS

On the orders of the day:

Mr. W. B. Nesbitt (Oxford): Mr. Speaker, I have a question I should like to direct to the Minister of Agriculture and I hope that he will be able to reply tomorrow. Can the minister tell the house how many cheques for

last years' supplementary milk payments are still outstanding or unpaid?

Hon. J. J. Greene (Minister of Agriculture): Mr. Speaker, I do not have that information, but I understand we are doing very well in this matter. I will indicate to my hon. friend tomorrow how many are outstanding.

[*Translation*]

CANADIAN BROADCASTING CORPORATION

CHIBOUGAMAU-CHAPAIS AREA—EXTENSION OF SERVICE

On the orders of the day:

Mr. Réal Caouette (Villeneuve): Mr. Speaker, I should like to put a question to the Secretary of State.

Is the department considering at present the repeated requests of the people of Chibougamau and Chapais for the extension of free C.B.C. radio and television services to that area?

Mr. Speaker: This question should be put on the order paper.

[*English*]

PENSIONS

POSSIBLE FREEZING OF OLDER WORKERS TO PRIVATE PLANS

On the orders of the day:

Mr. Robert Muir (Cape Breton North and Victoria): Mr. Speaker, on March 3 I directed a question to the Minister of National Health and Welfare who very kindly stated that it would come under the purview of the Minister of Finance. He said the question would be given to that minister for reply. Is the Minister of Finance in a position to reply to that question with reference to pensions?

Hon. Mitchell Sharp (Minister of Finance): Mr. Speaker, I understand that when I was absent last Thursday the hon. member inquired about the government's intention to introduce legislation which might affect the payments of returns of contributions from private pension plans.

There is really not much more I can add to what first I, and later my parliamentary secretary, said as reported on pages 1152 and 1219 of *Hansard* of February 14, 1966. The details of this proposed legislation on particulars such as those mentioned in the question of the hon. member will be disclosed to the house in due course.

Mr. Stanley Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): I have a supplementary question. Will that be disclosed this session?

Mr. Sharp: Mr. Speaker, it is certainly my hope and expectation that parliamentary business will proceed at a sufficiently accelerated rate that that will be possible.

ADMINISTRATION OF JUSTICE

CONSIDERATION OF ROYAL COMMISSION TO INVESTIGATE ORGANIZED CRIME

On the orders of the day:

Mr. Erik Nielsen (Yukon): Mr. Speaker, may I ask the Prime Minister whether the government has as yet decided upon the question of establishing a royal commission on crime and, if so, whether there has been any communication with the provinces in this regard?

Right Hon. L. B. Pearson (Prime Minister): No decision has been reached as yet, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Nielsen: I have a supplementary question. Has the Prime Minister had any formal request from the province of Quebec in respect of the establishment of such a commission?

Mr. Pearson: No, Mr. Speaker, not to my knowledge.

CANADIAN ECONOMY

REPORT OF ECONOMIC COUNCIL ON PRICE CONTROL

On the orders of the day:

Mr. Reid Scott (Danforth): Mr. Speaker, several weeks ago the Prime Minister informed the house that he would make inquiries regarding the delay in the report by the Economic Council of Canada which made a special study about a year ago regarding prices. Has the Prime Minister made that inquiry and can he tell us when we may expect this report?

Right Hon. L. B. Pearson (Prime Minister): Yes, Mr. Speaker, I did get in touch with the president of the Economic Council of Canada, who informed me that they were doing their best to expedite this matter.

POWER

COLUMBIA RIVER TREATY—TABLING OF REPORT OF PERMANENT ENGINEERING BOARD, 1965

Hon. Jean-Luc Pepin (Minister of Mines and Technical Surveys): Mr. Speaker, would the house agree to reverting to motions in order that I may table a document?

Columbia River Treaty Report Tabled

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. The hon. member for Kootenay West.

Mr. H. W. Herridge (Kootenay West): The minister now proposes to table the document that I was anticipating, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Pepin: May I have the consent of the house to table this document, Mr. Speaker?

Mr. Starr: What document?

Mr. Pepin: The annual report to the governments of Canada and the United States coming from the Columbia River Treaty Permanent Engineering Board, 1965.

Mr. Speaker: Order. Before the minister proceeds, I understand that the question period has now terminated. There are no further questions and therefore we might revert to motions for this purpose.

Some hon. Members: No.

Mr. Speaker: Is there unanimous agreement that the house revert to motions to allow the Minister of Mines and Technical Surveys to table the document to which he has referred?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Mr. Pepin: Mr. Speaker, may I table the annual report to the governments of the United States and Canada from the Columbia River Treaty Permanent Engineering Board?

Mr. Nielsen: Is it in both languages, English and French?

Mr. Churchill: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker; I am afraid we did not get the significance of your earlier statement. Was Your Honour assuming that the question period was over—because it is not.

Mr. Speaker: Yes, I was assuming that because no other hon. member rose to ask a question. If I had called orders of the day we would then, of course, have been in committee and this document could not have been tabled. Therefore, no further questions being asked, the motion was made and accepted. I should like at this time to ask the hon. member for Trois-Rivières to state his question of privilege.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Gilles Grégoire (Lapointe): Mr. Speaker, on the motion of the Minister of Mines and Technical Surveys, since no mention was made about this, can he tell us whether the report was tabled in English and in French?

[Mr. Pepin.]

Hon. Jean-Luc Pepin (Minister of Mines and Technical Surveys): It has been tabled in English only, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Grégoire: Mr. Speaker, we object.

Mr. Speaker: Order. There is no discussion at the present time. The minister secured the consent of the house to table the document and has tabled it.

Mr. Grégoire: Mr. Speaker, we are not giving our consent to table this document as long as it is in English only; we want it tabled in both languages.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

Mr. Pepin: Mr. Speaker, I can—

Mr. Grégoire: We object, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: Order. I regret to inform the hon. member that the document has already been tabled—

Mr. Grégoire: There was no consent—

Mr. Speaker: —if the hon. member will just open his eyes, he will see that the document has indeed been tabled.

Mr. Grégoire: Without the house's permission, Mr. Speaker.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Grégoire: The document was certainly tabled without the unanimous consent of the house, because we did not give ours.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member raised his objection too late. The hon. member for Trois-Rivières (Mr. Mongrain) has the floor.

PRIVILEGE

MR. MONGRAIN—LABOUR GAZETTE—DELAY IN TRANSLATION

Mr. J.-A. Mongrain (Trois-Rivières): Mr. Speaker, here is my question of privilege.

I received within the last few days the last issue of the Labour Gazette and I find that the French edition represents the October 1965 issue and that the English edition represents the February 1966 issue.

That means a gap of almost six months. I always understood that it was the privilege of the French speaking members to receive the French version at the same time or practically at the same time as the English version. I would like to complain about that situation, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: Order. In my opinion, this is more a grievance than a true question of privilege. I suppose that the hon. member does not intend to move a motion to follow up the question he has just raised. I suppose also that having formulated his grievance, he will now let the matter rest.

[*English*]

SUPPLY

The house in committee in supply, Mr. Rinfret in the chair.

DEPARTMENT OF NATIONAL HEALTH AND WELFARE

Administration—

1. Departmental administration, $2,330,100.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Caouette: Mr. Chairman, I am just waiting for the house to quiet down, and then I will continue my remarks.

[*English*]

The Deputy Chairman: Order, please. May I ask hon. members in all sections of the house to carry on their conversations in an undertone so that the hon. member who has the floor may be heard by the committee.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Caouette: Thank you, Mr. Chairman, for your kind intervention in order to get at least a little quiet in the house. When the other members have the floor they like to be heard and, on this side of the house, we also want to be heard when we have the floor.

I was saying last night, before the house adjourned, that we are considering a health insurance plan which would be open to all Canadians and under which the government would pay premiums to all families and all unmarried people.

Those people, families and unmarried people, should be left free to choose their group insurance plan, if you wish, or their health insurance plan; they should be left to choose the company they prefer. They should be left free to choose their physician, the kind of medicare program they want. If they prefer a plan which costs more than the premiums paid by the government, then they should pay the difference and get the insurance plan they want.

Last year, the province of Quebec decided, as reported in *Le Devoir* on March 24, 1965—

> Quebec will have its own health insurance plan within two years.

It means that in March, 1967 a health insurance plan would be submitted in Quebec and, as a matter of fact, there was a lot of talk about it a few weeks ago when the Premier stated that it would cost the province $355 million to set up a medical insurance or medicare plan, as it is commonly called.

It would mean $55 per capita in the province of Quebec. Any insurance company, or all the private insurance companies together, would give the citizens of Quebec a full insurance plan including medical care, drugs, operations, all that for approximately $30 per capita, in the province of Quebec, which would represent savings of $25 per Quebec citizen.

Mr. Chairman, all this shows that private enterprise is still the most logical and the cheapest way to grant services to the Canadian people, as long as they have the means to finance that plan or the plan they choose.

Mr. Chairman, not so long ago, that is on April 20, 1965, the former minister of National Health and Welfare, now the Secretary of State (Miss LaMarsh), said this before the members of the Optimist Club at Niagara Falls. I quote:

> Under the Canada Assistance Plan—

I would change the word "assistance" which smacks too much of poverty, of public difficulties, and say instead "the right to live" of each individual.

> —we are willing to match, dollar for dollar, the present provincial outlays in the field of allowances to mothers, assistance to those mothers who have dependent children.
>
> We are willing to share the cost of health services given by the provinces to the recipients of assistance.

The minister said this, but what the people did not know, and what we must tell them, is that we have a bureaucracy to pay here in Ottawa, and also another bureaucracy to pay in Quebec. We pay two administrations for exactly the same thing, which means a multiplication of expenses and a division of services or a subtraction in respect of the needy.

The hon. minister added:

> We will take steps to include the costs of medical, nursing, dental, optical and pharmaceutical care.
>
> However, it will be for the provinces to decide on the scope of such services and they will be responsible for taking measures to provide the health services they consider best adjusted to their particular case.
>
> This health legislation is interim legislation, which will be in operation only until the coming into force of a medicare scheme, which I hope will be very soon.

Mr. Chairman, I suggest that the Minister of National Health and Welfare and the government should get together around a round table with the responsible authorities and

officials of the medical associations in Canada, with provincial officials, as well as the executives of existing companies in the country and in our provinces, in order to establish the cost of a medicare plan, under which the government would pay premiums to families, as well as to single persons, so as to insure the whole Canadian population.

Mr. Chairman, no one ever thinks of meeting with the heads of insurance companies, medical bodies and the provinces to discuss the best objective means of providing services and giving results to the Canadian family, to the private individual in Canada. Instead, we think of setting up plans and, when those plans are conceived in the government services, we think of other plans to adjust those that are not always adequate. And it is because of all those plans that we drum in each other's head that we end up in the situation we are now.

Mr. Chairman, the people are not asking for plans, they want results. The worker, the farmer, the miner are not asking the government to draw up plans for them. Workers, farmers, miners, journeymen, people in all classes of society are asking the government to provide the private individual with the financial help that will enable him to choose and set up his own plan in a country that could truly be called democratic.

Mr. Chairman, such plans have been presented at every session. This year there is medicare, called for by the members of the C.C.F party, the Canadian socialists, for 25, 30 and even 35 years. All sorts of plans are demanded by people who want the government to dominate the individual, the human being.

Mr. Chairman, as I said last night, we have asked for higher family allowances in Canada. We have increased the allowances of the members of the house and the senators, and so on, but we cannot increase the revenue of Canadian citizens, and yet it is the taxes paid by farmers and all classes of society that enables us to vote increased allowances for members of parliament and senators.

Mr. Chairman, as I said last night, we are not opposed to larger salaries for members of parliament, because the cost of life has increased; but it has increased not only for members of parliament but also for mothers of Canadian families.

Ask a Canadian mother about it; the hon. ladies who sit in this house are surely aware that it costs more today to clothe, feed and house a child properly than it did 20 or 25 years ago. Conditions should be adjusted according to the times, according to 1966 rather than 1945.

In 1965-66, family allowances cost $599,500,000 to the government and the Canadian people; those are the estimates now under consideration and we hear ministers say it is costing too much, when the administration costs only of that department exceed $500 million and when $1,185 million are paid in interest on the national debt, that is, more than twice the amount paid in family allowances. This is the tribute paid for the financing but nobody is heard protesting against such a situation.

When a claim is being made for Canadian children, the cry of inflation, of demagogy goes up, the masses are being called to rise against lawful authority.

Mr. Chairman, there is no question of rising against anything, but we want to put the facts straight, pass laws according to human rights; and the most elementary justice requires that we give to human beings, to Canadians, so that democracy can survive, if there is any meaning in the word, so that we have a government of the people, by the people and for the people, and no longer a government for finance, of finance and to serve finance.

Let us start to serve the Canadian people and we will thus discharge the duty for which we were sent to the parliament of this country.

[*English*]

Mr. Johnston: Mr. Chairman, I should like to raise a few points in this afternoon's discussion of the estimates for the Department of National Health and Welfare. First of all, I should like to speak on a problem which is related to physical fitness, a matter which I believe has been given considerable attention by the department, and to raise a problem which has been brought to my attention from within my constituency, but which I am sure is a problem in many other parts of the country too. The problem relates to amateur sport, and this might be the time to reiterate the demand for a study of amateur sport in this country.

There are many facets to this complicated problem. Some of them have been raised earlier in connection with the national sport of hockey, but there are also a great variety of matters which I think the Department of

National Health and Welfare probably should investigate.

One particular problem is the question of the increased expense incurred by amateur athletes in attempting to compete in amateur athletic events across the country. These events increasingly are becoming the preserve of the wealthy, or else demand a tremendous local effort in order to send athletes to such competitions.

• (3:30 p.m.)

I had, for example, a letter from Vernon, dated February 11, regarding a rather outstanding athlete in the constituency. The boy, Steven Lattey, referred to in the letter last year was Canadian national junior skiing champion. This week end he has been invited to participate in an international ski meet at Banff. Next week he is to fly east to defend his junior championship and participate in a ski meet at Quebec City. All these trips are at his own or his parents' expense. I suppose he could simply give up and not represent the west in the beautiful province of Quebec. However, we do have these sporting events that are competitive on a national scale. A severe problem exists in getting to the places where these events are held, particularly for the individual athlete whose sport does not have spectator appeal or the resources that more highly organized team activities have.

I have noticed a one-shot effort along this line to be made in the centennial year, as reported in the Ottawa *Journal* of January 21, under the centennial commission's program for school fitness tests in 1967. A whole variety of events has been lined up. The centennial commission is considering asking corporations to offer awards for outstanding achievement and the suggested award will be a $3,500 expense paid trip for 12 to 18 year old athletes to participate in the Pan-American games. This is the sort of thing that should probably be put on a more continuing basis for the good of amateur athletics in the country. We should not be concerned only about what is going to happen in 1967 but also about what is going to happen throughout the following years. If some policy were worked out on the national level we might benefit and be able to participate in international meets to much greater effect than has been possible in the past.

The question of an investigation into amateur sports has been raised in connection with the game of hockey and the control that seems to be imposed by professional sport on amateur sport and on those taking part in the amateur sport from a very early age. I think this matter deserves serious consideration. I think the Department of National Health and Welfare might concern itself with the field of organized sport which is so constituted as to include children of extremely tender age. There is a warning in the March 5 edition of *The Canadian* in an article entitled, "The Big Machine That Runs Kids' Hockey". I recommend that article to the minister and his staff. The aspects covered in it could well be considered from the point of view of the health of children of tender age who are involved in what is a highly organized game which demands tremendous physical output and which has a high injury risk and a great deal of nervous strain. I wonder whether the department should not seriously be considering studies of the effects of such highly organized team sports when they involve six year old children and in which the most intense competition is encouraged. The age level is becoming lower and lower. I should think there might be real danger to the health of these children from such a sport not only at the time but also later in life.

It may be worth while looking into the cumulative effects of these sports in relation to the health of very young children who participate in extremely active sports. These sports might even be worth looking at from the viewpoint of the diversion of public funds into the very expensive and complicated facilities that are necessary for the numbers of very small children who participate in them. Frequently expensive facilities are necessary for children of tender age. When there is such a crying need for housing for the aged there may be a danger of too much public money being diverted to what is a more immediately popular use for the money. This too might be a question that could be studied by this department.

I should also like to raise an issue about the construction of homes for the aged. I have in mind particularly a home for the aged in my constituency. I do not think we would deny the need that exists for these homes. The home I refer to was built privately on the initiative of a person who is of very advanced age, an age at which many people have completely given up making any worthwhile contributions and are subsisting on welfare assistance from the government. Through the initiative of this individual a retirement home for 50 senior citizens was constructed. Unfortunately the building was subject to the imposition of the 4 per cent

sales tax on construction materials, a tax which has since risen to 11 per cent, which again shows the evil aspects of the tax. It discourages the very type of construction we would most like to encourage.

Some provisions were made for exemption from this tax on certain types of construction. However, on application for the exemption it was discovered that this home for the aged did not qualify because to qualify it would have had to be in receipt of aid annually from the government of Canada or from a province for the maintenance of persons specified in the preceding subparagraph of the provisions. Unfortunately for this institution it is not receiving a regular grant from the province although it is receiving from the municipality in lieu of taxation something in excess of $4,000 each year. There is therefore a grant from one level of government which happens in this case to be the wrong level of government. The Excise Tax Act specifies that there can only be provincial participation in this sort of thing. I think that the federal department in conjunction with the provincial department might well consider allowing participation at the municipal level.

When the Act speaks of aid being received from the government of Canada for this sort of endeavour the words are misleading because apparently there is no aid at that level. The only effective aid which is covered is that given by a province. It would make much more sense to remove the words "government of Canada" from the Act and speak instead of a province or municipality so that one block to the construction of housing for the aged could be removed.

Finally I should like to say a word regarding the issue of medicare about which a great deal has been said. I am afraid I shall have to disagree with my friends to the right who last night urged the government to make sure it stood very firm on the four principles enunciated.

• (3:40 p.m.)

Considering the remarkable retreats we have witnessed in the last few days I am sure it would not be at all difficult for the government to abandon the compulsory features of its medicare proposal or to consider a provincial scheme to be adequate in the absence of compulsory features. Several of the provinces have gone ahead and developed medicare schemes and it seems to me it is now too late for the federal government to insist on one monolithic compulsory scheme if it turns out there is opposition from the provinces and if the schemes which the provinces have instituted seem to be providing the extent of medicare which the people living in those provinces demand at certain times. We have become enraptured by the possibilities of a welfare state to the extent that "universal" and "compulsory" have become words of high praise, words which would seem in the minds of some people absolutely essential in the description of any scheme which might be considered worth while.

We know that the medical profession is not at all pleased about the suggestion that there should be a compulsory scheme. We know that a medicare scheme can succeed only with the co-operation of this most important group. I feel that the government in its negotiations with the provinces should consider carefully the desirability of taking any action in the area of medicare. I notice that in the words chosen to refer to medicare in the Speech from the Throne there seems to be a certain softening in the attitude initially taken by the government and I urge very strongly that the government should not insist on the one feature which would make medicare a source of intense dissension throughout the country rather than an area in which federal-provincial co-operation would provide the people of Canada with the degree of social assistance which they feel they can afford at this time. I believe it is quite possible for the federal government to work out the problem of providing for portable benefits without making the scheme monolithic and without making it compulsory.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Isabelle: Mr. Chairman, I shall be brief because I know what I am talking about.

May I rise to speak during the review of the estimates of the Department of National Health and Welfare not to criticize but just to bring forward recommendations which could be implemented if they were deemed useful after consideration. However, I will point out that if the provinces, in the course of their history, have decided to divide health and welfare into two different departments it is because thorough studies on the subject have shown this was required by the increased responsibilities and administrative burden.

The last province to follow suit was Manitoba, in 1961, which, for the reasons already outlined has divided its department in two. If we consider the development of the Department of National Health and Welfare before the merger, in 1944, we see that it was

not a department, but a health branch which came successively under the Department of Agriculture, the Department of Marine and Fisheries, the Department of Immigration and the Department of Commerce and Industry.

Only in 1919 and at the request of the Canadian Medical Association did the department become the Department of Public Health.

In 1929, the Pensions and Civil Re-establishment Division had become less important and a Pensions and National Health Division was created. Later, following the introduction of social security programs such as old age pensions and family allowances, related in a way to para-medical problems, the Department of National Health and Welfare was set up in 1944.

Since then, Mr. Chairman, other extensive programs were added to those already administered by the department, such as hospital insurance and several national health grants. Very soon the department will also be responsible for drawing up and implementing the national medicare program and the Canada assistance plan, not to mention the Canada pension plan which is already operative.

For those reasons, the Department of National Health and Welfare should be divided into two distinct units, so that we could reorganize the whole administrative framework. When you consider also the tremendous expenditures this department expects to make to carry out its future programs, I do not think there is any other way than the one I have just mentioned. First, this would make it possible to do away with administrative routine which, when it becomes too heavy, tends to bog down and thereby ceases to advance.

Then, this would give the departments more leeway for adequate planning to provide them with greater administrative flexibility and to justify the old saying: to govern is to foresee.

We have long been bogged down in an administrative stagnation where new ideas, lest they result in small mistakes and failures, have been completely set aside, at the expense of normal progress.

Finally, that will be one of the very important recommendations of the royal commission on health.

I pay tribute to the Department of National Health and Welfare which, in 1965, developed the Canada pension plan, one of the most daring undertakings to date of the department.

Those sir, are the few remarks which I wanted to make and which are really a combination of findings and suggestions, in the best interests of Canada.

Let those who criticize when the government advocates a program such as the health insurance plan know that we are aware imperfections can slip in. But if we had to wait for the legislation to be perfect to introduce or pass it—and even then, there would be criticism—we would never have that type of legislation in Canada.

Only to the extent where time has polished them have laws become almost perfect as human standards go, and I ask all doctors throughout the Canadian nation, my colleagues, to try to understand and appreciate our breadth of views on what seemed, a few years ago, an unattainable dream: health insurance.

That is one proof that the government wants the state, here in Canada, to exist for the individual and not the individual for the state.

• (3:50 p.m.)

[*English*]

Mrs. MacInnis (Vancouver-Kingsway): Mr. Chairman, I have been impressed with the need for having these estimates passed but with the exception of one brief contribution on the transport estimates I have said nothing since the estimates of the Department of External Affairs were before us. I say this because I believe it is absolutely necessary that certain things be said at this stage with regard to one of the most urgent problems facing Canada today. I refer to the question of old age pensions.

I am glad that the new minister and his assistant come from two provinces where this question is never far removed from the public gaze, which is the case also in my province and indeed, the other provinces. The urgency is great. A part of the problem is to provide security for the aged, to provide thousands of our people with the modern standard of comfort or well-being which they so desperately lack. The other part of the problem is the method by which we are going to pay our debt to those people who helped build this country, who helped create the standard of affluence which we know exists but in which they share so little. This is the double problem involved.

The old cannot wait. We must seek to provide food for the living rather than following the practice, as we do so often today, of providing flowers for the dead. Food for the living is something that should be provided in much greater abundance than we are providing it today, and it must be provided now.

I want to point out several milestones in connection with old age pension legislation. Believe it or not, very few hon. members can remember as I do the debates which took place in this chamber and the other place when the first old age pension legislation was introduced in 1927, over 40 years ago. Prior to that time there was only one way by which many hundreds of old people could get assistance or relief. That was by dragging their sons or daughters into court and having the court find to its own satisfaction that their sons or daughters were not able to support them. The old age pension legislation was the first federal social security legislation put on the statute books of Canada.

Those who know anything about my history will know I have a particular reason for being interested in that legislation and its evolution, because today I consider that first social security legislation has become a monument to the memory of one man. Many helped but increasingly it has become well known as his monument.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mrs. MacInnis (Vancouver-Kingsway): The first old age pensions were very meagre indeed, $20 a month at the age of 70 with a means test, but even then it was recognized we were establishing a principle and this was the first milestone with respect to old age pensions. At that time we established the principle that the elderly were persons entitled in their own right to our consideration and not merely as appendages to their sons and daughters. Prior to that they were considered as appendages to their sons and daughters to be looked after on a basis of charity and good will. It was only when the indignities heaped on old people had become so great and the physical and mental suffering so unbearable that we took that first step.

Some improvements were made to the legislation during the 1930's and 1940's but they were minor. Then in 1951 came the second milestone in old age pension legislation in Canada, the passage of the Old Age Security Act which was universal in its application and gave the pension to everyone at age 70. The pension at that time was raised to the amount of $40 a month.

This afternoon in this chamber I heard a member regretfully wishing that universality not be incorporated into our medicare legislation. I reply that the feature of universality in old age pensions which we established in 1951 is one of the finest things we have ever incorporated into Canadian social security legislation because it established a new principle. In 1951 we established the principle that every person at the age of 70 should be entitled to receive a measure of security from the community, regardless of any other consideration.

Let me add further that we did not do that just as nice Nellies or do-gooders. We did it because it was essential to establish that new principle. The earlier principle was that the elderly were entitled in their own right to receive consideration and a measure of security, and that was advanced in 1951 when we said that when people reached the age of 70 they were entitled to receive a measure of security from the community for the rest of their lives not as charity but as of right.

Sociologists in the United States, despite the fact that that country has so much piecemeal social legislation, are now eyeing with tremendous interest the idea of universality which we built into our scheme in 1951. When I hear the idea being mooted that we should place old age pensions in categories and give some of them free and others on the basis of a needs test—this needs test is recognized by all old people as a means test of a more frightful variety—I can only hope the government will not go back on one of the things which a preceding Liberal government enacted when it provided a foundation for old age pensions, medicare and other forms of security.

The principle of which I speak had another reason behind its establishment. Technology had advanced to the point where we were able to establish it and in fact had to establish it. In 1951 we recognized that there were a great number of people who, because they had spent their lives working in a period when wages were low, had not been able to put sufficient money aside for their old age. We also recognized or at least we were getting it through our skulls, which as human beings are pretty thick, that if we were going to have constantly rising incomes, constantly

rising revenues and constantly rising production we had to find ways and means of distributing buying power among the population so that production would move out of the factories and could be sold, thus creating a demand for more production. All of us have not yet learned that lesson but we will learn it in a bitter way unless we learn it in a humane and wise way before it is too late.

• (4:00 p.m.)

Let there be no more of the argument that we are going to give the old age pension only to people who really need it, that we are going to scrutinize every case and will not give it to those who do not need it. On the matter of cost, when you have a whole army of social service investigators going around making these inquiries all the time the cost is very great. It is also useless and unnecessary. The social welfare people are getting fed up spending their time doing this instead of doing rehabilitation work and getting people back into a position where they can be self-supporting even if only to a certain extent. We are wrong in trying to do it in this way.

The most fair tax in Canada or anywhere else is the tax on income. I see no reason that we should not take the old age pension, old age security pension or whatever pension we are giving to elderly people, make it available to everybody at age 65 and then use the instrument of the income tax to take back according to the person's ability to pay. That is what the income tax can do and it is the fairest way of seeing that people pay their share of the cost of security across this country. If the government should have other ideas in mind, those of us in this party will want to take a long hard look before we are pushed off the solid rock of the income tax which is the fairest and the universal way of seeing that it is done justly and in a sensible way administratively as well.

I heard the hon. member for Villeneuve this afternoon talk about wasteful expenditures of one sort or another among governments. Let me suggest that one wasteful expenditure is the probing and digging into people's affairs by reasons of a means test and a needs test, quite apart from the indignity which is involved.

I should like to say also that there were increases in the old age security pension in the 1950's and 1960's. In 1957 it went up from $46 to $55. In 1962 an increase again in the old age security pension brought it up to $65. In 1963 it went up to $75. By this time the elderly people of Canada were beginning to think that the only way they could get an increase in the pension was by having elections. Had I been on the old age pension I imagine I would have thought that an annual election was about the only way to try to catch up to the cost of living.

The cost of living has continued to rise. Because of the rising cost of living the older people have been dropping farther and farther behind. Let me point out what has happened since the last increase was given in 1963. The cost of living has gone up 5.4 per cent. With today's prices we would have to increase it to $79 even to make it equal to $75 in 1963. Something else has happened which we must not lose sight of. In this period the standard of living has been rising, wages and salaries have been going up, profits have been going up and income has been going up. When this has been happening the people on low fixed incomes have been falling farther and farther behind. The production of goods and services also has been going up. So merely increasing the pension rate a little bit, even to meet the cost of living, will not bring the old age pensioners up to the modern standard of living which they must have if we are going to do the job we should be doing at this time.

I say, Mr. Chairman, it is now time for a third milestone—1927, 1951, and now 1966. We are waiting to see whether the government proposes to make this year a milestone and the older people across the country are waiting to see what is going to be done to make it a milestone. I am going to say categorically at this time that we should establish a new principle, the principle that every person at age 65 shall have the right to a pension which will provide a modern standard of living with neither a means test nor a needs test. I do not think we can do anything less than that. Certainly we have to fight for that with all the ability we have.

I am going to suggest now the things that we in this party, and I would like to hope members of other parties, feel must be embodied in this legislation when it comes in. First, I should like to say that it should be made a right and not a charity, that it become universal in Canada and that we give it to people from age 65. That is the first point.

Second, I wish to say that it must include neither a means nor a needs test which involves checking into the affairs of people, and an unwarranted interference with the older people. In the past this has been one of

the reasons many of these people have tried their best to stay away from it as long as they possibly could. We hope that this pension will be given to everyone and that the surplus will be taken back in income tax according to their ability to pay.

The third principle is that the levels must be high enough to provide a modern standard of living. I know a general stand has been taken in support of the idea of pensions in the amount of $100 a month at age 65. I suggest the authorities have to reach the conclusion that that is not sufficient to provide a modern standard of living in the face of today's cost of living and standard of living. The committee which met in the other place suggested we should make the amount higher than $100 a month. They have suggested $105 a month for a single person and $185 a month for a couple.

As late as last fall the Toronto Metro Social Planning Council came to the conclusion after a careful study that for a minimum standard of living, health and decency the amount would have to be $126.47 for single persons and $213.02 for a couple. Last January, with the cost of living again having risen, the Conference on Aging met in Toronto and set up a sub committee of welfare people, social workers and experts in other fields. This subcommittee came to the conclusion that the amount for a minimum of health and decency should be $138.96 for a single person and $223.82 for a couple. These are figures which are given by competent and responsible people across this country.

I think it will be up to the government to consider these points carefully before it brings in its proposals. As I say, we must remember we live in a society where we can afford these things and where we must afford them if we are going to keep our production rising constantly. We must bring our ideas up to date. It is our ideas which are penurious and backward. I might point out that this is a much better type of national defence than all the bombers, battleships and bastions that we could possibly devise. This is the sort of thing we must do if we are to be strong economically in the modern world.

• (4:10 p.m.)

I now come to the fourth principle I suggest should be embodied in our legislation. I know some will suggest that this is a far-out suggestion, perhaps including some hon. members of the party to which I belong, but I think the time has come, and sociologists agree with me, to take the ceiling off earnings and other incomes of recipients of old age pensions. We talk constantly about creating incentives for people to save and be thrifty, incentives for people to go out and work while they can, rather than just sitting around until they become sitting ducks for doctors' offices and welfare workers. Why in the name of time can we not allow these old people to go out and perform baby sitting or the other part time jobs they can find in order that they may salt away a few dollars without being penalized? I have known of cases, as I am sure others have, where people have had to spend every last cent they had set aside for their funerals, as the welfare people express it, before being able to obtain supplementary assistance. I suggest it is time to do away with this kind of ox cart mentality, this penny-pinching line of thought that does not fit into our society today. This type of thing is economically a detriment rather than a help.

[Mrs. MacInnis (Vancouver-Kingsway).]

My fifth point is that pensions must be geared not only to the cost of living and made adjustable to that level but also to the rising standard of living that we enjoy. I am not going to take much more time but I want to refer to two or three people who live in my riding and the circumstances of their situations. I am sure hon. members could do the same in respect of older people living in their ridings.

In Vancouver there lives a couple aged 78 and 77 who are self-respecting people trying to get along on just their pensions. They attempted to obtain more but they were unsuccessful because one had $48 in a bank account and the other had a little more in a credit union. They were told they could not receive supplementary assistance until they had used that money and they decided to attempt to manage on $1,800 per year.

This couple is managing to get along on their pensions alone because they own their own house. They pay taxes of $84 per year which would be $184 were it not for the efforts of the provincial premier.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mrs. MacInnis (Vancouver-Kingsway): You may congratulate him, but let me tell you that he has been successful in this regard only by starving the municipalities.

The couple to whom I have referred pay $40 per year for insurance on the house, which is all they can possibly afford. They pay health insurance premiums of $60 per year. This would be cheaper if we had a

universal health insurance plan. The old gentleman bought glasses last year which cost $32. He needs a dental plate very badly but cannot afford one. In January they both had the flu and his wife had to have a prescription filled at a cost of $6.50. I should like to know how any of us could manage to budget for two people with $1,800 per year. This couple manages to pay these fixed costs in a self-respecting way by cutting down to a diet of bread and tea with precious little else.

This kind of treatment is not good enough for people of this quality or calibre, nor is it good enough for another woman to whom I wish to refer who lives not in my constituency but in a small Ontario town. This woman writes in these terms:

> My husband is 70 years old and we have to live on his pension. He is a very sick man with emphasema, a form of asthma. Each month it cost him $25 and sometimes $30 for pills. I am 62 and not old enough for a pension. I can't work, my heart is very weak. We have to pay $35 rent and telephone $3.55—something we have to have in an emergency. Lights too are high.

There is something else that is high. That woman's courage is high. These people have precious little to work on but hope—hope long deferred. I am sure that every member of this house could cite cases exactly similar to the ones I have cited this afternoon.

What are we going to do about this situation? We must find an answer. Are we going to turn a deaf ear to these people or are we going to give them what they need and must have?

I intend to bring my remarks to a close very quickly but I want to suggest that time has almost run out for these people and we cannot afford to let them wait longer. We owe them a great deal for all the work they have done. We are not giving them charity; we are paying a debt.

As a final word I should like to quote from a letter from a Miss "K", and I use her initial rather than her name. This woman lives in my riding and in part she writes:

> I am 68, retired, and thought twenty years ago that I would be able to live comfortably on the pension I had arranged. . . What can I do? It costs 40 cents bus fare to get to town—no tea—no meal. Even window shopping must be avoided as a way of life. Is this living? How does one enjoy one's self?
>
> People were never meant to be pigeonholed alone, in one room. Even dogs to be healthy must have 'running' room and, I believe, not to be kept alone.
>
> I wish it were possible, for just one of our top politicians, for one week, to try to live as a lot of our older folk are forced to do. How much fortitude would they have at the end of it?
>
> Please raise your voice—

Then she ends by saying:

> Let the last ten years of life be a reward, a blessing, not a curse.

That is my appeal and my belief. I do not blame any of us singly for this state of affairs because I believe we are all guilty of having failed to keep abreast of the needs of our senior citizens. Let us make amends this session. Let us provide pensions worthy of a country such as Canada. Let us not forget that the life we save today may be our own tomorrow. Who knows what is going to happen in the interval? I hesitate to make such an appeal, but today I suggest that we are all tied to one community and we cannot neglect today the most miserable, neglected and down-hearted older person in this country without storing up future trouble for ourselves. Let us today have the courage to provide the kind of foundation that will mark 1966 as a milestone along the road to social security for the aged.

Mr. Brand: Mr. Chairman, I rise to speak on these estimates with great reluctance. I intend to make more extensive remarks during our consideration of the new estimates, at which time I will deal with medical research, medical education and the like. However, after listening to the comments last evening of the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre I cannot allow some of his remarks to go unchallenged despite my very serious desire to see these estimates approved as quickly as possible. So far as the hon. member for Vancouver-Kingsway is concerned, I compliment her on her address but I must say that I may succumb to her charm but never to her blandishments.

It is my understanding that the bill on medicare to be proposed by the Minister of National Health and Welfare will be enabling legislation making moneys available to plans on a shared cost basis with the provinces. As such the government will be providing the means for some kind of medicare program for these provinces. Surely it is within the jurisdiction of the provinces to decide the type of program that each will or will not undertake.

I know that the present government has proposed four conditions surrounding the grants formula: Universal coverage, comprehensive care, government operation and portability from province to province. Surely it is equally obvious in view of the positions that several provinces are now taking that the formula will have to be amended. I refer

specifically to the most recent member of the medicare club, Ontario.

• (4:20 p.m.)

Does the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre suggest because the Ontario plan does not meet the first provision laid down by the federal government that Ontario should not qualify for any federal aid? Is that what he is suggesting? Does he feel that because there are still some provinces which look realistically at what such programs cost and decide on programs within their means, they should be penalized for careful budgeting? The hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre also takes the hon. member for Simcoe East to task for mentioning how slow the Liberal party has been in implementing a plan for health care. Has the hon. member forgotten that in Saskatchewan in 1944 the C.C.F. party rode to power on a program of universal medicare that did not come into being until 1962 and then only after the party to which he belongs mounted an attack on an honoured profession with such intensity and force that the wounds opened then have still not completely healed?

When I hear such things as how terrible the means test is, I wonder how sincere these comments are. It takes me back to the nightmare years of 1960, 1961 and 1962. What a smokescreen. Whenever someone such as the hon. member for Simcoe East suggests that there are areas of need in medical care such as more doctors, more medical schools, funds for the chronically ill and mentally ill, up go the smokescreens and we are treated to a heartrending story of how evil and debasing is the means test. Every time they speak they attempt to show that the socialists are the only ones in favour of all that is good. If anyone else attempts to raise any objections, however sincere they may be, they are treated to this display of socialistic virtue.

But, Mr. Chairman, let us look at the record very briefly. When the party these hon. members represent was in power in Saskatchewan, did they abolish the means test? If you were an old age pensioner who needed supplementary allowances, did you get them without a rigid and degrading examination of your finances? If you were a widow on mother's allowance and needed more milk for your children, did you get it without this rigid and degrading means test? As a matter of fact, I recall cases—I can give hon. members the details at any time—when mothers did not even get the milk and a widow would have to go to the social aid department of the city to get money in order to buy milk for her children.

An hon. Member: Where?

Mr. Brand: In Saskatchewan. Where else? Here is another point. Could you get a university scholarship or loan from the government of Saskatchewan without a means test? Ask anyone who has tried. Ask me. I did not object to it and I was grateful for what they did. It is this duplicity, Mr. Chairman, that has prompted me to rise in reply today.

I could go on to discuss hospital beds. We have heard laudatory comments concerning the hospitalization plan and features of it that have been a boon to doctors and patients alike. This I do not deny; we have had these things. But what have we on the distaff side? I listened very carefully to the speeches made in this connection and examined *Hansard* again last night to see whether there was anything more on this subject but there was nothing.

Consider my province of Saskatchewan. There we have a real paradox. Our patient-bed ratio is among the best in the world and yet we are faced with long hospital waiting lists. Even cancer patients have to wait months for a bed and some heart attack and fracture cases have been turned away because there are no beds for them. Imagine the situation at the University Hospital where for months complete wards are closed because of the critical shortage of nursing and other personnel. These situations have all existed; they are a matter of public record. Hospitals are faced with ever-increasing costs of operation but still there are not enough funds to provide some of the modern equipment that is considered to be so essential in running a hospital today. These are facts, Mr. Chairman, not fantasy but grim facts.

I hope that the Minister of National Health and Welfare will not turn out to be another of those who fail to see the situation in its true light and blunder on blinded by the brilliant beam of political opportunism. I sincerely hope he is not one of those. I could go on and discuss medical care and the increasing demands on doctors' services, the over utilization, the ever-increasing costs, the deterioration in quality care, but I do not wish to prolong these estimates at this time more than is necessary. Suffice it to say that we must look very closely at these other areas of need in this country. I ask the

government to look again at the Hall Commission report wherein they point out that we need doctors and we need health resource funds immediately to start building in the next few years for the number of doctors and the other personnel that will be necessary at that time.

I favour prepaid medical care. I work now under the scheme in Saskatchewan and have done so since its inception on July 23, 1962. But I would hate to see any more schemes introduced in this country by following the same rough road by which the scheme came into being in Saskatchewan because it caused heartache and disturbance among the profession and the people of that province. I do not wish to see this happen anywhere else.

As I say, Mr. Chairman, I favour prepaid medical care but not at the expense of the entire economy or the quality of medical care. Surely in growing up we must first crawl and then walk before we run. Surely it is wise to provide care primarily where it is needed and specifically where it will do the most good. Provide the doctors, provide the nurses, provide modern hospitals with modern equipment, an adequate number of beds and all those other things I have mentioned and you will remove most of my objections to this plan.

Above all—and may I address this request to the minister—do not forget to have adequate consultation with those providing the service. This is something that got lost in the shuffle in the province I represent. Remember that the Canadian Medical Association asked the former prime minister, now Leader of Her Majesty's Loyal Opposition, to set up the Hall Commission. Give the medical profession ample opportunity to discuss the matter with you, Mr. Minister, and you will find the path ahead a smooth one. Given such consultation, even the smokescreens of socialistic sophistry will dissipate in the cool winds of reason and understanding.

• (4:30 p.m.)

[*Translation*]

Mr. Allard: Mr. Chairman, if the present government often considers its administration with satisfaction, it happens, on the other hand, that millions of Canadians are unhappy about the huge sums of money spent on national defence and the complacency of the government with regard to the interest on the public debt.

Faced with poverty and increasing needs, those Canadians are asking the government to increase family allowances.

The Family Allowances Act was sanctioned on August 15, 1944 and went into effect on July 1, 1945. At the outset, the allowances decreased progressively with the number of children, but the government corrected that situation in 1949.

Apart from a small increase in 1957, the allowances have remained much the same until now.

Here is how the system works today. For each child under 16, the government pays $6 or $8 a month, according to the child's age. Under the terms of another act passed in 1964, that is the Youth Allowances Act, young people between 16 and 18 who are still going to school get $10 a month.

I wish to point out that since 1945, the allowances have hardly increased, whereas the cost of living went up sharply. As a matter of fact, between 1945 and 1965, the cost of living jumped by 87.7 per cent whereas family allowances increased by 9.4 per cent only.

Is it necessary to recall that in 1945, milk cost 8 cents a quart and bread 10 cents a loaf? We know that today, just to give a few examples, the price of milk has tripled and the price of bread has more than doubled. Those are undeniable facts.

Moreover, since 1945, our economic growth and our national production have increased considerably. Production increased not only in value but in volume and quantity.

I realize that each year the central government allocates huge amounts for family allowances. Thus, in 1965, Ottawa spent $550,571,248 for 6,849,095 Canadian children. We also know that since the fiscal year 1957-58 Quebec is no more the province which draws more allowances in this field, but Ontario.

If Ottawa already spends large sums in family allowances, one must not conclude that its contribution is sufficient. On the contrary, this question must be discussed considering not only the high cost of living but the families' limited income and acute needs.

I am thinking, for instance, of the situation of Quebec families. Mr. Jacques Henripin, a demographer and University of Montreal professor, drew the following outline in a lecture he delivered in November 1965 to the Family Social Services Federation congress:

> Out of the 994,000 non-farm families, 18 per cent have an income lower than $2,500; 24 per cent have an income between $2,500 and $4,000; 29 per cent are in the $4,000-$6,000 bracket; and the remaining 29 per cent have an income higher than $6,000.

Therefore, one finds, sir, that family needs, even though I choose only those of Quebec, as an example, become alarmingly greater.

That is why there is only one imperative solution and the initiative is a matter of urgency: the family allowances scheme must be amended without delay if hardship and poverty are to be fought effectively in this country.

At the last federal-provincial conference of Ministers of Health and Welfare in January 1966, the representatives of five provinces at least called for such a revision: those of Ontario, Quebec, Nova Scotia, Manitoba and Newfoundland.

If Ottawa delays any longer, the provinces which will take action will not be to blame. Hon. René Lévesque announced at that conference that Quebec would take action shortly in this field if the central government failed to do so.

Besides, it is to be wondered whether the administration of this program should not be entrusted to the provinces. Any province would then be free to set up within its boundaries a better comprehensive scheme including every aspect of social security.

It already seems as if the Prime Minister (Mr. Pearson) sees no objection to the provinces handling the distribution of family allowances. This attitude became apparent during an interview with parliamentary correspondent Charles Lynch over the English network of the C.B.C. on January 18, 1966.

It would seem, however, that the federal Minister of Health has no desire whatever that Ottawa should abandon the administration of family allowances.

As far as I am concerned, Mr. Chairman, I feel that this problem is under provincial responsibility, because it is an area touching upon social and educational fields. The constitution of 1867, in its spirit and in its wording mainly under chapters 92 and 93, gives the provinces exclusive jurisdiction over social and educational matters.

The fact that Ottawa entered this field of action in 1944 by not giving the provinces their fiscal revenue does not mean that the federal government was constitutionally empowered to do this.

It must be pointed out here that Ottawa passed its legislation on family allowances without first using a constitutional amendment. It proceeded differently with regard to unemployment insurance in 1940 and old age pensions in 1951.

[Mr. Allard.]

In fact, the federal Family Allowances Act of 1944, as that of 1964, which provides for payment of allowances to children, in addition to dealing with social needs, constitutes indirect interference in the field of education, since a child must go to school in order to be eligible for the allowance.

Therefore, it would be to Ottawa's advantage—and it would have plenty of time to do it—to devote itself to the national and international matters specifically mentioned in the constitution and to hand back to the provinces the responsibility for and the administration of family allowances.

While waiting for that development to take place, since it is urgent to amend the system of family allowances, we must ask ourselves what should be the social philosophy behind such a change.

Family allowances are related to the essence of human dignity and social welfare. The state should especially encourage its younger citizens and support the family, which is truly the basic cell of society.

As the taxpayers supply the amounts of money the state distributes, it is fitting that, in this field, the plan should be universal, just as in the case of old age pensions, health insurance and superannuation plans.

However, it is fitting that we should consider various degrees and standards in its application. For instance, with regard to allowances, family needs can be catalogued. The extent of the needs shall be studied without discrimination. The number of children per family, their age, as well as the father's income, should to be taken into consideration. Allowances could be paid according to a realistic and selective scale.

On the basis of these general principles, one can imagine various family allowances schemes.

Whatever the scheme to be adopted by amending the present one, I suggest that the new formula should be comprehensive, in proportion with the number and the age of children, based on needs, not on the simple wish to increase buying power it should take into account the father's income and the increase in the cost of living and it should be accompanied by an adjustment or exemptions concerning income tax legislation.

The new plan, in spite of realistic features, should not eliminate the first child from the benefits. The first child cannot be set aside mathematically. This child does not choose his rank upon his birth and he is a citizen

like the others and he has needs; he often grows up in a needy environment and, later, he will pay taxes for thousands of other children. Consequently, any discrimination against the first born should be rejected.

It is understood that an early change to the family allowances program will increase government expenditure under the Department of National Health. But this increase, under National Health, could be compensated by reductions in other areas, by elimination of waste or by permitting the institution of a provincial lottery.

One fact stands out, in conclusion: The government must take measures to increase family allowances considerably and thus effectively fight poverty through a more equitable distribution of national income. Such is the fundamental requirement of a truly democratic government.

• (4:40 p.m.)

[*English*]

Mr. Douglas: Mr. Chairman, it was not my intention to take part in this debate. However, I noted that the hon. member for Saskatoon seemed to spend most of his time making an attack on the former C.C.F. government in the province of Saskatchewan. He began his speech by saying that he did not want to hold up the estimates. Then he proceeded to make a provocative speech which I think he must have known demanded a reply.

An hon. Member: Resist the temptation.

Mr. Douglas: I do not want to resist the temptation.

Mr. Starr: No willpower.

Mr. Douglas: As a matter of fact, I thought it would be a very good idea if the statements of the hon. member for Saskatoon were drawn to the attention of the people of this country and particularly to the people of the province of Saskatchewan.

The first comment of the hon. member was that the C.C.F. government in Saskatchewan took from 1944 to 1962 to set up medicare. If he was as well qualified as he pretends to be he would have told the committee that the C.C.F. government was elected in Saskatchewan in 1944 on a promise to set up, stage by stage, a comprehensive health insurance program. The medical care program even in 1962 did not constitute the final stage as it does not cover drugs, dental care, glasses or other ancillary services. The hon. member might have pointed out to the committee that one of the first things the C.C.F. government did in 1944, with a total provincial budget of a little over $30 million, was to set up completely free care for the mentally ill, both mental in hospitals and psychiatric clinics, followed by the first completely free cancer program covering treatment, deep X-ray therapy, surgery and post-operational care. The provincial government set up completely free health services for the first time in Canada for all assistance groups such as old age pensioners, those receiving mothers' allowances, wards of the government and blind persons.

The province set up in one health region the first completely universal medicare program for all residents of that region, some 65,000 persons, by way of a pilot project as early as July 1, 1945. That plan is still in operation. It provided the statistical data upon which the provincial plan could be based and also provided a good deal of the data which was of use to the Hall Commission. On January 1, 1947, the provincial government set up the first comprehensive hospital insurance program in Canada and on this continent. We in the provincial government made it very clear to the federal government, first Liberal and later Conservative, that if at any time they were prepared to pay a substantial part of the cost we would be able to proceed with comprehensive medicare.

It was not until 1961 that the province felt it had sufficient revenue to proceed with comprehensive medicare, because the entire burden of this program had to be borne by the provincial government. Therefore, for the hon. member for Saskatoon to suggest that there was any delay in implementing the promises of 1944 is either an attempt to mislead the committee or is a woeful betrayal of ignorance. Knowing the hon. gentleman, I can make my own selection.

The second matter he referred to was the question of means tests. He referred to the speech made by the hon. member for Vancouver-Kingsway and said that while the members of the New Democratic party decry means tests, nevertheless in the province of Saskatchewan under the C.C.F. government means tests were retained.

Means tests were retained under the Old Age Assistance Act which provides for a pension to be paid jointly, in part by the federal government and in part by the provincial government. The regulations are laid down by the federal government and under them the provincial government is required

to impose a means test. We expressed our willingness at federal-provincial conferences, both under the Liberal federal government and under the Conservative federal government, to pay our share of the cost of the government would be prepared to remove the means test. The hon. member for Saskatoon has not pointed out that during the six years the Conservative government was in office the means test was retained and that there was no willingness on their part to remove it in spite of our repeated requests.

It is true that with reference to provincial programs a means test had to be retained, particularly with reference to supplementary pensions for the old age security group. It is also perfectly apparent that with the limited financial resources a provincial government has it is almost impossible to pay a universal pension to everyone at a certain age, because a provincial government does not have the power a federal government has of collecting back in income tax a substantial part of the pension from those who do not really require it.

I want the committee and the people of Saskatoon to notice that the hon. member is arguing for the application of a means test to medicare. Does this mean that the conservative party members have now become the exponents of means tests? Does this mean they propose that the old age security pension now universally paid should be rescinded and a means test applied? If a means test is fair and equitable in medicare, it is equally fair and equitable when applied to a pension. Is the Conservative party now, through its recent more reactionary acquisitions, announcing that it has taken the backward step of supporting means tests in social welfare and health problems?

I hope that Conservative members, particularly from Saskatchewan, who have campaigned a great deal on the question of removing the means tests, will now make it perfectly clear whether the hon. member for Saskatoon was speaking for the Conservative party and particularly for the Conservative members for the province of Saskatchewan.

Another thing to which the hon. member made reference was medicare and his opposition to the four basic principles of the Hall Commission report which the Prime Minister endorsed on July 19 and 20 of last year. The hon. member for Saskatoon took some credit for the fact that the administration of the present Leader of the Opposition set up the Hall Commission. For that they deserve full credit, particularly for choosing such an outstanding person as Mr. Justice Hall. Having taken the credit for appointing the Hall Commission, I wonder why the Conservative party has not come out and endorsed the report and the recommendations of that commission.

• (4:50 p.m.)

The Conservative party has been lying in the bushes so far as the Hall report is concerned. They have carefully avoided coming out into the open and saying where they stand on the recommendations of the commission. In the recent election there was no clearcut forthright statement from the Conservative party saying where they stood on the Hall Commission report. It has been left to the hon. member for Saskatoon to say that the Conservative party is opposed to the first basic principle laid down by the Hall commission, namely, that medicare should be universal and should apply to every citizen of this country irrespective of race, colour or financial circumstances.

Mr. Brand: Would the hon. member permit a question? Is he familiar with the meaning of the word "universal" as it is used in the Hall report? If not, I am perfectly willing to acquaint him with it.

Mr. Douglas: I am perfectly familiar with it. I am perfectly familiar with the paragraphs in which Mr. Justice Hall argues against any kind of means test and contends that the indignity and humiliation of any kind of test is totally uncalled for.

Mr. Brand: May I ask—

Mr. Douglas: The hon. member can sit down. I suggest he study the Hall Commission report. If he would do that instead of making the rather asinine statements he was making this afternoon I think he could make a more useful contribution to this committee and to his party.

Mr. Starr: Don't get mad.

Mr. Lambert: Come to Alberta and say that.

Mr. Douglas: As a matter of fact, I can tell the hon. member for Edmonton West that I said exactly the same thing in the province of Alberta.

Mr. Lambert: And where did it get you?

Mr. Douglas: Of course, the hon. member for Edmonton West is very interested in where it gets one. That is why the Tory party had one program in Alberta and another in

Saskatchewan. That is why when they were in office they wiggled from one side of the fence to the other and never did anything about medicare. That is why there were no great forward steps in health and welfare legislation while we had a Tory government.

Mr. Lambert: We got the whole Hospital Insurance and Diagnostic Services Act.

An hon. Member: We set up the royal commission.

Mr. Douglas: I am suggesting that the Tory party should now tell this committee and tell the people of Canada whether they agree with the hon. member for Saskatoon that medicare in this country ought not to be on a universal basis, that there ought to be discrimination so that only those who can qualify on a means test basis will be able to get medicare under a government sponsored plan. Do they support the kind of plan that has been set up in Alberta? I think they should tell us. That is what the plan in Alberta amounts to.

It means an arrangement whereby those who are able to pay for private insurance can do so while those who cannot pay the very high premiums demanded may, if they are willing to undergo the indignity, get the government to contribute part or all of the premium provided a means test can be passed.

Mr. Lambert: You have a means test attached to many other programs.

Mr. Douglas: I notice a great many interruptions from the Tory benches but I have not yet heard any person in the Tory party say whether or not they stand for the universal application of medicare to all citizens without any means test. We are very anxious to hear just that.

The hon. member for Saskatoon took my hon. friend from Winnipeg North Centre to task for urging the minister to press on with medicare by introducing enabling legislation to allow the provinces to come in if they choose to comply with the four conditions laid down by the Prime Minister taken directly from the Hall Commission report. What the hon. member is suggesting is that the federal government should depart from the Hall Commission recommendations and allow each province to establish any kind of medicare program it wishes.

This means that persons moving from province to province would find totally different conditions for qualifying. We would find that the transferability, the portability of medicare would be completely destroyed. The only way in which you can have national medicare is by having uniformity and the only way in which you can have uniformity is by having universal application so that people can move from Quebec to British Columbia or from Ontario to Nova Scotia and find they are capable of qualifying wherever they may go.

The hon. member for Saskatoon warned the minister against having medicare meet what he called the "long, rough road" it had in the province of Saskatchewan. Mr. Chairman, medicare only had a long, rough road in Saskatchewan because there were mossbacks like the member for Saskatoon who fought against its introduction. There have always been antediluvians who live in the past and who fight every kind of progressive measure when it is first introduced. Yet the medical profession in the province of Saskatchewan has since come out and said that the plan has been operating successfully.

Much of the opposition was totally unnecessary. I simply want to say that I hope the medical profession has learned from this experience and that its members are prepared to sit down with representatives of the government in Ottawa and with representatives of the various provincial governments to work out suitable arrangements whereby we can have the universal application of medicare to all Canadian citizens.

Let them make no mistake about this. They can fight rearguard actions. They can make the kind of speeches we heard this afternoon from the hon. member for Saskatoon. But the great bulk of the Canadian people want universal medicare and they are going to have it in spite of all the reactionaries, and I want to say to the minister that the people will give him their wholehearted support if he has the courage to put the legislation on the statute books.

Mr. Skoreyko: If the Minister of National Health and Welfare introduces the kind of program which the hon. member suggests, would he risk his seat in Burnaby-Coquitlam so as to allow the minister to be re-elected?

• (5:00 p.m.)

Mr. Martin (Essex East): No. The hon. member for Burnaby-Coquitlam would come over here.

Mr. Brand: Mr. Chairman, perhaps I may be allowed to make a few brief remarks in

response to the hon. member for Burnaby-Coquitlam. I thank him for having made those observations. I seem to have touched a nerve somewhere. I do not wish to take away any credit from the hon. member or from the government he had the honour to lead when he brought about many useful and progressive measures in the province of Saskatchewan, measures which are working very well at the moment. But I do not wish him to take credit for those he did not bring in and I noted that he mentioned the cancer program. This was started by one of the members of the Hall Commission, Dr. D. M. Baltzan, of Saskatoon, during the Conservative administration. It was first started as a pilot plan and it was made free by the Liberals, admittedly as an election bribe in—

Mr. Douglas: May I ask my hon. friend a question?

Mr. Brand: Just sit down. I have not finished. The hospital insurance program which your government brought in did an admirable job. I merely pointed out in my address that nothing has been done to take care of the distaff side, and I would ask the hon. member to listen carefully. As I suspected, the means test was once again used by the hon. member as a smokescreen, and this is exactly what I meant. I said nothing about a means test in any medicare scheme. I made no pronouncement about the policy of our party. I asked some questions which the hon. member did not take time to listen to, and so we have had more sophistry.

The hon. member said I opposed the four main points. If he reads *Hansard* tomorrow I think he will find that is not the case. He said that I said we had not endorsed the Hall Commission report. I invite him to read the speeches of the Leader of the Opposition, and I think I shall send him some of mine also.

May I just read from the Hall Commission report, paragraph No. 2, under the heading "Health Charter for Canadians":

> "Universal" means that adequate health services shall be available to all Canadians wherever they reside and whatever their financial resources may be, within the limitations imposed by geographic factors.

I understood the hon. member to suggest that he thought the medical profession had learned its lesson. I thought he had learned his in Regina a few years ago. May I point out that the plan at present in operation in Saskatchewan is not the plan originally proposed. Admittedly the idea is there but the plan was changed. The legislation was changed by a special session of the legislature called by Premier Lloyd of Saskatchewan after the meeting of the doctors and the Saskatoon agreement on July 23.

This plan operating in Saskatchewan is not the plan originally proposed by the hon. member's government. That plan outlawed the private practice of medicine in the province of Saskatchewan. Certainly the present plan is working well now. The reason it is working is that the doctors are still dedicated individuals who are working hard to give the best possible care to their patients despite the fact that there is overutilization of their services, despite the fact that they are working much longer and much harder than they ever worked. But I am afraid that by reason of the amount of work they are doing they are working in less depth than they should be in medical practice, and these are things which must be considered by the committee and the government in any proposals for medicare throughout the country.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Douglas: I do not want to delay the committee, Mr. Chairman, but may I just make two points. Reference was made to the free cancer program in Saskatchewan. First of all, I want to point out to the hon. member for Saskatoon that the free cancer program which had been set up by a Conservative government in 1932 or 1934, if I remember correctly, provided only for diagnostic services and not one dollar was ever paid out for cancer treatment or cancer surgery until a C.C.F. government was elected in the province and supplied the necessary funds for that purpose.

The hon. gentleman also made reference to the fact that the hospitalization program was set up with not sufficient attention having been paid to the supplying of what he calls the distaff side. I suppose he means hospital equipment, plant and facilities. I would point out that between the time our government took office and the time the hospital insurance plan was established we doubled the number of hospital beds in the province. I have not looked at the figures for the last two years but for years Saskatchewan had the highest ratio of hospital beds per thousand of the population of any province in Canada and was only equalled by one state of the union, namely, the state of New York.

When the hon. gentleman points out that the medicare plan operating in Saskatchewan is not the same plan as proposed originally he

is really playing with words. The plan brought in did not outlaw private practice. That was the interpretation which was given it by certain persons who opposed the plan. It certainly was not concurred in by the law officers, but in order to satisfy any who might have fears in that regard, Premier Lloyd did agree to bring in amendments to the Act. But at the time the Act was introduced in the legislature I made it perfectly clear that our understanding and interpretation of the legislation, on the basis of opinions by the law officers, was that it left the medical profession the right, if they chose, to stay outside the plan.

I contend that the basic principle of having medicare available to each person, without requiring him to prove he is indigent or comes within a special category, has worked successfully, and I am convinced that if it is made applicable to all Canadians it will work equally well and be generally acceptable to the Canadian people.

Mr. Howard: Mr. Chairman, I want to raise one particular matter with the minister relating to an individual case which on the surface at least looks rather unique. It involves an individual who is the recipient of old age security payments and has a deduction from his cheques in order to cover what is claimed to be an overpayment made to him by the Department of Veterans Affairs. So far as I can understand, this is because of a provision in the Financial Administration Act. I should like to read into the record a letter sent to this individual by Mr. Bone, regional director of the federal department in Victoria, B.C. The letter is dated in September of last year. The amount of the overpayment is significant and I draw particular attention to it. The letter begins:

> As you know, an overpayment amounting to $6,926.34 was made to you by the Department of Veterans Affairs which is administered by the federal authorities.

An overpayment of $6,900 is a fantastic amount. I understand the individual in question was receiving war veterans allowance at the rate of $55 a month which, if the overpayment total is correct, would mean it extended over a period of some 10 years or more, an inordinate and unreasonably long period before it came to the attention of the authorities.

The letter continues:

> Since these authorities were not successful in effecting collection of that overpayment the matter was referred to the federal Treasury Board. The board has instructed, under the terms of the Financial Administration Act, that the amount of the overpayment be recovered by monthly deductions from payments of your old age security pension.

In the first place, this is news to me. I thought payments under the Old Age Security Act were inviolate and were not liable to attachment or deduction no matter what the reason, but apparently in this instance this was done.

I read further from the letter:

> Beginning with the month of October, 1965 and continuing up to and including November, 1980, monthly deductions of $38.00 will be made from your cheque. A deduction of $10.34 will be made from your cheque for the month of December, 1980. Beginning with the month of January, 1891—

There must be a typographical error there. I think that should be 1981.

> —payment will resume at the full monthly rate.

The gentleman who wrote to me has enclosed his cheque. He does not know what to do with the balance of $37 left after the deduction was made. There is an interesting point I should like to draw to the attention of the minister. This gentleman obviously is 70 years of age now. Presumably deductions will be made from his old age pension cheque for the next 15 years. If he is 70 now he will be 85 when the repayments are finished. On the surface it just seems wrong. First, I think the Department of Veterans Affairs, if there was an overpayment of almost $7,000, is guilty of not discovering it earlier than they did.

• (5:10 p.m.)

I have inquired among my colleagues in respect of the cases of overpayment they have heard of in their years in parliament and they say that from memory they do not recall anything of this magnitude ever being involved and that an overpayment of an amount up to $1,000 would be the maximum. An amount in the neighbourhood of $7,000, however, is completely unheard of.

In the first instance, I think there is a degree of error on the part of the Veterans Affairs administration which permitted this sort of thing to happen. I do not know what took place. I have no knowledge of the background circumstances. I have no knowledge of whether or not the declaration that there was an overpayment is correct or whether it is based on correct information. I am not going to go into that aspect.

However, from the fact that the Veterans Affairs people have said there is an overpayment of $7,000 it seems to me that they admit their error in not discovering it much sooner

than they did. Second, it is the responsibility of the Minister of Justice under the Financial Administration Act to make a determination whether the overpayment is recoverable and the cabinet subsequently adopts an order in council, Treasury Board minute, or whatever the mechanism is, providing that the individual's old age pension will be cut in half even though the overpayment resulted in part from the error of the Department of Veterans Affairs.

I do not know what probability there is that the overpayment will be completely cleared up. Who knows how long a person will live? I do not know this gentleman's age at the moment but presumably he is at least a year or two over age 70. Whether the individual himself will continue to receive the old age pension for a sufficient length of time to pay off the indebtedness is problematical, all other things being equal.

I would seriously urge upon the minister that he institute a review of this matter and take into account the probability that the Department of Veterans Affairs made an error in not making this determination sooner than they did and also take into account the good possibility that even if you persist in deducting $38 a month from his $75 you will not recover the full overpayment in any event because of the passing of time. If Treasury Board must insist on balancing its books in so far as this one individual is concerned, I would ask that they be kind and gracious enough to wipe some of the overpayment off the books. If they feel they must make a deduction from his cheques in order to cover some of the overpayment, then let them think in terms of a deduction of $5 or $10. This is the usual amount, the hon. member for Kootenay West tells me, and he has had many years of experience in dealing with the Department of Veterans Affairs. He tells me that usually $5 is considered to be the proper token deduction to make in order to reduce overpayments.

I seriously urge this upon the minister. I have refrained from giving the individual's name but the minister is certainly welcome to the correspondence. I will send the correspondence to him later so that he will have it in his possession. I hope he will do something worth while for this individual and see if he can approach the problem with some fairness.

Mr. Coates: Mr. Chairman, first of all I should like to say I was both shocked and angered by the reply of the Prime Minister today to the effect that we in the Atlantic provinces should be grateful for what this government has done. I hope that my remarks this afternoon will not be considered in this light by the representative in the cabinet from Nova Scotia. This is an example of the Liberal philosophy about which I complained earlier in regard to presenting estimates in the house and it is a philosophy which must disappear if we are to hope to achieve the mutual and merited consideration of proposals when they come before the federal government.

I should like to recommend to the minister the speech of the hon. member for Simcoe East last evening. He in effect told the minister it is not realistic to try to provide the Canadian people with second rate medicare when they are deserving of the very best. He went on to say that they can receive it only if certain actions are taken by the government to provide the facilities which the doctors must have to work with if they are to be given an opportunity to provide the kind of service that Canadians want.

I recall a difficult situation that developed very recently in the Maritime provinces because we do not have the facilities to provide the kind of medical education desired by those who would like to have it. We do not have adequate facilities at Dalhousie University and there are none in New Brunswick, none in Prince Edward Island and none in Newfoundland. As a result Dalhousie medical school was under very severe criticism because of the number of applications they were willing to consider from areas other than Nova Scotia.

I know there has been a long discussion by the medical association of New Brunswick about the possibility of the establishment of a second medical school. Certainly something must be done in our area if we are to produce the number of doctors we need to service our people. Surely it would be very unfair to inflict upon doctors in our area an even greater load than they already are carrying simply because of the desire to meet a deadline.

No one in the Conservative party wishes to do anything but see to it that people in every part of Canada receive the very best medical attention. No one in the Conservative party wishes any person in Canada to be deprived of medical attention when he or she needs it. But we also appreciate the fact that certain actions which have not been taken must be taken on a priority basis before we can

expect to have universal medicare or anything like it.

• (5:20 p.m.)

I do not intend to say anything more on that subject because I believe the hon. member for Simcoe East has put forward these arguments in a very cogent manner. It is my hope that the minister will give very serious consideration to them as he goes ahead with his plans.

There are two other aspects of the minister's department about which I should like to speak. First of all, I want to refer briefly to the special committee of the Senate on aging. I do so for two reasons. We have heard a great deal of criticism of the other place recently. Whether or not it is warranted is not for me to say, but I do suggest that a report of the committee indicates the value of that body to Canadians. If there is some difficulty with regard to the other place, it is one that can be rectified by the government provided it wishes to take appropriate action rather than the kind of reform we noted in certain recent appointments to that chamber.

The highly qualified men of the other place should be given the kind of useful objectives to work toward that would be of benefit to all Canadians. I refer particularly to the deliberations of that body on land use and the fact that our ARDA legislation flowed from their report on that subject. Today the ARDA legislation is very much a part of our agricultural and resource policies.

The Senate report on aging contains many recommendations which if implemented would do much toward eliminating the poverty now evident in our country. Indeed, perhaps the implementation of these recommendations would do more than any other step the government could take.

The minister has a department through which tremendous things could be done. It is a department which deals with individual Canadians in difficult circumstances, a department from which will flow great material benefits to everyone in Canada provided the minister is willing to use the facilities available to him to take the kind of action that is required.

I wish to refer specifically to a recommendation on page 19 of the Senate report on aging. It reads as follows:

> The committee endorses in principle the institution of an income guarantee program for all persons aged 65 and over and recommends to the federal government that this proposal be given immediate study.

I want to draw the minister's attention to the discussion we have had during this debate about the means test and the Senate committee's recommendation to the effect that the means test should be eliminated and should not apply in considering the needs of the older people of this nation. At page 17 of the report the following is stated:

> Any suggestion that these older people, when the $75 pension is not sufficient, should be expected to depend for supplementation on public assistance after a needs test is utterly unacceptable.

It is certainly unacceptable to me and I believe it is unacceptable to this committee. Again on page 17 of the report the following is stated:

> The question is how best to provide such benefits. One possibility would be to increase the Old Age Security Pension by some agreed amount as has been done at intervals in the past.

That is exactly what we proposed during the election campaign and exactly what we have proposed during debates in the house since this session began. This is the logical step to take and I hope the minister will get in touch with the provincial governments in this regard if he finds that necessary. I think funds are available in the federal treasury to provide for the increase if the minister wishes to take that step. If the minister feels it necessary to consult the provincial governments I am sure he will find they will be willing to join in an effort to increase old age pensions to $100 as we have recommended or to $105 as recommended by the Senate committee as the very minimum guaranteed income for Canadians 65 and over.

The other matter I wish to raise and direct to the minister's attention relates to allowances for blind and disabled persons. I have been concerned for some time about the fact that individuals receiving allowances of this type are faced with the greatest difficulty anyone in life can face in being unable to work. These people have medical requirements beyond those of the average individual; yet in many cases they are asked to subsist on $75 per month. What is even worse, the regulations laid down by the Department of National Health and Welfare are interpreted by provincial governments in such a way that many individuals are ineligible for these benefits. This is creating shocking inequities.

I might have taken dozens, even hundreds of cases from my files and read them into the record to show the circumstances of these people who are incapable of working but cannot meet the qualifications for additional

allowances set down in the regulations of the Department of National Health and Welfare. In order to meet these qualifications one almost has to have, as the old saying goes, one foot in the grave and the other on a banana peel because of the way the regulations are interpreted today.

I would ask the minister to find out whether or not something can be done about the regulations in order to bring them more in line with the incapability of these people to work. I know of several cases at this time that are shocking, but whenever I write the minister of public health and welfare of my province I always receive a reply to the effect that the medical review board in interpreting the federal regulations issued by the Department of National Health and Welfare finds it is impossible for the individual concerned to qualify.

In this regard I should like to refer again to the Senate committee report on aging wherein at page 26 the following is stated:

> The committee recommends: That the N.E.S. devote greater attention to the field of part time employment with a view to discovering the nature of the demand and offering a more effective placement service.

I suggest that recommendation might apply very well to many of these people now unable to exist on disabled and blind pensions.

• (5:30 p.m.)

During the last election campaign one of the Progressive Conservative party's planks was the elimination of the means test in regard to blind and disabled allowances. Perhaps it was not a significant plank in our platform but it is a plank which indicates the real appreciation this party has for the welfare of the citizens of this nation. It exemplifies the fact that we are willing to produce the kind of program which will meet the needs of the people of this country. It exemplifies our concern for the suffering evident everywhere today in this nation among these people. I hope the minister will give very serious consideration to broadening the regulations so that employability will be a factor as well as disability.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Godin: Mr. Chairman, I am glad to have this opportunity to congratulate the Minister of National Health and Welfare (Mr. MacEachen) on his appointment to that post and I regret having to draw to his attention certain steps of doubtful value that were taken under his predecessor.

[Mr. Coates.]

It could be that the former minister was not informed of the unwholesome work performed under his department's authority by certain medical doctors who probably wanted to justify their jobs and enhance their prestige before their friends.

In any case, those wretched individuals took advantage of the cow's product to cowardly bring honest citizens before the courts. Some farmers are now charged with having put poor quality milk on the market. I am convinced that to force someone to stand trial, one must be sure that the accused is morally guilty. Therefore, in this case, the person who can honestly prove that the farmer is guilty, as far as the quality of the milk is concerned, is not yet born, for the very good reason that dairy milk is never bought but taken on consignment by the processors concerned. They go to the farmers to take delivery of the milk, they see to it that it is weighed and they only have the right to accept or return that product, and often, the product processed in several ways will be put on the market before the farmers get a penny.

At the present time, the dairy producers in the riding of Champlain are awaiting the verdict following a trial which took place before the courts in Trois-Rivières.

Other farmers in my riding are awaiting their trial which has been set for March in Quebec City. It is through the R.C.M.P. that they learned that they had put milk of poor quality on the market on May 4, 1965. The farmers, who normally sell their milk $5.50 per cwt. get from their dairy a first, second and third notice when such a thing happens. Sometimes the farmers must stop delivering milf for a week or two, that is long enough to enable them to locate the trouble. But there is never any talk of a trial. However, in the case under consideration, that is dairy milk, for which the farmers get only $3 per cwt. when it costs them $3.50, there was not any first, second or third notice.

And what is most ridiculous about this situation, Mr. Chairman, is that the processor never stopped getting milk from those farmers.

I have here the quantities supplied by a producer for each day in 1965. They total 63,669 pounds. Either his product was good or it was not. If it was, the dairy did well to accept it. But if it was not, it might have been due to the herd which should have been killed. But it might have been due also to the refrigeration method. If the milk was considered unsuitable for making some products,

because it had been badly kept, the processor had the right and duty to refuse it; then, thousands of consumers would have been truly protected. The reputation of the farmers would not have suffered; and only a few lawyers would have in their pockets a few dollars less from the Department of National Health and Welfare.

The minister made a serious mistake when he mobilized the R.C.M.P. on Christmas eve to hand out summons to farmers throughout the province of Quebec, because around that time the same police officers might have focused their attention on Quebec City to prevent the distribution of thousands of pounds of meat from the United States which had been declared unfit for human consumption and, in addition, had been previously refused by the city of Montreal.

I ask the minister to look closely into this deplorable situation and to get in touch without delay with the farmers involved who are greatly concerned over what the future holds in store for them, because departmental employees who came to testify at the trial in Trois-Rivières behaved in a manner which would please Fidel Castro very much.

We should not forget that there are in your department some employees who, for these same reasons, they obtained their job, could be somewhere else. The officers of the department use the law to do their job. All laws are good, provided they are not abused. Every citizen can use certain laws. Take my case: this very morning, had I wished, I could have sent to jail the owner of a restaurant where I had breakfast. This afternoon, just with a written charge, I could have any hon. member in this house locked up. I will not do it, because we live in a democratic country and mutual co-operation should rank before felony.

In conclusion, I ask the minister to do whatever is possible not to cause prejudice to the Canadian farmers, and particularly Quebec farmers, since 75 per cent of them are no longer masters in their own house, because they owe their land to federal or provincial agricultural credit, their machinery to the banks, their cattle to the Caisses populaires, as a result of loans granted to them. Actually, they only have their wives left.

• (5:40 p.m.)

And, although the minister is unmarried, I am sure that he will not need the law when, one day, he asks a woman to take his arm.

Mr. Vincent: Mr. Chairman, we did not intend to speak at length on the estimates of the Department of National Health and Welfare, but since the discussion seems to drag on we thought it our duty to ask certain members of our party to speak in order to remove the obstruction which seems to rise on our extreme left.

We have several comments to make, but we had agreed to make them at another time. However, as we see that it is almost impossible to reach an agreement on that point, we thought we should speak immediately.

Mr. Chairman, I should like to put certain questions to the Minister of National Health and Welfare (Mr. MacEachen), to whom I wish much success in his new duties.

I would like him to answer the questions I shall put to him when, a little later, he gives reply to the questions hon. members put to him. If he cannot do it now, he could answer them at a later date.

The first question is this: Mr. Chairman, it will be remembered that in 1963, his party, through the present prime minister, promised to extend student allowances to the age of 21.

It will be remembered that the former Minister of Justice, who now fills a high post in London, said to the house that the right hon. prime minister always kept his promises, and that he was giving himself four years within which to keep his promise to grant students allowances till the age of 21.

We would like the minister to tell us if he has had the opportunity, since he has become Minister of National Health and Welfare, to study the prime minister's promise, and to tell us when the government or himself expect to be able to grant these allowances to students until they are 21.

I ask that on behalf of the numerous Canadian families which see that family allowances have remained almost stationary since 1945.

If one compares the cost of living percentage points for 1945 with those of today, one sees that family allowances no longer meet the purposes for which they were granted in 1945.

I do not have figures here, this afternoon, but if my memory serves me correctly, the cost of living, according to the index set in 1949, was 100. In 1945, the cost of living would have been 75, according to the 1949 index. Today, we know that the cost of living increases very fast, particularly since the last two or three years. It even exceeds 140 points.

This means, Mr. Chairman, that if the government is ready to launch a war against poverty in Canada, the opposition is ready to support it.

We note that large families are apt to be poverty-stricken. This is a fact and it is our duty to ask the Minister of National Health and Welfare to take immediately the necessary steps to increase family allowances in order that they may be more consistent with the present cost of living.

I state this suggestion in addition to that I made a few moments ago concerning allowances paid to students.

Now, there is another matter about which I would like to ask the Minister of National Health and Welfare. I do not know if, to date, he has had any opportunity to meet his Quebec counterpart, Hon. René Lévesque. But we have been hearing for many months that the hon. provincial minister intends to take over administration of family allowances. He suggests that these allowances would be granted by the government of Quebec and the latter would receive fiscal compensation from the federal government.

Would the hon. minister disclose the present stage of the discussions with Hon. René Lévesque to this effect. I wish to point out that the statement of Hon. René Lévesque to the effect that the first and even the second child of a family will not be covered by family allowances has led to many protests.

In some letters I have received from families with three, four or five children, it is said that it is no use doubling family allowances if nothing is paid for the first and second child. Anyway, they say, it would be the same.

I should like some enlightenment from the minister on the intentions of the federal government as far as allowances paid to students up to age 21 are concerned and on the intentions of the federal government concerning the readjustment of family allowances to the cost of living, and also on its intentions concerning the wish of the Minister of Health of the province of Quebec to have control over family allowances and to get fiscal compensation from the Ottawa government.

Now, sir, I conclude not by placing before the minister all the requests received by me in connection with family allowances, but by telling him once more, and this is my own opinion, that if we are to fight poverty in Canada, we must give thought to large families. I have no doubt that if family allowances were geared to the present cost of living, which is always on the increase, we could render a very great service to our large Canadian families.

Mr. Caouette: Mr. Chairman, would the hon. member allow me a question?

Mr. Vincent: Certainly.

Mr. Caouette: I appreciate his position with regard to an increase in family allowances. Would the hon. member tell the house why his party, which was in power for five years, forgot during that time, to increase family allowances according to the cost of living index?

Mr. Vincent: Mr. Chairman, if I were to take the time, this afternoon, to say—

Mr. Caouette: Take the time.

Mr. Vincent: —all that was possible to do—

Mr. Caouette: Physically.

Mr. Vincent: —during that period of five years, well, it would be too long. But I am sure, as the hon. member for Villeneuve very often says it, I cannot recall his expression: "All that is physically possible"—

Mr. Caouette: Must be financially possible.

Mr. Vincent: All that is physically possible must be financially workable.

Mr. Choquette: And really desirable.

Mr. Vincent: One must consider that this is the year 1966 and that this government has been in power for four years already. The hon. member for Villeneuve is exerting pressure so as to raise family allowances; let him keep on joining us in order to ask this government to act in the direction we all want, namely raise family allowances.

• (5:50 p.m.)

[*English*]

Mr. Herridge: Mr. Chairman, I want to be very brief.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Herridge: I see that is welcomed on the government side of the house. I want to congratulate the minister on his appointment. He has a formidable task ahead of him in the next few years which will tax all his skill, his tact and his patience. I also want to compliment the parliamentary secretary on her appointment. I know she is keen about her responsibilities and takes them seriously. I want to say in passing that she adds a charming dash of colour to a very drab male landscape.

I pay my tribute to the staff of the department who carry on their work throughout the year as do members of other departments. I think they should receive greater recognition than they do from a very large percentage of the Canadian people. I notice some of them are here. I know they do not mind listening to this debate because it is an annual Roman holiday for the Department of National Health and Welfare. Others from the Department of Public Works are listening carefully behind them.

I support all the proposals made by members of our group with respect to a national health insurance plan, raising old age pensions to $100 a month at age 65, introduction of the Canada Assistance Plan and improved housing for senior citizens. In short, I support all those things that our party has stood for throughout the years.

On this occasion I rise particularly to deal with one item only, physical fitness and amateur sports. I must say we were very pleased with the announcement made by the minister recently that further funds are to be provided for the coaching of amateur athletes in this country, making it possible for them to take part in international competitions. I particularly wish to compliment all those organizations in Canada which are working in this field, including the Royal Canadian Legion.

I think the Legion has done very good work in this respect and has co-operated with the government, with the athletes concerned and with the communities in which Legion branches operate. I might say that the Legion branch in Kootenay West has taken great interest in the development of amateur sports and holds an annual track and field meet to promote interest in this program.

I must mention the excellent success that the University of Notre Dame has had in solving the problem of being able to combine attendance at university and good average marks with the development of sport of international championship calibre. I know that this is a unique development in the combination of educational opportunity and high calibre athletes in this country.

I stress the skiing part of the program because Kootenay West is known everywhere for its development of champions but particularly in the skiing field. In this connection I wish to quote from Sports Scope, volume 1, No. 1, now being published by the Royal Canadian Legion in the interests of the development of amateur sport. It is further evidence of the Legion's willingness to co-operate with the people, with communities and with the government in developing amateur sport. I feel in all fairness I ought to place this on the record:

> Some studied historian may one day be able to pinpoint the week end upon which Canada became a major ski power. An unstudied guess, however, would have to be the first week end of last April.
>
> One week before the Crystal Mountain meet in Washington, the Americans had done poorly against the relentless racers from France, Switzerland and Austria. So they went on to the National Alpine event hungry for a chance at redemption. Then somebody let the Canadians onto the course, and for the Americans it was a Bay of Pigs on skis.

And wasn't I pleased.

> With stunning suddenness, the Americans faced a new threat. It was almost as if a fifth column had struck secretly from within while American attention was focused on European racers.
>
> Nancy Greene swept the slalom, the giant slalom and the downhill that week end. Rod Hebron pulled a third in the slalom and coach Dave Jacob's skiers were scattered throughout the top ten positions.
>
> The men's slalom at the national was only the beginning. In the national, Rod Hebron, Bob Swan and Peter Duncan all placed higher than the nearest American. In the next three slalom races on the circuit, the best Canadian placed higher than the best American.
>
> Meanwhile, Nancy Greene had hit her stride. She won the two giant slaloms, a qualified first in a downhill, fourth in a slalom and one disqualification in a slalom after a run which was a full second faster than her nearest competitor.
>
> The Canadian team which had gone to the U.S.A. as country cousins returned to Canada as serious contenders for world skiing honours.
>
> By fall the racers were back in permanent quarters at Nelson, B.C. Those with an academic standing of grade 12 or less must attend high school. Others are encouraged to attend the local Notre Dame University or the Arts School.
>
> The Canadians has apparently solved the problem which is confronting the Americans: how to combine school and ski. But on the other hand, the U.S.A. has solved a problem which still confronts Canadian skiers:

And other athletes in this country—the question of funds.

> Whereas the U.S. program has a budget of $450,000, the Canadian Ski Association is having considerable difficulty in raising $150,000. If it can't, Canada's skiing ambassadors or their parents will have to dig down into their pockets to foot the bill.

I just want to mention that the Canadian Legion appreciates the sports training plan and took the opportunity to record this appreciation formally when presenting the Legion's brief to the Prime Minister on November 25 last. Reference to this will be found in *The Legionary*.

The Legion's national clinic for track and field coaches is recognized as one of the best

in the world. The Legion admits that the success of the program has been largely due to financial assistance received from the Department of National Health and Welfare. I think we must give credit where it is due.

An hon. Member: Time.

Mr. Herridge: I have 30 seconds to finish. In view of the success to date of the sports and physical fitness program I urge continued and close co-operation by the government with the universities and other organizations interested in the promotion of amateur sport in Canada through the provision by the government of further financial assistance for the coaching of Canadian athletes who will be participating in international sporting events. I also urge that where further assistance is required it be given.

I also wish to pay tribute to Nancy Greene who lives in Rossland in the riding of Kootenay West and is one of my constituents of whom we are all proud.

Item agreed to.

Medical Services—

20. Administration, operation and maintenance including authority to make recoverable advances in amounts not exceeding in the aggregate the total of all amounts to be paid by the governments of provinces and territories under agreements to be entered on terms approved by the Governor in Council with such governments in respect of health assistance to persons residing on Indian reserves other than Indians and to residents of the territories other than Indians and Eskimos, $32,002,500.

Mr. Howard: Mr. Chairman, I hope this is the correct vote under which to raise a question which has to do primarily with medical services to native Indian people. I want to mention two or three points to the minister. In British Columbia we have a means test type of medicare program and native Indian people who make application for coverage under that program are advised that they are not eligible to be covered because their medical coverage falls under the jurisdiction of the government of Canada. I think this matter was raised a few years ago. The policy with respect to coverage for native Indian people in British Columbia was that if it was considered that the individual had sufficient funds to pay his own medical bills they fell on his shoulders but if it was determined that the individual did not have sufficient funds to pay his medical bills then the department paid them.

• (6:00 p.m.)

In other words, there was a means test in application then in the case of native Indian people who cling to what I might call their aboriginal right and feel that the cost of their medical coverage should be borne automatically by the federal government. This feeling is perhaps stronger in British Columbia than elsewhere because in British Columbia the native Indian people have not signed any treaties with respect to their lands. They feel that the Crown, having invaded their territory and exploited resources formerly exploited by the native people, has a concomitant responsibility toward them. They feel rightly or wrongly—rightly, I think—that coverage is the responsibility of the government and should not be dependent upon the application of a means test.

If this is still the policy of the federal government, and from what has been said I believe it is, we find the native Indians in British Columbia facing two means tests. First, there is the means test approach which the federal government has imposed on them for some time. Second, if they want to apply for coverage under the British Columbia medicare plan they find themselves confronted with another means test, a means test which amounts to a prohibition because the attitude of the provincial government is: We want nothing to do with you because you are a federal responsibility. As a result the native Indians find they are covered by no one so far as medical care is concerned.

I wonder whether the minister would care to reply and give an account of the policy of his department in this area. Perhaps he could tell us whether any steps are being taken to overcome the difficulty which native Indians are experiencing in getting medical coverage.

At the same time he might tell us what the situation is with respect to the so-called medicine chest case in Saskatchewan. A year or so ago a court found that the present day application of a provision in one of the old treaties meant that these people should receive medical coverage from the state.

The Deputy Chairman: Order. I regret to interrupt the hon. member for Skeena but I see it is six o'clock.

Mr. McIlraith: When the Speaker resumes the Chair I propose to ask that we waive private members' hour.

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Progress reported.

PROCEEDINGS ON ADJOURNMENT MOTION

SUBJECT MATTER OF QUESTIONS TO BE DEBATED UNDER ADJOURNMENT MOTION

Mr. Deputy Speaker: It is my duty, pursuant to provisional standing order 39A, to inform the house that the questions to be raised at the time of adjournment tonight are as follows: The hon. member for Chapleau (Mr. Laprise), Labour Conditions—Timmins—skilled labour shortage in gold mining industry; the hon. member for Hamilton East (Mr. Munro), Industry—Hamilton, Ont.—cessation of operations of Studebaker Company; the hon. member for Cumberland (Mr. Coates), Broadcasting—Fowler Commission—acceptance of recommendations.

Mr. McIlraith: Mr. Speaker, I should like to ask unanimous consent to forgo the private members' hour today.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Does the house give unanimous consent at this time to forgo the private members' hour?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Mr. Olson: Only on condition that it is postponed and not abolished.

Mr. McIlraith: Agreed.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Is it agreed that the private members' hour just be postponed?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

SUPPLY

The house in committee of supply, Mr. Rinfret in the chair.

DEPARTMENT OF NATIONAL HEALTH AND WELFARE

Medical services—

20. Administration, operation and maintenance including authority to make recoverable advances in amounts not exceeding in the aggregate the total of all amounts to be paid by the governments of provinces and territories under agreements to be entered on terms approved by the Governor in Council with such governments in respect of health assistance to persons residing on Indian reserves other than Indians and to residents of the territories other than Indians and Eskimos, $32,002,500.

Mr. Howard: As I was saying, Mr. Chairman, a year ago or perhaps longer a court in Saskatchewan decided that a clause in a particular Indian treaty meant, in present-day terms, that at least the Indian people covered by the treaty should have their medical coverage provided by the state. The implications of this decision were extremely far reaching and would, I think, lead us in the direction which I for one would like to take, namely that of providing medical care coverage not only to native Indian people but to others.

This court decision brought the matter to a head. I understand that the government of Saskatchewan appealed the decision. Why, I do not know; presumably they did not like it. I should like to know from the minister what is the current status of this case. If it is still pending as an appeal before the courts I think we are perhaps prohibited from saying very much more about its merits. Before I go further, perhaps the minister can tell me the status of this particular case.

Mr. MacEachen: In connection with the first question asked by the hon. member, the one relating to Indian participation in the medical service of British Columbia, the department does of course provide medical services to the Indians. However, at the present time it is attempting to provide a method by which Indians can participate in the British Columbia insurance scheme and secure coverage under the provincial medical aid plan. So far the department has not been fully successful in achieving its objective but it is continuing its efforts.

Mr. Howard: What about the court case?

Mr. MacEachen: I am sorry. I was otherwise engaged when the hon. member mentioned the case in Saskatchewan. Would he be good enough to repeat it briefly? Then I will try to give him the necessary information.

• (6:10 p.m.)

Mr. Howard: This is the so-called medicine chest case. I do not recall the name of the Indian group involved. It related to an early treaty which said that a first aid kit or medical facilities of that kind should be kept at the Indian agent's office. As I recall, this was subsequently determined by the court to mean full medical coverage in present day terminology. The decision was appealed and I should like to know the status of this case now.

Mr. MacEachen: I should like to tell my hon. friend that it has not yet been decided.

Mr. Howard: Then I shall say no more about that aspect. However, what the minister had to say with respect to negotiations with the provincial government of British Columbia to bring native Indian people under the B.C. medical plan was interesting and

revealing. It was an amazing statement for him to make because his own Prime Minister has declared on more than one occasion that he is in favour of the four fundamental points set out in the Hall Royal Commission report on health services, one of them being that medical care should be universally applicable and that there should not be a means test. I presume it is still the position of the government that when it comes to the question of medicare the government's policy is to make it universally applicable without a means test.

But in the face of that the minister now tells us he is negotiating with the province of B.C. to bring native Indian people into a plan that has a means test. He and the Prime Minister are running in opposite directions. In recent days it has been shown that there is a divergence between what the Prime Minister thinks and what some of his ministers think, but if the Minister of National Health and Welfare wants to be consistent with the Prime Minister's policy he should be leading the way in medicare with regard to people who are his direct responsibility under the constitution so as to provide medical coverage without a means test for native Indian people not only in B.C. but right across the country. The B.C. plan has a means test as an integral part of it.

I hope the minister is not successful in these negotiations because I know what will occur in that event in B.C. and I know what is occurring now. People have to go to the premier of the province and disclose their bank accounts and how much property they have. They must make full disclosure of all their personal circumstances in order to get medical insurance coverage. This is contrary to our way of thinking and contrary to the thinking of the minister's party. As I say, I hope the minister is not successful in these negotiations and I hope he will seriously reflect on this matter.

Mr. MacEachen: I am not precisely clear as to the point the hon. gentleman is making with respect to the means test. The objective of the department is to have the Indian population treated in precisely the same way as other citizens in British Columbia who are served under the B.C. medical insurance scheme and in that way to secure the kind of integration that is a goal. But this does not in any way detract from our general policy with respect to the universality of medical insurance. As has been stated several times today and yesterday, we will assist provincially administered medicare plans which meet the four principles, one of which is universality.

I was encouraged the other day to read in the press a report made in the provincial legislature of New Brunswick to the effect that it was the intention of the province of British Columbia to enter the general plan. If that report is correct, then it is very encouraging and will remove the difficulty my hon. friend foresees.

Mr. Howard: Mr. Chairman, this sounds something like the Bomarc philosophy, that you get something and once you get it you do not want it; you want something else. It also hinges on the prospect of the government bringing in a medicare program and the minister has not shown any indication that it is going to do that yet. I still say he is going in the wrong direction. If he wants to provide full medicare coverage involving the principle of universality, then let him start with the human beings who come within the jurisdiction of the federal government. We have applied a means test philosophy to them for donkey's years which has resulted in the degradation of these people and the development of an inferiority complex on their part. The minister is now attempting to perpetuate the same sort of system by bringing them under the B.C. medical plan, which involves a means test, on the same basis as everybody else.

If the minister wants to negotiate with the B.C. government for coverage of the native Indian people across the board so they will be covered regardless of the means test in the provincial plan, then that is a horse of another colour and I wish him success. But obviously he is not trying to do that. He is trying the approach of integration and integration is a pretty foul word so far as the native Indian people are concerned because the implication is that it is a one-way street.

Mr. MacEachen: Mr. Chairman, there may be a misunderstanding here. I do not see where the fact of a means test enters into the service that we are attempting to provide or that the means test is any way applicable to the Indian population if they can be served under the B.C. medical plan. This is our feeling about it.

Mr. Barnett: Mr. Chairman, I am sure the minister realizes my intervention is meant only to be helpful to him. There is a section in the Indian Act which says that the Governor in Council may make regulations for the purpose of providing health services for

the Indian people but even though the Indian Act has been in existence for many years apparently the Governor in Council has not yet got around to making regulations in connection with health services for Indian people. Indeed, one might almost argue that the activities of the minister's department in this connection are without any real statutory foundation. I suggest that without waiting for legislative action respecting a national medicare scheme regulations could be enacted under the authority already given to the Governor in Council by which, without application of a means test, the services available under the British Columbia medical plan could be provided for the Indian people of B.C.

• (6:20 p.m.)

I suggest to the minister that this is a course of action he might consider. I think the few of us who know the situation at all, in respect of the approach currently in effect in providing Indians with medical services through the Department of National Health and Welfare can argue that the present situation is a most unsatisfactory and unhappy one. The Indian people themselves do not know where they stand from one day to the next so far as their eligibility for health services is concerned. So far as I have been able to find out, most of the persons who are administering the services, certainly the people in the Indian Affairs branch, do not know where they stand in trying to tell the Indian people what they may or may not be eligible for.

I suggest to the minister that there is open to him an immediate course of action for which there is statutory authority, to bring all the Indian people of British Columbia into the coverage of the British Columbia medical plan without in any way creating the situation which the member for Skeena has been discussing with respect to the proposals which I understood the minister to say are being considered or discussed with the government of British Columbia at the present time. I suggest this might be a very useful interim measure and that the problem of medical care and services for the Indian people could be resolved immediately under the authority of the legislation now in existence. In many ways it would simplify, at any rate, the administrative situation in respect of Indian health services. In fact, if the Governor in Council were to adopt regulations which in effect would prepay the premiums for the Indian people so that they would be eligible for the full benefits of the British Columbia plan, this need not cost the federal government any more for health services in British Columbia than they are spending at the present time.

Mr. MacEachen: My information is that the department is quite ready and eager to do what the hon. member suggests.

Mr. Barnett: The minister says his department is eager and ready to do it. Is the government eager and ready to do it? Are they going to do it and, if so, when?

Mr. MacEachen: The answer is yes, Mr. Chairman.

Item agreed to.

25. Construction or acquisition of buildings, works, land and equipment including payments to hospitals and other institutions which care for Indians and Eskimos as contributions toward the construction of hospitals and related facilities, $5,050,000.

Mr. Howard: Mr. Chairman, there is one brief comment I should like to make concerning a hospital close to Prince Rupert known as the Miller Bay Indian Hospital. Originally it was a hospital for tubercular patients. With the decline in tuberculosis it has been transformed into a sort of general hospital for native people from the whole northern part of British Columbia and I presume part of the Yukon Territory as well. In fact, I think I met a native person from the Yukon who was a patient in that hospital at one time.

The hospital facilities are second world war army or air force buildings. They were built during the second world war for military purposes and are pretty antiquated by present day standards. About a year ago an attempt was made to close the Miller Bay Hospital. This was forestalled because if it were closed there would not be sufficient hospital facilities available in the area to take up the slack and provide accommodation for the patients who normally might expect to be in the Miller Bay Hospital. So it has been kept in existence.

So far I have heard no thought expressed nor plan ennunciated with regard to what is scheduled so far as the Miller Bay Hospital is concerned. My thought and that of a large number of the native people there is that we would just as soon see the Miller Bay Hospital closed and go out of business because these people would rather have hospital care and attention provided to them in the same type of hospital and with the same facilities as those provided to other people. They do not

want to see the perpetuation of the system of establishing separate facilities for people based on their racial origin.

I am wondering whether there are any plans for the government to work in conjunction with the British Columbia government to expand the hospital facilities available under British Columbia law to the extent that they will provide sufficient beds for the expected number of native people who might have to use them if the Miller Bay Hospital were eventually closed. I should like to hear about this and so would the people in this area. Can the minister tell us anything about the plans in respect of Miller Bay?

Mr. MacEachen: Mr. Chairman, I can tell my hon. friend it is the wish of the department to do precisely what he wishes, that is, to wind up this hospital. It is a question of getting alternate facilities.

Mr. Howard: How soon will it be proceeded with or how soon will the alternate facilities be available?

Mr. MacEachen: Mr. Chairman, I regret I do not have the information on this particular hospital with me at the moment. If it will satisfy my hon. friend, I will assure him that I will obtain full particulars and give them to him by letter as soon as possible.

Mr. Howard: That is quite agreeable, Mr. Chairman.

Item agreed to.

The Chairman: This completes the estimates of the Department of National Health and Welfare.

DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC WORKS

1. General administration, including grants as detailed in the estimates, $14,892,700.

Mr. Keays: Mr. Chairman, is the minister going to make a statement on this item?

Mr. McIlraith: Mr. Chairman, I did not plan to make a statement because these estimates cover works for the year just ending and which are nearly completed. I think the items which really are of interest to hon. members are those in next year's estimates which I hope will be referred to the Standing Committee on Housing, Urban Development and Public Works in the very near future.

Mr. Keays: Mr. Chairman, we do not wish to delay the passing of these estimates unduly but we would like the assurance of the minister that the estimates for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1967 will be sent to the standing committee as soon as possible after the new fiscal year begins.

Mr. McIlraith: I will gladly give that assurance right now.

• (6:30 p.m.)

Mr. Keays: At this moment it is quite evident that we have to ask ourselves whether there is co-ordination in the work of the department, whether there is a meeting of minds and also whether the different branches of the department are directing their efforts to the same cause when they are studying the feasibility of projects and undertaking studies. It seems that the equilibrium has been upset somewhere along the line and I should like to say more about this a little later.

It seems to me we are not heeding the danger signs of inflation in the nation and if we are we are not applying the solutions all across the country. Some areas of the country have been declared as designated areas because there is high unemployment and a great deal of available labour. It seems to me that the measures we are using in this regard are not being applied elsewhere in the country and I hope that the people in the department are aware that domestic measures must be taken to curtail the dangerous inflationary trends. I hope they also realize that an appraisal of government spending programs must be made so that priorities can be applied to certain projects with others being postponed.

Duff Roblin, the premier of Manitoba, tried to impress upon the government some time ago that we could not afford all the requirements of government at once but that priorities must be set in order to deal with them in turn as we can afford them. Many of the projects included in the estimates now before us have not been started. We have items in the present estimates for projects which are of grave necessity but which have been postponed for a number of years.

A few moments ago I suggested there was not a meeting of minds concerning some of the projects which have been undertaken. Before coming into the house yesterday I read an article which appeared in *Le Soleil*, edition du Bas St. Laurent, concerning port facilities being built in the area of Gros Cacouna. I understand this project will cost in the neighbourhood of $4 million. We are now endeavouring to find out how we are

going to utilize these facilities. In the article there is this statement in French:

[*Translation*]

The decision to make an operational survey of those harbour improvements should also be announced shortly. The survey would be conducted by a specialized firm.

[*English*]

This project is practically complete but we are now going to undertake the study of a portion of it. Does that mean that the branches of the department that studied the project before it was started did not consider all the factors or that there have been changes in the plans of certain individuals who wish to establish industries in the area, or does it mean that this project was simply built to answer the wishes of the people of the area?

The hon. member for Rivière du Loup-Témiscouata is not in his seat at the moment but I want to assure him that I have no objection whatsoever to this project. I do object, however, to the fact that many projects of a more pressing nature have not been proceeded with yet. I think of many small repair jobs that have to be done to wharves and small necessary dredging jobs which would cost from $200 to $2,000.

There seems to be some confusion in this regard. When it comes to these small but necessary jobs they are not proceeded with but when it comes to jobs costing millions of dollars they go ahead. This seems to be a pennywise and pound foolish policy. I refer to the inshore fisheries of the lower St. Lawrence and eastern Quebec. The fishermen there cannot carry out their operations because of sand which has moved into the entrances of the harbours. They must wait until high tide before they can get into or out of the harbours. The dredging of these harbour mouths would entail very small expenditures. It seems that the powers that be get around to doing these small jobs in the month of November after the fishing season is over. When spring arrives the same situation exists because the sand has been carried in again and the fishermen cannot get out to the fishing ground. I know of 25 instances of this kind.

In this same regard I cannot help but think of many slipways which have been built. I trust that professional engineers had nothing to do with the planning of these slipways. Some of these slipways have been built with a stone or concrete wall four feet higher than low tide and I should like to know how a fisherman can get his boat up on the slipway at low tide. There are eight or ten such slipways in my area alone.

On the other hand, I can think of areas where wharves are necessary for the deep sea fishing fleet but because of the lack of repair ships are not able to approach these wharves. There is a lack of bumper facilities, rubber or otherwise, for the protection of these ships. In many instances there are large nails protruding and ship owners refuse to use the unloading facilities. These jobs require small expenditures but they are very essential to the fishermen in the area.

Without taking too much more time I want to refer to the Chandler project and the study which was made by the research council in 1959. This project was proceeded with because of the urgent necessity of having a new harbour at Chandler. In that area there is a pulp mill. One paper machine has been installed and I am sure a second one will be installed in the near future. The company in the area cannot operate efficiently or profitably by using the present facilities at Chandler. The government has asked the company to contribute a certain amount of money toward the project. To date the company has refused to make this money available because of certain conditions which have been imposed. Apparently the contribution amounts to $525,000 payable in two instalments, one of $50,000 and one of $475,000 upon completion of the project. What hurts the company concerned is the fact that the $475,000 is an amount of money which the Department of National Revenue says the company will not be able to charge against operating expenditures.

• (6:40 p.m.)

I have never heard, and I doubt that too many people have, of a case where a private company has been asked to contribute a large amount of money to a capital expenditure for a project belonging to another body or person. In this case the new installation will be the property of the government or the public and the company will be asked to contribute a large amount of money which it cannot deduct from its expenses. I think we have a new approach in this regard and I should like to suggest that the company would accept additional wharfage charges or rental charges involving large amounts of money because they would be able to charge these expenses against their operating costs. In this way the amount of money asked from the company by way of a capital expenditure would in the period of a few years be doubled.

I would therefore ask the minister to endeavour to settle this case as soon as possible because the situation is urgent. I hope that necessary repairs to facilities will be carried out as soon as possible next spring so that those people who wish to work may do so. We should encourage people to work and they should be given the opportunity of pursuing their trade without great difficulty.

We wanted to speak about the tendering system employed by the department. We also wanted to speak on the question of awarding contracts on a regional basis up to a limited amount of money. However, we will delay our discussion of these matters until the estimates for the next fiscal year are before the committee.

As a final request of the minister and the government I ask that a little initiative and perhaps imagination be used in building across this country in maritime areas marinas for those who wish to travel by boat on their holidays. Boat travel is a new trend. There are hundreds of thousands of boats in use across this country by people who use them for their holidays.

I am sure it is important to these people to know that when they are at sea they can use these marinas as resting places and to obtain protection from the elements of nature. Marinas are needed in the St. Lawrence and gulf areas; they are needed on the lakes. I am sure that with our centennial year approaching many American tourists will be coming to Montreal by yacht and it would be unfortunate if disasters occurred because of the lack of marinas along the St. Lawrence up to Montreal.

Mr. Peters: Mr. Chairman, I am quite sure there is a tendency to wish to discuss on a regional basis the proposals made recently by the Department of Public Works. However, I think we should perhaps wait until the minister's estimates for 1966-67 are before us. I am in agreement with the proposition that even though we have not authorized in a technical sense the payment of money for the operations that have taken place under the Department of Public Works, eleven twelfths of the money has been expended and payments under contracts must be made. I do not think that at this late date we shall renege with regard to the operations that have been undertaken in the last year.

I should like to bring to the attention of the minister a matter that has been drawn to my attention quite forcibly in the last few weeks. It concerns a change in the practice of the department to which I as a member of parliament am opposed. I have looked at the list of staff members of the department to see how many executive secretaries the minister has because every time I write a letter to the minister or the department I receive a reply from an executive secretary saying that what I am inquiring about cannot be done.

I do not know what qualifications are necessary for one to be an executive secretary but some of the problems I have referred to the department are of a highly technical nature. I have been asking the department for advice whether a project is feasible and have received the reply that the project will not be undertaken. In my opinion it is not for executive secretaries to say whether a project is to be undertaken and in most cases I am not asking for this type of advice but for one of the officials of the department to decide whether it is feasible. As a member of parliament I am asking for this information.

I know this system is adopted in other departments when requests are made of an official and I can see some merit in it in that members of parliament are supposed to deal with these matters at a certain level. However, I believe the Department of Public Works is a pretty broad organization and it is also a fairly technical organization in many aspects of its duties. For this reason I suggest strongly that unless the executive secretaries are Solomons they should leave it to the heads of the various departments to decide whether something can be done.

The matter that I raised with the department was a very simple one and referred to a particular type of soil. My inquiry was whether this soil could be used in greenhouses and, if it could, would it be possible to lease a certain portion of land from the government? I received a reply saying that the government had decided they needed this land and were not going to lease it. There is no point in leasing it if the material is of no value. We can negotiate for the land after it is decided whether it is valuable. My request was for technical advice.

No doubt the minister is well aware, after listening to some of the speeches that have been made previously, that in the field of public works there are wide ramifications. There are highly trained and highly skilled people in his department and I believe that members of parliament can benefit from the advice these people are able to give. When it comes to a matter of policy I agree that this

should come from the minister but the system of channelling letters from a member of parliament through the minister's executive secretary is one that I believe the minister himself does not agree with and as a member of parliament I disagree violently when my inquiries are subjected to this delaying type of tactic. Under this practice the suggestion is that the answer is given from the top, which is not necessarily the place at which you wish to start. Therefore I suggest that if this is a new policy, and I am informed it is, it should be discontinued.

There is one other matter I should like to mention, Mr. Chairman, and it was mentioned by the hon. member who spoke before me. I refer to changes that have taken place by regulation. One such change has bothered me because it was an issue in the last election campaign. It was a decision of the Prime Minister to make a change in the harbour facilities for pleasure craft. We have always been interested in knowing why the government had not moved into the field of providing services for this changing environment, particularly on inland waters. I live by a body of water that is a boundary between two provinces. This area has had considerable commercial activity in years gone by but that commercial activity has now changed. While the activity is no less commercial and in fact the volume, moneywise, has increased, it has completely changed. We were interested in the change that could be made by regulation at the insistence of the Prime Minister while visiting British Columbia. He had the opportunity then of involving himself with the yachting society in the area, taking a trip and finding the facilities not suitable. We are all well aware of the fact that the facilities are not suitable in many areas.

• (6:50 p.m.)

This is something to which the federal government should give consideration. I am surprised that this was done for political purposes. I hope the minister intends to give the house before long some indication of what is the government's intention in this regard. I believe that in every province in Canada tourism is a growing industry. Some aspects of it in some areas are international and in other areas interprovincial and really not the responsibility of the provinces, but no jurisdiction has yet been established in regard thereto.

The minister will probably have to reconsider the regulation which was passed in response to the generous gesture of the Prime Minister but which I think has not been thought out too well. If that is done, then assistance and technical advice can be given areas which will benefit from it in the provision of the proper type of harbour facilities, thus projecting the trend which has developed over an extended period of time.

These are only two considerations to which I should like the minister to pay attention. I hope that when the estimates of the Department of Public Works are brought before parliament in the next few weeks they will be referred to the committee for detailed study because I believe it is a department which affects every member of parliament and we have got bogged down because of the way we have been handling estimates in the past. If we do what we are doing now and relinquish our opportunity to speak on each of the items in these estimates which concern our ridings then there should be some method, as there is in England, to compensate for this loss of scrutiny and give a member the opportunity to make some recommendations regarding public works in his riding. In my opinion this is not possible under the present system of handling the estimates.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Caouette: I only wish to say a few words on the estimates of the Department of Public Works. The minister is rightly anxious to have his estimates passed, since they have been spent. I want to point out to the minister that he is more anxious to see his estimates passed than to comply with the suggestions and the requests we submit to him rather often.

I wish to call his attention to the Rouyn post office in the riding of Villeneuve. A few years ago, before I came to this house, this post office was enlarged. Now, this extension gives the impression that, instead of a post office in Rouyn, we have some kind of a henhouse.

It should not be overlooked, Mr. Chairman, that the city of Rouyn is the metropolis of northwestern Quebec. It is the largest city and the nerve centre from the economic, social and every other point of view, of northwestern Quebec.

We have very nice post offices in Val d'Or, Malartic, Noranda, we have small post offices in Cadillac, Duparquet, and Evain in the riding. I sometimes wonder what architect in the Department of Public Works had the idea of building a henhouse to serve the population of Rouyn.

This post office should be completely done over. And if the minister ever went through Rouyn, he must have seen this shameful building there. The most populous city of the county and of all northwestern Quebec.

The Postmaster General (Mr. Côté) asked me to make representations to the Minister of Public Works (Mr. McIlraith), so that changes may be made to give us a post office which not only looks like a post office but which meets the needs of our city of Rouyn.

I know that the estimates which we are studying will not allow him to enlarge or improve post offices, but he could use those for the fiscal year 1966-67 to see that the exterior or appearance of the Rouyn post office is changed. It is a sorry sight as it now stands.

Mr. Chairman, I should also like to point out to the minister the pressing need of two airports in our region, one at Val d'Or, the other at Rouyn. In the case of Val d'Or, the necessary credits have been voted and the Minister of National Defence will probably attend to it. In the case of Rouyn, the Minister of Public Works will have to see to it.

All we have now is a small shack, 20 by 24. Fifties of people go to the airport to catch the plane. We have been asking for an airport for at least four years, but the minister has turned a deaf ear.

Another thing: people from different municipalities, in that part of the province, of the country, have asked the federal government to help with the construction of wharves on certain lakes in our region. They were told every time: "Since it is intended for tourist purposes, we are not really eager to build those wharves."

I remember, for instance—it may have been about 15 years ago—that under the Liberal administration here in Ottawa, and the present Minister of Public Works sat in this house at that time, authorization had been given for the construction of a wharf at Taschereau. The name was not Taschereau then; the area was known as Pontiac county, but, at Taschereau, a wharf had been built in the middle of a field, approximately 300 feet from lake Robertson. The wharf is still there today and people go there to fish in blue hay, where the water is about six inches deep. They fish for small perch.

This wharf, built with public funds under a Liberal government, is useless, except for a few young people who like to go fishing. As a matter of fact, this wharf is so far from the lake that I wonder whether the minister was not asked to build a lake along the wharf in order to justify its existence. I wonder.

At any rate, I sincerely believe the minister should give some thought to the building of wharves along certain lakes in the Duparquet area, for instance, an ideal spot for tourists which attracts thousands of persons every year from the United States and everywhere.

People who arrive at the lakes with their fishing gear and a boat are disappointed by the lack of wharves and ramps in our area, and they cannot enjoy their holiday. The Minister of Public Works should heed those requests and authorize the construction of wharves in our area.

Mr. Chairman, these are a few comments I had in mind. I know the minister is anxious to have his estimates passed, but I would ask him to be slightly more anxious to reply when we ask him something. It is all very well to say yes, yes, yes but something must be done.

We cannot be satisfied for ever with "yes" and promises. It may be more difficult to pass the 1966-67 estimates than those we are studying now. Let the minister ask his officials to accede to the legitimate requests not only of the people of my county but also of other counties.

I wish to insist particularly on the building of an appropriate and nice looking post office in Rouyn, so that the one which we have now can be demolished.

• (7:00 p.m.)

[*English*]

Mr. Olson: Mr. Chairman, normally this is the time when each member should have the opportunity, and take the opportunity of raising questions of a local character respecting the administration of the Department of Public Works in his constituency. I am not going to do that this afternoon. I am going to confine my remarks, and even those will be brief, to the policies of the government, and in particular to the administration of public works on what I would consider to be the national scale.

First, Mr. Chairman, I should like to impress on the officials, and on the Minister of Public Works, that there are a large number of people across the country who feel that the federal government is not following through with the terms and the intent of the Trans-Canada Highway Act that was passed in this house. I think if you were to examine that piece of legislation, it would be found that it was not the intention that the federal government should give only one payment to

the province, as a share of building the highway in the first place. The intention was that Canada should have at least one highway from coast to coast built to sufficient standards to accommodate the requirements of traffic on that highway.

I suggest to the minister as well that the specifications that were called for in 1950, or thereabouts, for a highway across Canada have changed substantially since then. Yet there has been no indication from the government that it intends to continue to assume the responsibility of the federal government to see that there is a modern highway from one end of Canada to the other. The government simply made a payment, I believe in the first place on a shared cost basis of 50-50, and when that highway was completed across any province that was the end of the federal responsibility. Mr. Chairman, we do not accept that as being in keeping with the intention of the Trans-Canada Highway Act.

On looking back you may see many occasions where the federal government has in fact amended the provisions of the Trans-Canada Highway Act by moving forward the completion date, and also changing the federal government's share of the cost of the balance of the unfinished highway, if you like. The result has been that some provinces which were very conscientious and very swift to proceed to build this highway across areas for which they were responsible have in fact been penalized.

We had a debate in the house respecting this matter a few days ago when, I believe, the hon. member for Gaspé introduced a notice of motion respecting some aspects of it. I am not going to talk at any length now, but I believe that there is a need to advance the standards respecting the highway to meet the needs of highway traffic. The federal government should not withdraw from that responsibility. A particular section I have in mind at the moment is a stretch of approximately 70 to 80 miles, from Calgary to the border of the Banff National Park. In view of the Alberta department of highways decision to construct a two-lane highway in the first place, there has been a failure in its capacity to take care of traffic using it.

It has been suggested that when the provincial government proceeds to upgrade the standards of that highway to four lanes, the federal government will refuse to pay a part of the cost of increasing the capacity of the road to meet new traffic conditions.

Mr. Chairman, without taking a great deal of time, I think that the federal government should announce that it intends to participate on a continuing basis in the keeping up to modern standards this highway across the country.

I think, too, that the federal government should change its attitude—if I may use that word—with respect to the disproportionate share that has been paid to some provinces which have been able to delay the completion of the highway.

Participation has moved from 50 per cent to 75 per cent, and in some cases to as high as 90 per cent. We think that this is discriminatory and that it should be changed.

Mr. Chairman, I am not going to take time to go into some of the other details, although as I said at the outset, I think this is the appropriate time to do that. I will not do so, because we are in the last month of the fiscal year.

I hope that the minister is ready to give some favourable response to the requests which have been made of his department, that the federal government should not withdraw completely from its responsibilities in keeping up to modern day standards this highway from one end of the country to the other.

Mr. Lambert: Mr. Chairman, I should like to make a few comments along the lines which have been made by the hon. member for Medicine Hat with regard to, first of all, the Trans-Canada Highway, what to me has become an entirely inexcusable, discriminatory treatment of various provinces with regard to the completion of the Trans-Canada Highway. It seems that those provinces which dragged their feet either intentionally, or otherwise, got the better treatment. Those provinces particularly the western prairie provinces, which completed their construction early were discriminated against. It is true that in that part of the country it is a good deal easier to build roads than in other parts. Surely, they are entitled to the same percentage contribution as some of the other provinces, in so far as the Trans-Canada Highway is concerned. I think what has happened is entirely wrong. I think that the prairie provinces should not have been penalized.

I want to underline what has been said by the hon. member for Medicine Hat with regard to the section between Calgary and Banff. On the one hand we have the government support of the application of Canada for

the winter olympics of 1972 which will require an expansion of the road facilities between Calgary and Banff. This notwithstanding some of the bureaucratic nonsense which has come out of the department of northern affairs where some of the senior officials seem to think that it is their duty as administrators to determine when the point of saturation has been reached in the usage of our national parks.

• (7:10 p.m.)

This is nothing less than bureaucratic arrogance. Our national parks are for the enjoyment of the people. The trans-Canada route was designed to lead to the majority of the national parks in the Rockies, and it is incumbent on us to develop the roads to them but not to penalize the provinces. I think that with regard to this section of the road, the province of Alberta is entitled to additional contributions, in the same way as the province of Newfoundland receives a higher rate, some 75 per cent in respect to the highway. In the same way as the province of Quebec receives particular contributions toward trans-Canada highway construction because of Expo. In addition to that Quebec receives a lot of fringe benefits, if I may call them that, with regard to highway construction in and about the city of Montreal.

I do not understand why there should be this discrimination—and it is rank discrimination. I think a great deal could be said in this same vein on behalf of the province of British Columbia. I wish to draw the attention of the minister to this matter in no uncertain terms. We shall be back dealing with this question time and time again during consideration of the estimates for 1966-67. This is an injustice which must be redressed.

The other point on which I should like to speak briefly tonight concerns the re-organization of the minister's department. It has now become a service department. We want to hear a great deal more about this reorganization than the minister has told us. I have become aware of certain tendencies which might be disquieting. There may be a logical reason for them, but we should have an explanation. Are we to have a series of little empires with planning sections, tendering sections and so on, with "big Father" in Ottawa still looking over the shoulder?

Is there to be a diminution of function here in Ottawa or is this to be merely a proliferation of administrative layers? We must have a detailed explanation. I do not expect we shall get it tonight but we shall look forward to hearing one at the earliest opportunity.

While the Department of Public Works is engaged in this business of decentralization into the five regions, it is curious to note that some of the other departments seem to be reversing this tendency and are doing away with the co-ordination which is inherent in a regional directorate. I think it is right to allow more authority in the field, but let us consider what other departments are doing in this regard. I have a suspicion that they are missing the boat. As I say, I hope there will be a full and frank disclosure of what has been done in the Department of Public Works, and that an explanation of this new philosphy will be given us at the earliest possible date.

Mr. Howard: I should like to support, briefly, the proposals made by the hon. member for Medicine Hat and the hon. member for Edmonton West in relation to the Trans-Canada Highway. We have long contended that inherent in the concept of building this highway was a concept of discrimination as between one area of the nation and another.

I do not wish to go into this matter further. I am sure the minister knows my views both with regard to this particular subject and with regard to proposals for additional highways, also to be built on the basis of federal-provincial participation, and usually referred to at home as the second Trans-Canada Highway. This is a matter we can deal with subsequently when the opportunity is available and when more time is at our disposal. I just wanted to say we completely support the thoughts of the two hon. gentlemen who have just spoken on this subject.

I should like to refer briefly, perhaps "for home consumption", as the phrase is, to two or three communities which are affected by decisions of the minister. These are the communities of Hartley Bay, Kincolith, Kitkatla and Kitimat.

I have had correspondence with the minister about the needs of these communities in recent days. The need of each one of them is the same, namely, a harbour or breakwater system to protect the fishing boats and the people who live in these communities.

The case of Kitimat is a particularly grievous one because an amount for the construction of a breakwater or harbour system at Kitimat had actually been set aside in the estimates, or, if it was not in the estimates as

such it was contained in the advance planning provisions or whatever is used by the department to suggest that a certain project is to be carried out almost immediately.

During the period around election time in 1962, funds were on the point of being set aside for the purpose to which I have referred. A decision has been made to proceed with the construction of a breakwater and boat harbour at Kitimat, but it was wiped out by the austerity program which immediately followed that election. Since then it has not been restored.

It was always my assumption, that these projects were placed on a list which was reviewed at least annually so that the correct priority could be determined. It would seem to me that if a decision was made at least three years ago to slate a project for construction, and if this decision was cancelled because of a national emergency at that time, it should have been reinstated at the first opportunity following the end of the emergency. The emergency has been over for a long time now. For this reason, the absence from both this year's estimates and next year's estimates of any provision in respect to this particular boat harbour is particularly grievous. I understand it has been set down for some time in 1967-68. I ask the minister to have somebody in his department advance this particular project as far as possible. Let us see whether it cannot be carried out during the current calendar year or during the current fiscal year.

The needs of the other communities I mentioned are no less urgent. They are all visited by strong winds in the fall, winter and spring. There is no protection to speak of in any of them from southeast gales. The people who live in these places have made fairly large investments in fishing boats, and these vessels need the protection which harbours and breakwaters would afford.

• (7:20 p.m.)

I would, therefore, ask the minister to look into this question and give it priority so that the necessary work can be done. I do not mean by this that it be done in 1967-68 but that it be done during the coming fiscal year by way of supplementary estimate, which is the only possible way since the main estimates have already been tabled.

I also wish to make a brief reference to the national capital commission item. Hon. members from the Ottawa area may think it is a bit presumptuous for someone from 2,000 or 3,000 miles away to comment about our national capital in the manner which I propose, but quite frankly I think the highway and road system in the capital is a ruddy disgrace. Many people who come to Ottawa express this point of view. They are shocked at the condition of the streets, especially at this time of year. The potholes that develop, seemingly in a matter of minutes are a disgrace to the national capital.

During the daytime I see people out in the streets filling in these potholes with hot asphalt, or running a hot iron over them, but they must be working in two shifts. They must go out again at night and dig them out, because next day no one would notice any change. This goes on year after year after year. Every spring it is the same blessed thing. To put it bluntly, the roads here are a disgrace to Canada and to the national capital.

At this juncture I am not particulary concerned whose responsibility it is, but we do have a National Capital Commission and I presume one of its functions is to beautify the national capital, to make it a pleasant place in which to live, and a pleasant place to visit. But with the potholes and the roads the way they are, it is a deterrent to people enjoying themselves and having a pleasant time driving around the city while they are in Ottawa.

I understand that a few years ago somebody sponsored a pothole contest. I do not know if it is still in existence, but you could win a prize by pointing out the biggest pothole of the week. Somebody once turned in a whole city block but they ruled his entry out because they thought that was going too far.

Somewhere along the line this situation has to be altered. I know there was conflict between the National Capital Commission and the city hall over some of these questions but surely to heavens, if we have any pride in our national capital, we should do everything we can to find ways and means to improve these streets because, in this modern age of motor vehicle transportation, their condition is something which affects everybody.

Mr. Loney: Since the minister has assured us that his estimates for 1966-67 will soon be coming before us I shall not make the extended remarks I ordinarily would. However, I do wish to support the hon. member for Gaspé and, without reiterating his words, would urge the minister to consider the request that slow growth areas, depressed

areas, or areas that have not been designated should have priority in an accelerated program of public work projects. I do not mean large scale projects, but those coming within the range of $1,500 to $15,000 for which local contractors and labour would qualify.

Before putting several questions to the minister, I should like to take this opportunity of expressing my gratitude to the officials of his department who, within the confines of their responsibility, have been most receptive to and considerate of requests I have made.

I do not expect the minister to give me a detailed reply tonight, but if he can let me have the information later I will be satisfied. With respect to the sum of $4,600 for exhibits, advertising, films, broadcasting and displays, I should like to know whether tender advertising is included and, if so, would the minister provide me with a breakdown of the moneys spent on such services by district in each province, for public works construction, public buildings accommodation and maintenance, harbour facilities, construction, repair and dredging.

Mr. McIlraith: Mr. Chairman, the item does not include advertising which covers tender notices. It includes the kind of displays the department might put up, for example, at a meeting of the Royal Architectural Institute. However, I shall be happy to provide the hon. member with the detailed information he has requested.

Mr. Loney: Under which item does tender advertising come?

Mr. McIlraith: It comes under the vote for general expenditure for projects, depending on whether it is for harbours and rivers, building construction or other headings. There is no advertising item as such. I have noted the hon. member's question and I shall provide the information in full to him.

Mr. Herridge: Mr. Chairman, as usual under these circumstances I shall be quite brief. I have always been interested in this department because I have been closely associated with it since the beginning years of this century. I have supervised the building of miles of highways, wharves, other things of that sort, and so I know something about this type of work.

I shall never forget when we had the first wharf on the Arrow Lakes. We did things formally in those days. We had a dinner in a backwoods village, where there were no roads, nothing but black tar. In passing, may I say that sometimes I wish those days would return again.

As a result of the building of the dams on the Columbia River, naturally a number of communities will be flooded out, and wharves will be needed in other locations. I should like to ask the minister what proposals are being made for the relocation of these wharves when this project is completed, and who will bear the cost of relocating them along the lakes and along the river?

I should also like to ask what amount is available this year for the maintenance of the wharves still being used and operated? What plans has the department for the maintenance of a supervisor in Nelson, and of a headquarters office? If the minister cannot supply the answers now, I shall be happy to get them from him later in writing.

Mr. McIlraith: I shall be very glad to give them in writing.

Item agreed to.

• (7:30 p.m.)

25. Construction or acquisition of equipment, $1,161,500.

Mr. Keays: Mr. Chairman, would the minister give some consideration to the purchase of more plant and equipment for the dredging operation. As I mentioned some time ago a good deal of our dredging operations can be conducted only during the fall when the fishing season is over. With more plant and equipment, I wonder whether it would be possible to get this work done at the proper time of the year.

Mr. McIlraith: Mr. Chairman, I would be very glad to consider that suggestion.

Item agreed to.

40. Construction, acquisition, major repairs and improvements of, and plans and sites for roads, bridges and other engineering works provided that the amounts within the Vote to be expended on individually listed projects may be increased or decreased subject to the approval of Treasury Board, $6,400,000.

Mr. Howard: Mr. Chairman, contained in this item is an amount of $4 million toward Canada's share of the cost of constructing highway No. 6 in the counties of Matane and Gaspe North, Quebec. Would the minister explain this to us, tell us how it arose, and what is involved?

Mr. McIlraith: I will have that information in just a moment. I remember something which occurred in that part of the province last year when I was in another department, but I hesitate to give an answer of which I am not sure at the moment.

Mr. Lambert: You are quite wise.

Mr. McIlraith: Let it stand for the moment.

Mr. Macquarrie: Mr. Chairman, I should like to make reference to the Prince Edward Island causeway. As the years go by we have been delighted to see that we are getting closer to the actuality. Our people were delighted with the call for tender. Naturally, we regret that certain incident which took place at the opening ceremonies, which perhaps is better forgotten. In a moment of panic after a certain event on November 8, one of the minister's colleagues made a comment, which is recorded in the Charlottetown *Guardian,* to the effect that we spent $100 million in Prince Edward Island and did not get a seat there. The Charlottetown *Guardian* said it was asinine statements like that which made them lose the two they had.

I will say no more except to commend the minister on the furtherance of this very important project. I hope he will move forward, as have his predecessors, in a venture which is economically feasible and which his department has demonstrated not only is feasible in an engineering sense but is imaginative and challenging. I think we will have a structure there which will be the pride of his department, and we look forward to its actual completion.

Mr. McIlraith: Mr. Chairman, if I might answer the question of the hon. member for Skeena, the explanation in respect of that item is that in 1962 legislation was passed by this parliament to provide for the construction of a railway in that area. When the economic studies were made, it was found that this would not be a use of that amount of money that would bring the best value to the area. Instead an arrangement was made that the necessary funds available under the policy as announced by the Minister of Transport—under whose responsibility it was that the government provide transportation assistance in an equal amount—would be provided for the construction of a highway in that area to give the area some very badly needed transportation.

In respect of the second question, asked by the hon. member for Queens, concerning the causeway, I am very happy to be able to advise him that the first contract has been let, as he knows. The project is proceeding well on schedule. If what he says has some reference to a certain other incident, I would remind him that at that time there well might have been a little confusion in some minds owing to the fact that all the provincial premiers from certain provinces—I think six provinces—across the country appeared in a flattering picture with the national leader of a party and included, at least in the advertisements in the rest of Canada, as the premier of that island, that very fine province, was another man, a very handsome man, whose name I think is MacRae. Perhaps that is how the confusion arose.

In any event, the causeway construction is proceeding, as was indicated it would, when the announcement was made.

Mr. Howard: Mr. Chairman, I notice the item referred to says "toward Canada's share". Would the minister tell us what percentage of the total cost Canada's share toward this highway at Matane and Gaspe North would be? What is the total cost? What percentage are we paying of that total cost, and what is the length of the highway? Over what period of time is it estimated the construction will be carried on.

Mr. McIlraith: The gross amount to be contributed toward highway construction under this item is $13 million. The arrangement was that they were to accelerate the construction to the greatest extent possible. That $13 million covers 87 miles of highway in the north Gaspe area. The estimate for this year was $4 million. I do not have the estimates for the payments of the balance, because these depend on how rapidly the province proceeds with the construction of the highway. The province does the actual construction. We inspect the work and pay only after it is done and inspected. The decision in respect to the speed with which the work is done is theirs, however, our limit date for the project is November 1, 1968.

Mr. Howard: What percentage do we pay?

Mr. McIlraith: It is not in terms of percentage. We would pay the $13 million that parliament enacted. The $13 million would go toward highway construction in the immediate area where it had been indicated the railway was to go.

Mr. Howard: Would the minister consider, in this current calendar year, introducing a bill in the house to build a railway in northern British Columbia. We do not want the railway; we just want the act passed so that we can get some money for highways.

Supply—Public Works

• (7:40 p.m.)

Mr. Keays: With all due respect to those who believe it is not economically feasible to build a railway in the designated area, it is my belief that their forecasts within a year or two will be proved wrong. This amount of money provides for the construction of 87 miles of highway at a cost of $125,000 and $25,000 for paving. I should like the minister to inform me at some future date the number of bids which have been received for the different jobs in that area. It is possible that this government is going to pay the whole shot, and I should like some information in this regard.

I want to remind the hon. member for Skeena that had he voted for a railway when that bill was before this house a few years ago, there would be no need for him to ask questions at this time about highways.

Mr. Howard: Nonsense.

Item agreed to.

National Capital Commission—

60. Operation and maintenance, general administration and interest charges on outstanding loans that were made for the purpose of acquiring property in the national capital region, $6,809,000.

Mr. Bell (Carleton): Mr. Chairman, only ten months before the centennial year one would anticipate a major discussion on the National Capital Commission estimates. It is only because of the mood of the committee tonight that I refrain from engaging in such a discussion, but I do point out to the committee that not since 1961 has there been a genuine discussion of the National Capital Commission estimates in this house. In fact, I think there has been only one speech made on the subject since 1961. Since 1955 there has not been an examination of the activities of the commission by a joint committee of the Senate and House of Commons. So I am going to ask the Prime Minister and the Minister of Public Works to reconsider the proposal I made earlier during this session, that the estimates and the activities of the commission be referred at this session to a joint committee for study.

Mr. Chairman, I did not make that proposal for the purpose of seeking an investigation of the commission. Quite to the contrary, I made it to give the commission the opportunity of having its fine story heard and to indoctrinate the members of this house, who must vote the money for this National Capital Commission, with regard to the fine work that is being done. If the minister does not agree to my proposal to send these estimates to a joint committee, I suggest he make a major presentation at this session, before the standing committee on Crown corporations, or the standing committee on housing, urban development and public works. If he will do that, it will be exceedingly useful.

In order to prepare the national capital for the centennial year I believe a crash program is urgently needed. By reason of the lack of co-ordination between municipal and federal authorities, the Department of Public Works and the National Capital Commission, the central part of this national capital last year was an unholy mess.

I think we must make absolutely certain there is co-ordination, and that we have a crash program to prepare the capital for what we hope will be a wonderful celebration only a matter of months from now.

My hon. friend, the member for Skeena, took his usual pot shot at the potholes in the city of Ottawa. I should like to say to him that many of those potholes are the result of the neglect of this parliament during the past 15 or 20 years in depriving the taxpayers of Ottawa of the moneys that were properly due. If there are these potholes today, it is because of that lack in days gone by. I hope this lack will be made up, and that under the fine leadership of the hon. member for Ottawa West we will have a crash program to prepare the capital as it should be prepared for the centennial year.

Item agreed to.

The Deputy Chairman: This concludes the estimates of the Department of Public Works. We shall now proceed to a study of the estimates of the department of the Secretary of State.

DEPARTMENT OF SECRETARY OF STATE

1. Departmental administration, $481,600.

Mr. Simpson: Mr. Chairman, does the hon. lady intend to make some introductory remarks before we deal with these estimates?

Miss LaMarsh: Mr. Chairman, I have no intention of making a lengthy statement about these estimates. I would prefer to deal with specific matters that might be raised by hon. members.

Having regard to the individual votes, I should like to point out to hon. members of the committee that there is at least one separate vote for each of the 12 departments or agencies for which I am responsible, plus a statutory item for the office of the representation commission.

I should ask also that hon. members who wish to speak on any of these matters wait until the appropriate vote, under which an agency or commission is called, before making their remarks.

As to the estimates in general, I think the key point to be noted is that they indicate a continuing transition of functions of the department of the Secretary of State. Some of the departments and associated responsibilities which traditionally came within this portfolio, as hon. members are aware, have now been transferred to the President of the Privy Council in anticipation of the establishment of a new department. At the same time, more and more of the so-called cultural agencies have been collected together under the aegis of the Secretary of State. This is still in the process of transition, however, and that fact is reflected in the estimates now before the committee.

There are still one or two anomalies that remain in this regard. For example, vote 20 which deals with patents and copyrights is listed in the Secretary of State's estimates although this responsibility now lies with the President of the Privy Council. Members will note that vote 40, which covers the Economic Council of Canada, is also listed under my department although that organization now reports through the office of the Prime Minister. On this occasion, however, I will deal with administrative questions which might be raised with respect to this council.

With these few remarks, Mr. Chairman, I should like to recommend to hon. members that the estimates for the current fiscal year, almost now expired, be approved after such discussion as hon. members may see fit.

Mr. Simpson: I should like to thank the hon. lady for her explanation, but I wonder whether she can give us some idea of the order in which these subjects will be dealt with at this time.

Miss LaMarsh: I think it would be the order which appears in the blue book starting at page 420. We might start with the board of broadcast governors at page 48, followed by the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation at page 52, then the office of the Chief Electoral Officer at page 56, the Civil Service Commission at page 80, the National Film Board at page 276, the National Gallery at page 280, the Public Archives and National Library at page 364, the Public Printing and Stationery at page 370 and the Secretary of State's department at pages 420 and 421.

Mr. Fairweather: Mr. Chairman, as the house anticipates that before too long the hon. minister will have before us a resolution to set up or recommend the setting up of a committee on broadcasting, it is not the disposition of the official opposition to make any comment in depth about the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation or the Board of Broadcast Governors at this stage. Hon. members know that we have been considering the estimates now, to use a legal expression, from time immemorial. We want to give the hon. lady, at a later date, an opportunity to discuss the wider aspects of broadcasting which I am sure interest all hon. members. There will, at that time, be detailed explanations requested and I am sure the hon. lady will be glad to give us answers in this regard. These will be related to various aspects of the corporation's plans for different regions of Canada, but in view of the mood of the house at this time I do not think this is the time to go into a philosophical discourse on our national broadcasting system.

• (7:50 p.m.)

The hon. lady mentioned the co-ordination, if that is the word, of cultural activities under her aegis. I think this is a good step, and because cultural activities suggests to me self-discipline I am going to exercise self-discipline by not going into any further consideration of these estimates at the moment.

Mr. Prittie: Mr. Chairman, I say the same as the hon. member for Royal, that the time is not right for extensive comments on the various matters affected by the minister's department, particularly broadcasting. There is certainly a great deal that needs to be said on this subject. However, we are informed that the committee will be meeting before too long and these matters can be discussed at that time. That is all I will say, Mr. Chairman.

There is one question, Mr. Chairman, that I should like the minister to answer, either during discussion of her estimates or in the house before very long. This is the question of the building plans of the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation in three major cities of this country, namely, Montreal, Toronto and Vancouver. Some plans which were going ahead in Montreal were delayed because of the Fowler Committee investigation into broadcasting. I do not think that all of these plans can be delayed indefinitely until the cabinet committee has finished its discussion of the Fowler report or until the House of

Commons committee has finished its discussions. I suggest it is a matter on which some decision has to be made shortly, and I should like to hear from the minister on this point.

Miss LaMarsh: I will be making some reference to the point when we come to the C.B.C. At the moment the item before the committee concerns the Board of Broadcast Governors.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Laprise: Mr. Chairman, I should like, while we are studying Secretary of State estimates, to draw the attention of the minister to a problem about which she is aware. Ever since 1962, we have repeatedly pointed out to the government and the Secretary of State the problem which exists in my riding, the Chapleau riding, with regard to broadcasting and television in the cities of Chibougamau and Chapais.

At the present time, radio and television networks cover practically the whole country; over 90 per cent of all Canadians have access to these services, but there are still some centres, cities in Canada, where there is no television and radio.

That may not be exactly the case for Chibougamau and Chapais, for the citizens of these two municipalities do have television, thanks to a cable and microwave system.

These people are served, but they must pay a fortune to get television signals, while the organizations of both these municipalities have already, on several occasions, submitted briefs and resolutions to the Department of the Secretary of State and to the government with a view to obtaining the same radio and television service as every other Canadian region.

I have here the last of the resolutions submitted recently to the Department of the Secretary of State asking that these services be provided without charge, as they are in every other part of Canada.

This brief, submitted by the Chamber of Commerce of Chibougamau was endorsed by the local public bodies, namely the municipal corporations of Chibougamau and Chapais, the Chambers of Commerce, the Labour Unions and the Owners' League, in short, the whole population of these two cities.

The brief submitted recently read as follows:

Whereas, on several occasions, requests were made to the C.B.C. and to the Department of Transport to get free television in the region of Chibougamau-Chapais, and that such requests never produced anything;

[Mr. Prittie.]

Whereas the cities of Chibougamau and Chapais are remote cities which pay practically the highest taxes because of their geographic location;

Whereas the cost of living in our region for gas, groceries, etc., is higher than elsewhere;

There is no doubt that, in a region very remote from other centres, the transportation costs increase, thus lowering considerably the purchasing power.

I now resume reading the resolution:

Whereas most salaries in Chibougamau and Chapais come from the mining industry and are therefore higher than in other regions, they bring more money into the public treasury;

Whereas we are not asking for more than the others around us are getting but that we are asking for at least what we are entitled to;

Whereas there are approximately 15,000 people in Chibougamau-Chapais and that we are happy to say that our region does not live off the government. the spectre of unemployment does not exist in our part of the province;

It is quite true; as soon as someone becomes unemployed, the cost of living is so high that he cannot stay long and has to leave.

I continue:

Whereas television in a Canadian home is no longer a luxury but just a means of information, entertainment, culture, etc. and that it becomes a necessity and a right which is ours as it is everywhere else in Canada, and without charge;

Whereas in the larger centres colour television will soon be available to all and that it should at least be given in black and white in our region;

I wish to point out to you, sir, and to the Secretary of State (Miss LaMarsh) that the people of Chibougamau and Chapais are not asking to stop preparations to give colour television to the other regions but at least that television in black and white be given to them. They are not asking for what belongs to others but only for what belongs to them.

• (8:00 p.m.)

I go on:

Whereas, at present, some people can afford black and white television with poorer results than elsewhere and by paying the following prohibitive prices:

First, a television set costs more than elsewhere, secondly, the sizeable sum of $200 must be paid for the connection with the community antenna and then, a fee of $7 a month of $84 a year, plus a 6 per cent provincial tax that other areas do not have to pay;

And they can only get one channel. But if they do not pay that amount, they are without any television at all.

Whereas the only benefit in living in an area such as ours is that we can earn our daily bread, while the handicaps are many such as:

1. Gravel roads that easily wreck a car within the first 30,000 miles.

2. Gasoline at 12 cents a gallon more than elsewhere;

3. Fuel oil 3 cents a gallon more than elsewhere with heating required twelve months a year;

4. Being further away, we have to use the telephone service more often than elsewhere, and this is anything but free;

5. Transportation of all materials increase substantially the cost of living in our area;

6. Electricity costs about twice as much as elsewhere plus 6 per cent additional in taxes.

7. Rents are higher than elsewhere;

8. Building costs are higher because of transportation and the tax on materials;

9. The great distance from large towns is detrimental to the education of our children beyond a certain level.

For all the reasons listed in this brief, which is a positive statement of the plain, definite ideas of the people of Chibougamau and Chapais, we urge the authorities concerned to study this brief seriously and to answer us, not by ambiguous statements, but by immediate action.

The Chamber of Commerce of Chibougamau.

That, as I said earlier, was endorsed by all the public bodies and the people in Chibougamau and Chapais.

On many occasions, Mr. Chairman, I myself asked the previous Secretary of State to correct that situation I was told that we had to wait until the Fowler report on broadcasting was presented. We have now had this report for several weeks, several months even. But the government does not seem too much in a hurry to implement its recommendations.

Mr. Chairman, what I want to point out to the minister is the fact that the people of those two towns are the victims of a serious injustice on the part of the C.B.C.

And here, I submit to the Secretary of State that the Fowler commission put the finger on what is happening to those people. As a matter of fact, on page 68 of the report, it is said:

All Canadians pay for the national broadcasting system—not just for the C.B.C., but for the whole system, including the private radio and television stations. They pay for about a third of the total cost when they pay their taxes. They are paying for the other two thirds every time they run around to the corner store for a can of soup or a loaf of bread. Many of them are thus paying for broadcasting services they cannot enjoy. Clearly, much remains to be done.

Well, Mr. Chairman, that is the case with regard to the people of the cities of Chibougamau and Chapais, they pay for services which they do not enjoy. That is unfair and the government must not tolerate this situation any longer. It must immediately order that the C.B.C. be given the necessary funds to enable it to extend the radio and television services not only to Chibougamau and Chapais but everywhere in Canada where it is physically possible to do so at the present time.

A little further, on page 83 of the English version of the Fowler Commission report, these words struck me:

Therefore, during the next five years, a firm degree of restraint should be applied to the licensing of new stations, public or private, taking the real need for broadcasting service, radio or television, into account.

It cannot be denied that the needs are obvious as far as isolated centres are concerned. They need those services for entertainment, culture and information.

On page 83 of the same report, it is said:

We believe that, for the next five years at least, the formula now being used by the C.B.C. to determine the eligibility of communities for television service (2,000) or radio service (500), either in English or French or both, is sound.

However, we are not satisfied with the planned rate of expansion to meet the needs disclosed by the formula; we think that, given the necessary approval and financial provision, it could and should be accelerated;

It means that the government should put at the disposal of the C.B.C. the sums needed for its expansion to enable it to serve the people who are not yet getting any service.

The recommendations follow:

1. That, during the next five years, no new C.B.C. stations should be opened in centres that now have service as determined by the formula presently used for eligibility.

2. That consideration be given to the feasibility of accelerating the rate of progress now planned by the C.B.C. for extending coverage, both radio and television in English and French, to centres eligible for public service under the formula.

Mr. Chairman, in the light of these recommendations, the government is no longer justified to hesitate and it must accede immediately to the request of the towns of Chibougamau and Chapais with regard to radio and television services.

On page 124 of the Fowler report, I notice another paragraph in which the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation says how it conceives the mandate it has received from parliament:

Whether Canadians live in remote or heavily populated areas, the national system should serve them as adequately and equitably as possible.

This suits very well those areas and I invite the minister to study carefully the resolution that has been submitted to her and to give a very special and immediate consideration to these legitimate requests. I am

convinced of this and I am sure the minister is also.

When C.B.C. officials are asked whether it is materially possible to achieve these purposes, they answer yes, but that the government does not make sufficient funds available to the Corporation, suggesting it is too costly at present to serve those areas.

As far as the Chibougamau-Chapais area is concerned, it is served by private enterprise at present, as I said earlier, but at a prohibitive price for these people. Out of the 2,400 or 2,500 families living in this area, at least 1,000 are unable to afford these services which are provided free of charge everywhere else.

So, C.B.C. officials tell us that their policy is to give a perfect signal in any area served. Well, Mr. Chairman, what the citizens are asking for immediately is not so much a perfect signal; as a matter of fact, they would be quite satisfied with what they have at present provided it would be free of charge as anywhere else in Canada.

Consequently, I suggest to the hon. Secretary of State, that she invite the officials of the C.B.C. to meet representatives of private enterprise which actually serve the area, as well as representatives of the two cities to come to an agreement. It would cost less to the C.B.C., expenses would be less than they are now and the service supplied to the two cities could be improved gradually. I am sure this would give the whole population, which has been waiting for a long time, the same service that can be found elsewhere in Canada.

So, Mr. Chairman, I hope the Secretary of State will consider the recommendations I have suggested to her tonight. A delegation of about 15 people from that area came to Ottawa today at their own expenses, which is quite a sum. They have not come here for the fun of it, but to see that justice is done, and I am convinced that the Secretary of State can render this delegation immediate justice.

• (8:10 p.m.)

[*English*]

Mr. Simpson: Mr. Chairman, it was my understanding that we were going to deal with these subjects separately. Apparently at this time we have launched into a discussion of C.B.C. subject matters. I have a few remarks to make to the committee and to the hon. Secretary of State. It is not my intention this evening to go into a discussion of the inner workings of the C.B.C., mainly because coming from an area that has as little C.B.C. service as we have, I probably do not know a great deal about the inner workings. However, I did want to say that I am not going to discuss programming or anything of that nature. We shall probably be hearing from other hon. members of the committee on this subject.

It has been mentioned by previous speakers that this is probably not an opportune time to go into these matters to any extent. It has been mentioned that a committee of the house has now been set up to study broadcasting. However, I am not quite as optimistic as some of the other hon. members with respect to this subject. I shall be ready to discuss these matters when this committee does meet. Until that time, I think that some questions can be asked this evening.

I listened with great interest to the hon. member for Chapleau, and his remarks have a very familiar ring. In fact, I almost thought that I was listening to one of my own constituents, because so many of the problems which he covered were applicable to the constituency of Churchill.

However, it is not only on behalf of the northern parts of Manitoba that I make my remarks this evening; it is on behalf of all areas that are as yet not served by C.B.C. television. It may be taken for granted that the northern Manitoba area is of particular interest to me.

I have been told by the member for Yukon that in the Yukon there is only one television outlet, and that is a cable service at the capital. All of the areas up there are still waiting for some type of service. As I say, at Whitehorse in the Yukon Territory there is one cable system. There, the residents are obliged to pay $15 a month for the privilege of viewing the station.

I do know from experience that the C.B.C. has very generously supplied programming to the station in Whitehorse, as it has done to a number of stations, some of which are in the area I represent. On the subject of extension of services, I think it is generally accepted, particularly in areas not already serviced, that the C.B.C. does have a duty to go to the unecomomical areas where private enterprise feels it cannot or will not go. I think that although the C.B.C. does provide television service to some 92 per cent of the people of Canada, according to its records, it still has an obligation to go into other areas as quickly as possible. I think that the time is long overdue when these areas should be told just when they are going to get television service.

I know that television service is difficult to provide, but not impossible. The C.B.C. has calculated approximately how much money it is going to take to service these areas, so that it becomes strictly a question of money.

An hon. Member: Right.

Mr. Simpson: Without too much fanfare, and I might say without too much criticism, the present government authorized the C.B.C. to make expenditures on colour television. I can assure the hon. lady and the corporation that there will not be too much criticism from unserviced areas about launching a program of colour television, because the people in those unserviced areas know that we must face up to progress. However, it is difficult for them to understand why—and I think the government now must accept this—if money is available for colour television, it is not available to provide service to other areas now unserviced. I do not intend to be unkind when I say that each year as we have looked over the C.B.C. estimates covering some millions of dollars, we do not see too much of a breakdown of how this money is to be spent.

I realize that the corporation puts out an annual statement, which is widely distributed. In that annual statement there is a breakdown to some extent of the manner in which this money is spent. However, it always amazes me when I see, looking at vote No. 1 under the corporation, the words:

> Grant in respect of the net operating amount required to discharge the responsibilities of the national broadcasting service.

It shows $96,799,000. Mr. Chairman, there are 18 words in that explanation which works out to approximately $5 million a word. I would have hoped the C.B.C. could have added three more words, something like "extension of service" because at $5 million a word we would have enough money to provide service to all of the people who are not as yet receiving this television service.

In the report of the corporation for 1963-64 it was pointed out that according to present planning it would take something over ten years to bring service to those areas which are now unserviced.

• (8:20 p.m.)

The sum of approximately $15 million would be needed. Many years ago I asked officials of the corporation whether the corporation would consider approaching parliament for a special grant of money to enable them to finish the job. It was felt by the corporation at that time that parliament, unfortunately, would not be very receptive to a request for a special grant of this nature. Year after year no request was made. But in the annual report of 1963-64, the corporation did make this suggestion. I noticed with interest and pleasure that in the most recent annual report the corporation makes a similar request. In this instance, however, the corporation recommends that specific grants to the corporation should be made by parliament for this purpose. They say this was the procedure followed in the initial stages when radio was brought to the north under similar economic conditions. The corporation says it believes television to be an amenity which could do much to make life in the north more attractive and help the development of our frontier areas. The point here is that the corporation is recommending that parliament provide this special grant of money sufficient to enable it to finish the job of extending television services.

The corporation, as I understand it, has recommended that parliament provide sufficient funds to enable it to go into colour television. One of the questions which I believe the government should answer tonight is this—How was the decision made as to which of these recommendations was to be carried out? I believe it is important that the people in areas such as I represent get an answer to this particular question. In my constituency, at least, the many thousands of people who are interested in receiving this service are not greatly critical about the advent of colour television. What they say is this: if Canada can have colour television we can also have the extension of service.

I notice that the corporation has recently extended services into the Jasper area of Alberta, or else it is planning to do so. Services were extended recently in the area east of Kenora, Ontario. The people in my area look at these things and ask: how many are being served, and what does it cost? They want to know these things so that they may be in a position to decide whether any discrimination is being shown in determining which areas should be served first.

I have discussed this matter carefully on many occasions with officials of the corporation. Time and time again, we have gone over the formula which the corporation is using to determine which areas should be serviced. They use a cost per household formula. They tell us that in a certain area people can be served for $7, $8 or $10 per household, and

these people will naturally be getting service earlier than those where the cost may be as high as $15 per household.

I suggest that the use of this formula leads to discrimination, and I should like the Secretary of State to convey to the officials of the corporation the reason I believe this is so. In the most recent annual statement of the corporation we find the cost of production and distribution of television services in Canada amounted to a total of $91,863,839, almost $92 million. This is the amount which was required to service about 92 per cent of some four and a half million households in Canada. But suppose for the moment that this $92 million is servicing all the four and half million households in Canada. This is the figure which should be used, in all fairness when making these calculations. We would then arrive at the amount it is actually costing the corporation.

I say it amounts to discrimination when the corporation looks at the areas which are still to be served and says: We shall work on a figure of $4 or $5 per household because that is what it costs us to put television into one particular area. The cost should be figured on an all-Canada basis in order to be fair.

These figures can be juggled in a number of ways. When I look at this $92 million for the cost of production and distribution of television services, servicing 92 per cent of four and a half million households in Canada, I find that this works out to an average across the nation of some $20 per household. This is the basis on which I feel the corporation should look on further extensions. It all boils down to the fact that the extensions will take money. We are all agreed on this. I think the government of the day should at least make up its mind to tell the people in these areas whether or not it is prepared to grant a sum of money to the corporation sufficient to do the job.

Many times during the last session of parliament I asked the Secretary of State whether the government was considering providing such a sum. On each occasion I was assured by the Secretary of State that the government did not intend to consider any specific grant of money to the corporation until the Fowler report had been received.

• (8:30 p.m.)

But before the Fowler report was received by the government some $15 million was provided for the corporation to allow it enter the colour television field. I do not see how we can get along quickly with these estimates unless the government can give us a satisfactory explanation for doing that, and tell us when it will provide the money which the corporation says is necessary to service these areas.

The information which the corporation officials give us is helpful on many occasions, and what I have to say is not in criticism of them, but they tell us that within the next five or six years Canadians will have their television service bounced from satellites orbiting the earth. This is certainly feasible from an engineering point of view, but people in areas which are still unserviced are reluctant to sit back and wait for this to happen when they know that within the next 18 months the C.B.C. could acquire sufficient equipment to service their areas. All the C.B.C. needs for that purpose is a grant of money from this parliament. I also believe the corporation has an obligation to tell these people when it plans to service their areas.

Many of the people in these areas would be a lot happier if they knew they could get television reception in two or three years. The corporation should be able to determine the time it will take.

People in the northern Manitoba area who receive fringe reception from private stations carrying C.B.C. programs, or who may have the benefit of a cable system operated by private enterprise, are told by the C.B.C. that it cannot make application to enter the area because it is already serviced. Consequently, there would be duplication of services. The corporation does not say this in quite those words, but it feels the licensing authority would be reluctant to allow it to do so. It is probably quite right. The C.B.C. already has made application to go into the city of Saskatoon, but I understand that its application is being held up; I suppose temporarily, although I do not know.

However, I can recall that a few years ago the C.B.C. application to go into the city of Edmonton was granted. There was a public hearing at which those wishing to complain were able to do so. But the C.B.C. application was granted, and if ever there was duplication of services that situation in Edmonton was it at the time of the application, the city had ample T.V. service from private stations.

I said I was not going to cover the subject of programming, but with the advent of colour television more questions need answering. I noticed that the other day the Maple

Leaf Garden Corporation estimated that colour television would provide it with something like $9 million revenue from the program it has on the air within the next three years. I do not know how much profit there is for the C.B.C. from "Hockey Night in Canada" but it is certainly a popular program. Most viewers want to see it continue, but in view of the estimate made by the corporation sponsoring Maple Leaf Gardens I only hope the C.B.C. will get its fair share from that program.

The area in northern Manitoba which is asking for immediate service has a population of some 100,000 people. A considerable portion of the area already receives television service from the Yorkton station which carries C.B.C. programs. But I think I am quite safe in saying that if, in the first place, there had not been a hassle between the C.B.C. and the B.B.G. that area of Manitoba would have been available to the C.B.C. for network programming. However, it is still available, except that we are told there is no use in the corporation making application to service it since it is already serviced. But I repeat, that is exactly what happened in the city of Edmonton.

The part of the area surrounding Flin Flon and The Pas has been serviced with cinescope programming, films being delayed one week, and the picture reception is good. But there are some 20,000 people in that area who feel the time is long past when they should be receiving the network service.

• (8:40 p.m.)

If you take the 100,000 people from Dauphin through to Flin Flon and on to Snow Lake, who are asking for this programming at the present time, they come well within this cost per household which I mentioned. I know the corporation can say there are other areas which they can service at a cheaper cost per household, but I think the figure they should use is the figure of $20 per household which you get when you look at the amount it costs to service the number of households which are being serviced in Canada.

Quite often one hears comments in respect of the advisability of a member of parliament rising to criticize the corporation for what it is or is not doing. I do not think this is the case, but I have been told that when one rises in the House of Commons and starts criticizing the present system of priorities, the area that one represents may find itself a long way down the list.

The Deputy Chairman: I regret to interrupt the hon. member for Churchill, but the time allotted to him has elapsed.

Some hon. Members: Continue.

The Deputy Chairman: I understand that hon. members wish to allocate additional time to the hon. member to enable him to conclude.

Mr. Simpson: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I should like to thank the committee for allowing me to continue. I was about to say I would not like this committee to get the idea that this is any threat which has been passed on to me through anyone connected with the C.B.C. This is not so. However, I hear this in my area. I am informed that if we continue to criticize, we may have to wait a long, long time for this service. I think the government can straighten this matter out in short order, if they will assure this committee they are receptive to the suggestion and are willing to provide this sum of money which the corporation already has recommended in its annual report. Then everyone would be quite happy.

I will be quite surprised if this is not a lengthy discussion, because we are told by the corporation—and I do not doubt their figures—that there are some 50 areas in Canada which remain to be serviced. So, if there are 50 other areas which are as anxious to get this service as is the area which I represent, then I would imagine we are going to have quite a long discussion, unless we receive an answer from the government.

I did not mean that I was speaking for all those other areas; I was merely referring to all the places which were not serviced. I have noticed, Mr. Chairman, on the many, many occasions when I have risen in this house to speak about television, that it always seems to me this is a subject in which perhaps not too many people are interested. I suppose mainly this is because most of the areas which the members represent already are serviced. However, one time during the hearings of the broadcasting committee a few years ago I mentioned that if there was any threat that the Grey Cup, for instance, would not be televised in Canada, every member of this house would be up on his feet howling his head off.

Strangely enough, about a year later, it appeared as though the Grey Cup was not going to be televised. If you think we have had some crises in this house during the past few years, just recall what happened on that

occasion. The house was in an uproar for a full day and it continued on spasmodically for the rest of the week, until somebody intervened, I understand, and the matter was resolved. This is the reason I say that the people who already have these services should realize what it means to the people who do not have them. If one of your favourite programs is discontinued, you are ready to howl. However, probably it is not too interesting to hear someone discussing the need for television.

I will listen, Mr. Chairman, with interest to any of the members who have problems similar to ours, in their areas which are not serviced. I think we should have several answers from the government or from the corporation. In relation to the areas which are still without the service, I think we should be told by the corporation what areas these are and where they are.

Also, I think we should be told what the priorities are for each of these areas at the present time in the C.B.C.'s planning. I recognize, as I said before, that it is difficult to expect the corporation to lay down a list of priorities and expect that those priorities will remain the same the next year or the year after; but I think we are entitled to know what priority each of these particular areas has at the present time.

I believe the main question we should have answered by the corporation is, on what date will each of these areas be provided with C.B.C. television service. As I mentioned, the government could eliminate the necessity of these questions being answered if they would assure the committee that they are prepared to see that a sufficient sum of money is provided so that the C.B.C. will be able to do this work immediately. This answer to that question will satisfy the people in all of these areas. I am hoping, as the debate progresses, that we will receive an answer to some of these questions from either the Secretary of State or from the corporation.

• (8:50 p.m.)

[*Translation*]

Mr. Goyer: Mr. Chairman, I want to speak briefly concerning C.B.C., and more particularly on the housing conditions, namely, the building in which the C.B.C. operates while there are prospects of interesting sites offered by the municipal authorities.

The present situation in Montreal is becoming more and more permanent and it requires a rapid solution, because it is so obvious with regard to administration. In fact the C.B.C. operates 17 different offices scattered almost everywhere in the city of Montreal from one end to the other; this, of course, leads to lack of co-ordination and to increased and repeated expenses which the C.B.C. could avoid.

It also puts the artists in a very awkward position. Under the present circumstances, they must, on very close and often crowded schedule, for some of them, run around the city to take part in various broadcasts. Accordingly, they have to turn down certain jobs because of the geographic situation.

It must not be forgotten, on the other hand, that Montreal is the artistic capital of Canada, and that the C.B.C., reflecting as it does a major part of the arts in Canada, should therefore be well served.

How can we solve that administrative breakdown, as far as premises are concerned?

The city of Montreal has offered the C.B.C. a plot of 27 acres. It gave the undertaking that it would clear this land, unfortunately located in a ward with many slums. The city of Montreal fulfilled its obligations; it cleared the land and tore down the slums. But the government delays its decision to have the new C.B.C. building built as soon as possible. The city of Montreal had put the deadline at October, 1965 for the start of construction, but today, we are still waiting for the first shovelful of earth to be taken up.

The grouping together in the same building in Montreal of all the services of the French and English networks of the C.B.C.—and everybody agrees on this, both C.B.C. authorities and the Fowler commission—would be a very good thing, and it is urgent.

From the administrative point of view, when the execution of a project is delayed, someone must take the consequences, and that someone is always the citizen who pays taxes, because of slow administration.

This is a field in which the government has had time to think, plan and act. The government is still taking its time and so risks losing the land placed at its disposal by the city of Montreal. This land was to be used before October 1965; it is now March 1966 and nothing has been done yet. It would be surprising if the city of Montreal were to wait indefinitely. This is why I think it is urgent that the minister and the cabinet make a decision, especially since Expo '67 is drawing near and this land, so rare in Montreal, is situated near the Expo grounds.

It would be unwise to keep unused indefinitely this piece of land located on Dorchester boulevard. If we want to show that Canada is prosperous, we must not leave a hole right in the middle of a city. Besides, it would be interesting to see to what extent, if not the government, at least the owners of old houses surrounding the C.B.C. square, would be willing to improve the district as soon as possible, so that the slums would vanish from the city that we are going to show to the world.

If we really want to live the motto "Man and his world", it is not enough to display it in a window, but to have it at home, to build it at home, in every street, in every district, in short in every city and in every province.

Before closing, I wish to say, simply from the administrative point of view, that, in my opinion, the Fowler commission and C.B.C. are again in complete agreement on this point; in fact, the Fowler commission raised the same problem in the city of Toronto. Therefore, an administrative problem does exist that the Corporation would like to see settled, that the Commission wants to see settled, but that the government, unfortunately, is in no hurry to solve, although it should do so as soon as possible.

[*English*]

Mr. Bell (Carleton): Mr. Chairman, all the agencies for which the hon. lady is parliamentary housekeeper appear to be under discussion on item 1 of her estimates. Therefore, although the committee is desperately crowded for time, I make no apology for insisting upon an opportunity of dealing briefly but explicitly with what has become a very highly sensitive, indeed, an explosive issue in the public service, namely the inept and improper handling by the government and the Civil Service Commission of the problem of bilingualism. Precipitate and ill considered attempts to change the ground rules for promotional and other competitions are leading to discrimination against French speaking and English speaking civil servants alike, and to widespread discord throughout the civil service. Action taken surreptitiously and clandestinely by the Civil Service Commission, only partly revealed in an indiscreet speech made by the chairman of the Civil Service Commission on February 1, has placed the whole merit system in jeopardy and flouted the Civil Service Act.

An unfortunate, indeed, unbelievable statement of future recruitment policy by the Minister of Mines and Technical Surveys has intensified the problems, and an attempt made by the Minister of Public Works to pour oil on troubled waters has not been effective.

Sir, this is a very delicate problem where one may easily be misinterpreted. I seek only to bring justice to all civil servants, whether of French speaking or English speaking derivation, and I shall try to choose my words carefully and with moderation, although there is no doubt that the time has come to call a spade a spade and to appeal directly to the Prime Minister to stop the erosion of one of the greatest public services in the world.

I welcome the Prime Minister's announcement this afternoon that there will be further consultations with civil service staff associations, and I hope those associations will truly reflect the opinions of their members. For, sir, it is useless to blink at the fact that there is greater anxiety, more uneasiness, unrest and subdued anger in the civil service in Ottawa at this moment than at any time in my memory.

What is happening, sir, and I want to make it clear, is that in my view the civil service commission has confused job requisites, in which bilingualism is a most significant factor, with principles of personnel rating and evaluation, in which it has no place.

• (9:00 p.m.)

Because of that, the merit system is being outrageously flouted. I say that the whole basis upon which Canada has built the finest Civil Service in the world is in grave jeopardy. The Civil Service Act was completely revised by this house as recently as 1961, and it is clear and explicit as to job requisites. Section 47 of the act reads this way:

> The number of employees appointed to serve in any department or in any local office of a department who are qualified in the knowledge and use of the English or French language or both shall, in the opinion of the Commission, be sufficient to enable the department or local office to perform its functions adequately and to give effective service to the public.

Those, sir, are the tests as to whether a job is to be bilingual or whether it is to be unilingual. These tests were agreed upon without complaint in a special committee of this house as recently as 1961, although there was some resistance in the house itself by the hon. member for Hull and the hon. member for Sainte-Marie. But the tests, I suggest, are twofold; first, adequacy of performance of departmental functions and, second, to give effective service to the public.

No one can complain legitimately when the application of these tests results in the specification of a bilingual officer or the specification of a unilingual officer whether that unilingual officer be French or English. But when those tests of job requisites are falsely and improperly imported into the evaluation or rating of the merit of an individual to hold a job, which job does not require a knowledge of two languages, then I say the time has come to expose this fallacious reasoning.

Section 38(1) of the Civil Service Act is the enunciation of the merit system which has stood unbreached since the days of Sir Robert Borden, the father of the merit system. I want to put the words of that section on record, sir. They are:

> The Commission shall examine and consider all applications received within the time prescribed by it for the receipt of applications and, after considering such further material and conducting such examinations, tests, interviews and investigations as it considers necessary or desirable, shall select the candidates who are qualified for the position or positions in relation to which the competition is conducted, and shall place them in order of merit.

We cannot play with words, Mr. Chairman. Merit is merit, not merit plus 10 per cent for some factor extraneous to merit which the Civil Service Commission chooses to import into the plain meaning of the word in violation of that plain and natural meaning. There is in the Civil Service Act one explicit departure from the merit system, the introduction of the veteran's preference. The mere fact that there is a statutory exception to the merit principle is a clear indication that there is no other. Section 33 is equally clear. It reads:

> The Commission may in relation to any position of any class or grade prescribe qualifications as to age, residence or any other matters that in the opinion of the Commission are necessary or desirable having regard to the nature of the duties to be performed, but in so doing the Commission shall not discriminate against any person by reason of race, national origin, colour or religion.

In other words, the Commission has the power, and in proper cases the duty, to prescribe bilingualism as a job requisite, but it has no authority to discriminate when it comes to evaluation and rating of individuals on the basis of merit. Yet, what has it done? The chairman of the Civil Service Commission made a speech on February 1, 1966, in which he made the following statement:

> The Commission has recently recognized proficiency in the two official languages as an element of merit in selection for appointments and promotions to positions in the National Capital area and in other centres where the public being served is sufficiently representative of the two cultures of Canada . . . In these cases, proficiency in the two official languages is considered as an additional asset and is accorded 10 per cent of the total selection rating score.

Well, sir, this speech and this procedure I say first flouts directly the will of parliament and is in contempt of parliament. Why do I say that? On September 19, 1961, as appears in *Hansard* at page 8573, the hon. member for Hull moved an amendment to add subclause (2) to clause 47 as follows:

> At the time of competitions, those candidates who can establish that they possess a sufficient knowledge of the two official languages of Canada shall benefit by an added 5 per cent over all other candidates—

You find at page 8575, Mr. Chairman, that this amendment was negatived by a vote of 43 to 16. Yet in the face of that vote and without any further consideration by parliament, the Commission expresses its contempt of this house and institutes the very procedure this house rejected—it institutes it two for one. If this is the policy of the government now, there is a clear duty on the government to come back to this house and stake its life upon the adoption of a policy already so clearly rejected by the house.

This speech of the chairman of the Civil Service Commission was the first announcement that, surreptitiously and without the knowledge of any of the staff associations, a 10 per cent advantage had been put into effect in the national capital area and in other centres of Canada for those with proficiency in the two official languages. This 10 per cent, I submit, will be an effective barrier to unilingual candidates in most competitions, whether knowledge of two languages is necessary or not for the performance of their duties. Very rarely indeed in a competition is there such a wide margin between candidates, and the result is that tens of thousands of civil servants who entered the Civil Service under one set of ground rules will find their advancement or promotion blocked and barred. Frustration, dead-end, blind alleys —these will be the lot of thousands.

The introduction of this 10 per cent preference into the merit system is in my view without colour of right. It flouts completely, as I have submitted, the structure of the Civil Service Act. It is within the prerogative of parliament to do this; it is not within the prerogative of the Civil Service Commission. If parliament chooses to do this, it is one thing, but for the Commission to do it I say drives a horse and cart through the whole

merit system and discriminates equally against French speaking and English speaking civil servants. I emphasize that it discriminates against French speaking and English speaking civil servants alike. I say, Mr. Chairman, that it will lead to the demoralization of the civil service and will make a farce out of bilingualism.

I tell the committee that if it had been in effect in 1927, it would probably have deprived the Department of External Affairs of the services of one Lester B. Pearson. If it had been in effect later, I doubt whether the civil service would have had the dubious advantages of the services within its ranks of the now hon. member for Bonavista-Twillingate or the hon. member for Eglinton. Actually, Mr. Chairman, one of the major problems is to define objectively what is in fact bilingualism. Many people who profess to be such are truly not. Some objective standard, I submit, must be devised. Thirty years ago I was reasonably bilingual, at least to the extent of being able to make numerous speeches in the French language. Lack of opportunity has deprived me of any proficiency in that respect. Yet others scarcely more proficient than I claim to be bilingual.

This 10 per cent rule, I point out, will prevent promotions from other centres of Canada to the national capital.

• (9:10 p.m.)

No longer will it be reasonable for a postal worker, a customs or immigration officer to expect promotion from Regina or Fort William, from Ville Marie or Rimouski, from Halifax or Saint John, to the headquarters of his department in Ottawa. Practically, an officer in these places cannot be bilingual. He cannot practise the other language to keep up his proficiency, and he cannot expect to circumvent the 10 per cent preference. The net result will be that the future civil service of Canada will be drawn from the very tiny group or segment, only 12.23 per cent of the population according to the last census, who speak both French and English. I repeat those figures, there is only 12.23 per cent who speak both French and English.

Eliminated from the civil service of their native country will be the 19.13 per cent who speak only French—almost 20 per cent of the people in the country who speak only French —as well as the 67.35 per cent who speak only English and the 1.27 per cent who speak neither. Within the present civil service, promotions will be confined to a select inner few made up of only a tiny percentage of the total service. The fact is that the members of the Civil Service Commission themselves could not qualify today under the rules that they themselves have laid down.

Let me be clear, Mr. Chairman. Where the job requires a knowledge of the two languages, as many jobs do, of course, in order to provide proper service to the public under section 47, I believe that that must be clearly laid down as a job requisite. But to breach the merit system by an artificial, unrealistic percentage will set back rather than promote the cause of bilingualism. I have it confirmed in writing by the chairman of the Civil Service Commission that this 10 per cent rule is now in effect in all areas of Canada which have an English or French mother tongue minority of at least 10 per cent.

It is not easy to say these things, sir. It is very easy to be interpreted as being anti-French. I have spent a large part of my life trying to bridge the gap which exists in this country. But as an Irishman, sir, I am neither anti-French nor anti-English. I seek tonight to be a Canadian interested in the welfare of the 87 per cent of my fellow Canadians, French, English, and other ethnic groups alike, who do not enjoy the undoubted advantage of bilingualism.

I am sorry that the Minister of Public Works is not in the house at this moment, for between us, the minister and I represent over half the civil service population. I make a direct appeal to the Minister of Public Works as a man of moderation, as a man of tolerant understanding, as a man of firmness and of character, to use his prestige and his moral stature within the government to reverse the unwise policies which have been embarked upon, policies which will do injury to French speaking, English speaking and other Canadians alike.

I say to this committee tonight, let us not completely stultify the best civil service in the world. Let us not permit the public service of Canada to founder upon illusory rocks which can only endanger the unity of the nation. I ask the Prime Minister and the Minister of Public Works to protect the civil service of Canada. If they fail in their duty we shall have a mass exodus of technical and professional personnel to the United States, to Australia and to New Zealand, which will do permanent injury to Canada. This cannot be permitted to happen, sir.

I ask every member of this house, French, English, or whatever their ethnic background, and I do so with the greatest sincerity at my

command, to rise and to protect the greatest public service in the world from that which is being done to it.

Mr. Valade: Would the hon. member permit a question. I heard the hon. member for Carleton make reference to some of my past interventions, but I did not clearly understand if he said that I opposed any revision of the act, or something of that nature. I should like him to make it clear, because it is important to me.

Mr. Bell (Carleton): Yes, Mr. Chairman, the hon. member for Sainte-Marie was one of those who, in September 1961, joined in the support of the amendment which I read into the record. He, and I think the hon. member for Hull, were the only members who took exception to section 47 in the form in which it is.

Mr. Pelletier: May I put a question to the hon. gentleman. Since he has been defending the principle of unilingualism in the civil service—

Some hon. Members: Oh no.

Mr. Winkler: Discrimination.

Mr. Pelletier: —may I ask him whether he knows many French unilingual civil servants in Ottawa?

Mr. Bell (Carleton): Mr. Chairman, it is a total travesty of what I have attempted to say to suggest that I have been defending unilingualism. I know many unilingual French speaking civil servants in Ottawa, many more than the hon. member knows. The ones I know believe in what I have said in this house tonight.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Grégoire: Mr. Chairman, I listened with a great deal of attention to the speech just made by the hon. member for Carleton (Mr. Bell).

I have never taken him for a fanatic and I still do not want to do so tonight. In my opinion, the comments he made tonight merely reflect a general idea according to which, realizing that the monopoly held by a certain group is flowing away, some people are afraid to lose it to the advantage of all Canadian citizens, both English speaking and French speaking.

The fact that bilingualism is asked for in the civil service does not mean, Mr. Chairman, that competence must first be set aside. Certainly not.

[Mr. Bell (Carleton).]

• (9:20 p.m.)

What we believe should be a prime criterion for recruiting a civil servant, whether at higher or lower level, is the competence. Only in various degrees of competence—now I am talking only about competence—meaning the factors which can be used to assess the competence of officers in the Canadian civil service; well, language should be one of these factors.

If the employee speaks English only or French only and is bound to meet either French or English speaking public, then I must say to the hon. member for Carleton that bilingualism is a factor of competence for the civil servant who has to speak to his fellow citizens in one or the other of the two languages. It is a criterion of competence. That is why the civil service commission must take this criterion into account in the field of competence, that is bilingualism, as much as all other criteria. That is one of the fields which concern the competence of a civil servant.

I am convinced that, in this connection, the hon. member for Carleton cannot deny the argument I advance that in the case of a senior official dealing with the public bilingualism is a necessary and unavoidable asset of such official's competence.

This being said, Mr. Chairman, it must not be forgotten that we too often see applications—not only in the civil service, but in crown corporations, as I pointed out to the house recently—for instance, in the case of air hostesses, Air Canada, where it was said: Knowledge of English is required, but knowledge of French is a further asset. Why is one language required and another a further asset? Why are not both languages required, since an air hostess is called upon to serve both French and English-speaking Canadians?

When competitions are held within the civil service for positions requiring the official to deal with the public, such as in the Taxation Division, or here, for instance, in the house of commons where there are telephone operators. Four times out of five, the operator will tell you that she speaks English only, not French. If you want a French-speaking operator, you are told to hang up, that you will be called back. You wait 20 minutes before you get an operator who can understand and speak French.

Will the hon. member for Carleton now tell me that employees such as these should not have an increase of 10 per cent and even

more than 10 per cent. I would say that 33 per cent should be awarded bilingual telephone operators. Thirty three per cent of the members in this House of Commons speak French and want French to be recognized here as elsewhere.

How can the hon. member for Carleton deem it acceptable that telephone operators in the House of Commons be unable to answer in French when they are being spoken to in French.

Do you know when bilingualism includes French? When it is time to fill out income tax returns. If you fill out your income tax return and the government owes you money, send it in English. The money comes quickly. Send your income tax return in French and you must wait, perhaps a month, before you get your money. When you owe the government money, fill out your return in French: it will be a month before you have to pay.

Will the member for Carleton tell me that the officials of the Income Tax Division are competent, when one must wait a month, a month and a half longer if one writes in French instead of English?

Then would it not be appropriate to give a percentage of additional points to bilingual civil servants who have to deal with the public? If we want bilingualism to become a fact, civil servants in contact with the public will inevitably have to get a higher percentage for their competence, because they are bilingual and can speak and understand both languages.

Mr. Chairman, I understand the situation of the hon. member for Carleton. There are a great many civil servants in his riding. We cannot demand all civil servants to become bilingual overnight.

Although we ask for integral bilingualism, we do not want to break everything. There must be a period of evolution. When the day comes where our young people, in colleges and universities, know that additional credits are given for bilingualism in the civil service, then, our young people will learn French to be more "competent" when they enter the civil service.

It is an indication of competence when one can speak the two languages in a country like Canada. And this applies just as well to the French Canadians of the province of Quebec. When they know there will be more advantages, more points, if they speak the two languages, they too will realize, as will be realized in the other provinces, that in order to have more chances for promotion in the civil service, they have to speak the two languages.

When we say 10 per cent, let us not disregard it. We complain that French Canadians are not sufficiently numerous in the civil service. Why? When French Canadians from Quebec, Montreal, Rouyn or Trois-Rivières, apply for a job in the civil service, if they want to get to the top, they have to be extremely good in English, although their mother tongue is French. They must be very qualified and able to speak English, just about flawlessly.

If they do not keep this in mind, they know, right from the start, that they will not reach the higher echelons of the civil service. This is evident by the distribution and the cross-section of officials found in the civil service.

Ministers, deputy ministers, directors of crown corporations, all of them practically speak only one language, English. We should like to facilitate the unity of our country, by having more French speaking officials who are asked, right from the start, to be qualified, because otherwise they would have no chance for promotion.

The difference between you and us is that we are not asking for that. We are not asking for officials who speak French only or French reports only. The difference between you and us is that we are asking for both French and English. I do not call that being fanatic.

The University of Ottawa had to declare itself a bilingual university to get grants from the province of Ontario. McGill University gets as much if not more in grants from the Quebec government and it never had to declare itself a bilingual university; in fact, it is an English university in the province of Quebec. The University of Ottawa, which was a French university and which tries to give a French education to the people of Ontario, was obliged to declare itself a bilingual university to get grants from the Ontario government.

We are not that fanatic in the province of Quebec. I am not taking the floor to ask that all high officials be French Canadians. We are asking that they be bilingual, that they speak both languages. Can one be more reasonable, more logical? Is it not showing goodwill to ask that they be bilingual? We are asking it from all those who deal with the public, who work on trains, for the income tax division, Air Canada, from all those who work for crown corporations, in departments, who deal

with the public or answer the phone. Is it not normal?

I appreciate that the hon. member for Carleton may be worried. He says that almost 50 per cent of the civil servants live in his riding. It is not because such a situation developed gradually that it must be allowed to linger.

It should be possible to take the necessary steps so that from now on those who join the civil service will know that they have a better chance, qualifications being equal, if they are bilingual.

Some crown corporations have set up language laboratories. Once, in a hotel north of Montreal, I saw some employees of the C.N.R. who spoke English only and who were taking French in a language laboratory sponsored by the C.N.R. Those men wanted to learn French and they did. It did not take them so long and at least today they can deal with the public.

We must start with the young. All sensible, sincere Canadians must accept, must approve the decision taken by the civil service commission and congratulate it for giving an additional percentage of points for bilingualism in the civil service.

In all the departments, whether is it the Secretary of State or the Department of National Defence, language courses can be organized to enable the newcomers to the civil service, those with chances for promotion, to reach the highest positions. If they are French Canadians, they can take English courses; if English Canadians, take French; so that all can benefit from the two languages and thus gain greater competence.

Think about it. There are ministers and senior civil servants who have to do business in other countries of the world. Well, nobody in this house can deny that when a citizen understands and speaks French and English, he can go almost anywhere in the world and make himself understood. In the fields of diplomacy, defence, broadcasting, trade and finance, when you speak both languages you can be welcomed and you can make yourself understood almost everywhere across the world. Therefore, it is a level of culture and competence a good civil servant must try to reach.

It is one of the criteria, even though not the only one, that must be taken into consideration in the case of a civil servant.

[Mr. Grégoire.]

• (9:30 p.m.)

[*English*]

Mr. Churchill: Would the hon. member permit a question?

Mr. Grégoire: Yes.

Mr. Churchill: I thought the hon. member needed a rest. I should like to ask him this: would he impose any restriction on people whose native language is other than English or French, those who speak Polish, Ukrainian, Italian, Greek, and so on. Would the hon. member oblige them to know both English and French before they could enter the Civil Service?

[*Translation*]

Mr. Grégoire: I admit this case is important. I know that in the prairie provinces, there are several people of Polish, Ukrainian or Hungarian origin, who already speak their own language, and it is expecting very much of them to speak two more languages in addition to theirs.

I believe that to become a good civil servant, they must speak one of the two official languages of Canada. It is a good start already and they are even more competent if they speak both official languages of this country.

I do not want to impose that on them, I do not want to ask that of them. On the other hand, between two persons of equal competence—and I really mean of equal competence here—which one should the government choose?

There is in St. Boniface, near Winnipeg where the hon. member comes from, quite a number of French Canadians. In Winnipeg, if two candidates apply for the same job, and they are equally competent though one of them is bilingual, speaking English and French, I believe the latter enjoys an advantage over the one who speaks English only. If the two citizens from St. Boniface speak French and are otherwise equally competent, I would say that, if one of them speaks English, he must have the precedence on the other.

I believe the hon. member for Winnipeg South Centre (Mr. Churchill) will admit that if two French Canadians apply for postmaster's job in the office where he collects his mail, the one who speaks English has an additional competence over the one who speaks French only.

That is what we claim and nothing else: Competence being equal, the one coming into

contact with the public and who can speak both languages is the one who should enjoy priority.

An hon. Member: The two official languages of the country.

Mr. Grégoire: Obviously, let us not talk about other languages now.

[*English*]

Mr. Churchill: May I ask another question. I take it the hon. member does not agree with the proposition put forward by the Minister of Mines and Technical Surveys who is reported to have been insisting that people entering the Civil Service must know both French and English. I want to speak on behalf of those whose native language is neither English nor French.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Grégoire: Mr. Chairman, quite understandably, this is a field where flexibility is required when such a suggestion is implemented. One must be flexible enough to admit that this situation exists and that, at present, most of our civil servants are unilingual.

The suggestion made by the Minister of Mines and Technical Surveys (Mr. Pepin) to allow a certain number of additional points to a bilingual civil servant seems quite normal to me, since he acknowledges and establishes the following principle, namely that a Canadian civil servant who must deal with the public and who can speak both official languages is necessarily more competent than another who speaks only one of those languages.

This is what such a principle should recognize. We have another solution to offer. Let us give an additional bonus of $200 or $300 to any civil servant who can supply proof that he can speak and understand both languages.

So, upon entering the civil service, everyone would be on the same footing, whether bilingual or not. Once in the civil service, if he wants to be entitled to the bonus, it is up to him to study in a language laboratory to learn French or English according to whether he is a French or English Canadian.

At this time, according to the program we proposed three years ago, to give an additional bonus to everyone who is bilingual upon entering the civil service for any department they would all be on the same footing, but once in the service, the bilingual employee would receive the bonus if he can understand and speak both languages.

That will force civil servants to learn the other language. If they are French, they will learn English and if they are English they will learn French, should they want the bonus. And it would not take too long. I know that the former Secretary of State had conceived a plan for civil servants. Now, all that would be beneficial to those now in the civil service. They could immediately learn the other language that they do not know and then get their bonus. Besides, in six months or a year from now, they could speak French or English and be understood by everyone in his own language.

I think that the member for Winnipeg South Centre should be satisfied with this. He should find such an attitude or such a principle satisfactory.

• (9:40 p.m.)

[*English*]

Mr. Churchill: Mr. Chairman, I have another question, even though I think we should get the estimates through tonight and with that in mind I anticipate a short answer. Would the hon. member recommend a bonus for a person whose native language is English but who has learned Eskimo in order to communicate with some of our native people, and a bonus for others along the same line, for those who act as interpreters in Russian, German and so on?

[*Translation*]

Mr. Grégoire: No, Mr. Chairman, the bonus would be for bilingual people, namely those who speak and understand the two official languages in Canada. It is rather exceptional to speak Russian, and a Russian interpreter gets a much higher salary, because he had enough determination to learn Russian; it is his bonus, because he has an extra qualification, due to the fact that he speaks Russian. I do not know Russian, but nobody would pay me the salary of the Russian interpreter either.

But to be bilingual, that is to speak French and English, that is an additional asset in the civil service, and it deserves a bonus, in order to promote the development of true bilingualism in Canada. This bonus, will be an incentive for the officials actually in service to learn French, if they speak English only, or to learn English if they speak French only. Does this answer satisfy the hon. member for Winnipeg South Centre?

[*English*]

Mr. Churchill: Thank you very much. Do you mind if I leave now?

[*Translation*]

Mr. Grégoire: Mr. Chairman, I am happy to see that the member for Winnipeg South Centre has gone to enrol in a French course. I shall be glad to help him if he needs it.

Mr. Chairman, the Secretary of State could certainly allow the member for Winnipeg South Centre to use the existing language laboratories.

This is, first of all, a political and social question, for Canada is officially recognized as a bilingual country by virtue of its constitution. That is the first and basic reason.

But for those who seem to object to that, I will recall that there is moreover a question of culture involved. The individual who can command two languages will unavoidably enjoy two cultures. That is obvious, Mr. Chairman. Those who wish to learn more, to know more, should do it for the sake of culture, for their self-improvement. It goes without saying that every human being tries to learn as much as possible, tries to add as much as he can to his personal background. Two cultures are definitely better than only one.

In the light of those facts, Mr. Chairman, I believe we must support the civil service's proposal to allot 10 extra points to those who are bilingual when they apply for a job. It was set at 10 per cent and I accept that percentage.

However, I would ask to consider also a supplementary bonus for those who are already on the job, during the period of transition, so that that period might not be too long. Then, you would see many officials register for French or English courses, as the case might be, with a view to learning the other official language of our country.

Mr. Chairman, those are the few remarks I wanted to make.

I think the hon. member for Carleton (Mr. Bell) will have noticed that I was not too fanatical in my ideas today. Those ideas are logical. We are not asking to take anything away from anyone, but merely asking to recognize the merit and competence of those who can speak the two languages, which are recognized by the constitution as the official languages of Canada.

[*English*]

Mr. Cantelon: Mr. Chairman, I intend to change the subject because I am sure it is impossible to pour oil on these troubled waters. If I did, I am quite certain the head of the hon. member for Lapointe would come bobbling through, spouting words. I should like to say a few words about a matter very close to the hearts of my constituents, a matter which I have mentioned to the minister on another occasion, namely, C.B.C. coverage for Saskatoon—a new C.B.C. station for Saskatoon.

To refresh the minister's memory I wish to tell her my constituency receives only one type of program and we are very anxious to have two. If a C.B.C. station can be put into Saskatoon, then we expect we would be able to have a C.T.V. program, as well as a C.B.C. program.

In this connection there is another matter I should like to mention. We have a satellite station at a place called Pivot, which is served from Medicine Hat, and over the past few months a great deal of technical difficulty has arisen. We hope the minister will use her good offices to see that an improvement is made to the technical efficiency of this station.

While talking on this subject, I think it would be a good time to mention the CBOT radio station in Ottawa. Before coming here, from what I expect might be called a remote area, I was accustomed to having very good radio reception. In common with many hon. members, I enjoyed good music and good commentaries, much of which are to be found on the C.B.C. network. Unfortunately, CBOT is not a good station. It is almost impossible to get good music from it, and clearcut words from the commentators who broadcast over it. I do not know whether the minister can do anything about this but, if she can, I think something should be done to see that the technical competency of this station is improved. It is a disgrace to the capital of our country.

Much of the C.B.C. programming in recent weeks has, in my opinion, improved greatly. We no longer get those far out programs, if we can call them that, produced by the quasi-intellectuals among the programming group in the C.B.C. At least we have not had any in recent weeks. I think in the past they were attempting to follow the ancient Greek tragedies. Unfortunately, all they succeeded in doing was omitting the drama involved in those tragedies and giving the dirt. This is indefensible in a network which comes into the homes of everybody.

Mr. Macquarrie: Mr. Chairman, I should like to say a word or two about the item which concerns the office of the Chief Electoral Officer. This office was held for a long time by a highly esteemed man, a man who gained the respect of every successful and unsuccessful parliamentry candidate. I think the office should be filled forthwith. It is not good to have this important office vacant, especially in a country that has had such a plethora of elections as we have had in recent years.

• (9:50 p.m.)

I should like to say further, Mr. Chairman—

An hon. Member: You are too truthful, Judy.

Mr. Peters: You are getting some help with your speech.

Mr. Macquarrie: Yes, by this little contretemps between the lovely lady and this gallant gentleman.

I will continue. There is another matter of importance which I should like to bring to the attention of the minister at this time. I believe the elections act requires urgent and most careful scrutiny with a view to some far sweeping changes. We have had the habit in Canada of revising the elections act after an election. We have learned, I am sure, many things from the last few elections. The disenfranchisement of the students, for one thing, is very important and the disenfranchisement of many Canadians abroad, not only those in the Department of External Affairs, who do not have the opportunity to vote. There is the whole question of people who are out of their own area, and perhaps out of the country temporarily.

We could provide, I think, the necessary mechanism, if we moved toward the permanent voters list. I think this is an underpinning for absentee and proxy voting. Many persons believe the voting age should be lowered. I am one of those, but some of my colleagues do not belong to that group.

I should like to say to the minister that I believe the committee on privileges and elections should be activated as soon as possible, because there is a great deal of work to do in scrutinizing the act. I had the honour of presiding over the committee on privileges and elections the last time it held its sittings. We had many long meetings, long discussions and deliberations. I think the time is ripe for action in this regard. We must move toward having our democratic machinery up-dated. I do not think it is a good thing to have a vacancy in the office of the Chief Electoral Officer, and have an act which has been allowed to grow out of date.

Following the precedent set by the member for Royal, I will indulge in brevity and postpone my voluminous remarks until the next time I have an opportunity.

Mr. Nesbitt: Mr. Chairman, I should like to ask the member for Queens a question. Does the hon. member for Queens think that the time for holding elections should be reduced to 30 days rather than 60 days as it is at the present time?

Mr. Macquarrie: I believe, with a permanent list, it could be done in 30 days.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Latulippe: Mr. Chairman, I have only a few remarks to make—I will not be long—about broadcasting in the constituency I represent.

My constituency has very bad service by way of broadcasting. For instance, at five and six o'clock in the afternoon, the frequencies are lowered and the power of private stations is lowered, so that the constituency is deprived of radio or French broadcasts in the evening. By lowering the broadcasting power of the private radio stations, it is impossible to tune in French stations. It is only possible to pick up American stations which are so powerful and take up all the power, so that it is impossible to get a single French word between five o'clock in the afternoon and eight o'clock the next morning.

The Canadian Broadcasting Corporation owns a small station, a small substation in the town of Mégantic. This small substation is much too weak, it is not powerful enough to serve the population, with the result that American stations overpower it and the small transmission station of the C.B.C. becomes worthless. Not one word can be heard all evening; all through the night the C.B.C. station does not operate because it is too weak to be heard above American stations.

In order to listen to radio programs in my riding, one has to tune in the Sherbrooke station, which serves part of the riding. Afterwards, one has to tune in the Thetford Mines station, serving another part of the riding. Later on, one has to tune in the St. Georges de Beauce station that serves another part of the riding, and a great part of the riding is still not covered, even though we have to tune in three stations to cover the whole riding. Nevertheless, a great part of the riding is left out.

My riding is made up of French Canadians, in a proportion of 97 per cent, while almost 80 per cent of the programs are American, not French. American stations run the show in my riding.

So we speak about French. The riding I represent is a French riding and we cannot even get French radio.

So I ask the C.B.C., and the minister to consider the requests I have made, for the riding I represent, for the Chamber of Commerce by which I am asked to make representations, for the Owners' League, in short for all public bodies of the city and the riding I represent.

We want an improvement in broadcasting. I don't believe the improvement we seek will cost too much to the government. To my mind, it would involve an increase in power of the C.B.C. station or the small C.B.C. relay station in Mégantic, so that it will be strong enough.

It would also involve permission for the private stations to maintain their power high enough to enable us to tune in French stations after ten o'clock at night.

The government, I do not know why, orders private radio stations to reduce their power by half, maybe more. I am not too sure about the percentage. At any rate, we have no French radio programs from five or six o'clock in the evening until eight o'clock the next morning.

I ask the minister to take this request into consideration. I am sure that the municipal and county authorities will make other representations because, for some time, they have been putting a lot of pressure on me to ask the minister and the government to do something in that connection.

That is why I took the opportunity to take part in this debate tonight. Once again, I ask the minister to examine the situation and have an inquiry made in that area, in order to give justice to my constituents.

• (10:00 p.m.)

Mr. Valade: Mr. Chairman, a while ago, the hon. member for Dollard (Mr. Goyer) raised a very important question for the Canadian metropolis. Unfortunately, the minister did not refer or reply to the comments of his colleague, but I would certainly speak very briefly if the minister would assure us that the proposed C.B.C. complex which the previous government promised to carry out as early as October 1, 1965, and which was delayed by his predecessor to October 1, 1966, will be carried out.

The minister undoubtedly knows that this is a very important project of a rather special nature, since it is one of the most extensive projects to be carried out in the Canadian metropolis and I refer to the C.B.C. complex.

If the minister can assure us to-night that there shall not be any other postponement after the final date of October 1, 1966, my remarks, Mr. Chairman, will be short. So, if the minister can give us an answer, inform the house, in a word, give us a definite answer and not a shifty one as has been given in the past, the house shall obtain a much more immediate co-operation from me.

Does the minister intend to reply to my question, Mr. Chairman? I shall take the liberty of renewing my request if I do not receive an answer to my inquiry.

Mr. Grégoire: Mr. Chairman, I also wish to ask a question—

Mr. Valade: Mr. Chairman, I directed a question to the minister and I would hope that she would at least be courteous enough to give us an answer. It is a simple clear and important question; it deals with a project of some $35 million. According to my information, it is a revised project, and I would like the minister to assure us, tonight, in short to state that there will be no more delays concerning the execution of that project, the C.B.C. complex in Montreal. It is a matter of administrative responsibility, and I cannot understand how the minister can remain indifferent and refuse to answer this kind of question, unless we are to see in this another sign of indifference toward a metropolis which has sent to parliament 20 Liberal members out of 21 ridings. It would be an insult to the Canadian metropolis to refuse to answer this question and if the minister refuses to do so, I shall ask the support of the 18 other Liberal members from Montreal, who have common interests to defend; as the hon. member for Dollard Mr. Goyer)—and I congratulate him for doing so,—I shall seek their support in order to have an answer in respect of that huge project.

I realize that the hon. Minister has to discuss common interests with her colleague, the Minister of National Defence (Mr. Hellyer) and the new Postmaster General (Mr. Côté), but I think that the Secretary of State should show a little more interest for her

responsibilities and give us an answer to-night.

As a matter of fact, Mr. Chairman, I demand such an answer, for we have been playing and juggling too long with this project, that was decided upon, voted and approved by the city of Montreal, by the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation and by Parliament. With startling suddenness, and through a political scheme on the part of her predecessor, this project was postponed a few months prior to the federal election, so as to prevent the election of the member for Sainte-Marie as Conservative member of Parliament for the Montreal area. Liberals resort to all tricks, Mr. Chairman, and I am not surprised about that.

But since the electoral campaign is over, I think the Minister owes us such an answer and should tell us to-night whether or not it is her intention to see that this project about the C.B.C. center is effectively carried out, as was announced by her predecessor on October 1, 1965.

I do not intend to resume my seat without having had an answer from the minister. It seems to me that the matter is simple. If the hon. lady is aware of the administration, of the decisions the cabinet has made previously or at present, I believe that she should answer. If the minister is unaware of this, it may be that she is not considered important enough to be kept abreast of the main decisions taken by the present government. This is of consequence to us, and while I bow to your impartiality, Mr. Chairman, you happen to be my left hand neighbour in the city of Montreal, and I know that this question is of interest to you—

The Deputy Chairman: Order. If I may interrupt the hon. member, I would ask him not to refer to the person who is now in the chair since the latter cannot, on account of his office, take part in the debate in progress. I suggest that the hon. member carry on with his remarks without alluding to the member who is presently acting as deputy chairman of committees and who cannot therefore take part in the debate.

Mr. Valade: I must point out to you, Mr. Chairman, that I did not put forward any argument likely to place you in an embarrassing situation. I only said that as a member from Montreal, you were interested in the matter—

The Deputy Chairman: Order. I am sorry to interrupt the hon. member, but I would ask him to proceed with his remarks while making the points he wants to submit to the house. I would also ask him to overlook the fact that I am a member of this house, because being acting chairman of the committees of the house, I cannot take part in the debate.

Mr. Grégoire: On a point of order, Mr. Chairman. I think you are perfectly within your rights. Up to now, you have performed your duty with fairness and honesty. I feel all members should make it possible for you to keep on performing your task as efficiently as in the past.

I think the hon. member for Sainte Marie (Mr. Valade) will agree with me on that point.

Mr. Valade: Mr. Chairman, I agree with the hon. member for Lapointe and I would like to see him in the chair to spare us his interventions which are often out of place.

Mr. Chairman, I simply wish to tell the Secretary of State that this C.B.C. centre concerns all the members from Montreal. I do not intend to make it a question of party politics; I am not in a position to do so.

Everyone knows that it is the Conservative party which initiated that project, which conceived it, which endorsed it and which had it approved. Consequently, I am not here to gather political advantages. Let us hear from the government tonight that it will carry out the project approved by the house of commons under the previous administration.

Mr. Mongrain: Mr. Chairman, I wonder whether the hon. member should not put his question in English to the minister so that she could understand and answer?

[*English*]

Miss LaMarsh: Mr. Chairman, I am perfectly able to understand, but I fail to see how I am able to answer the hon. member until he sits down and surrenders the floor to me.

Mr. Valade: Mr. Chairman, I do protest against another intervention by the minister. I asked her earlier to reply and told her that my intervention would be short. Then I sat down and she refused to give an answer. Now she says that if I sit down she will give me an answer. I am just complying with the request of the hon. member for Trois-Rivières. I am saying to the leader of the

truth squad that we in this party are truly bilingual, at least we try to be. I have asked her the question in both French and English. Perhaps I should ask her the question in Spanish, Chinese or Eskimo, I don't know; but I have asked if she is ready to answer this question now. I impress upon the minister that I am ready to refrain from speaking on the subject if she will give me an answer, but she has not yet given any indication that she will answer my question. As the minister responsible for this project, will she say whether it will be completed on the date that was decided, namely October 1, 1966?

[*Translation*]

Mr. Chairman, I see the minister is surrounded by some other colleagues from Quebec—I ask her to tell us whether this project will materialize. I see the new Postmaster General (Mr. Côté) at her side; he is perfectly bilingual and he is a young man who rose to glory at a clip with Quebec minister Laporte. This project is no longer a joke. Our Liberal opponents once again want to fool the population of Montreal. I am happy to see them smile about this intervention which affects the economy of the East of Montreal. French Canadians complain of having been neglected in the past by the federal government.

Now that the former government has decided on a project of fantastic scope which will give a considerable impulsion to the city of Montreal, particularly to the east—I see the Postmaster General smile and I should like to know whether it is a cynical smile or whether he intends to fulfil the promises made during the election campaign.

Mr. Côté (Longueuil): I rise on a question of privilege.

Mr. Valade: I ask the Secretary of State to answer my question.

The Deputy Chairman: Order. The hon. Postmaster General is rising on a question of privilege.

Mr. Côté (Longueuil): It seems that the member for Sainte-Marie wants to involve me in this matter. He says I have a cynical smile. I only ask him to sit down that I may answer him.

Mr. Valade: Since the Secretary of State is invited to answer by her colleague the Postmaster General, I leave her the floor if she wishes to answer.

[Mr. Valade.]

• (10:10 p.m.)

[*English*]

Miss LaMarsh: Mr. Chairman, there have been a number of questions asked this evening, and I was waiting, particularly in view of the lateness of the hour, until all questions had been put before I attempt to give some brief answer prior to the termination of our discussion on vote No. 1.

Earlier this evening the hon. members for Chapleau and Churchill, as well as hon. members for Saguenay, Grand Falls-White Bay-Labrador, Northwest Territories and even the hon. member for Bonavista-Twillingate privately, and on many occasions, raised the question of the extension of the services provided by the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation, first of all to parts of Canada not yet reached by any service. I fully agree, as I am sure every hon. member does, that it should be extended to such regions as quickly as is humanly possible, if it is humanly possible.

As is known by these hon. members I have enumerated, though I am sure there are others who have not taken the opportunity to mention to me difficulties in this regard in their ridings, the C.B.C. has been unable over a number of years, because of insufficient money voted by parliament, to reach the complete population of Canada. Indeed, we could never reach 100 per cent of the population of Canada through the radio arm of the corporation as well as the television arm.

As a result of my predecessors' study of the matter—firstly the Minister of Transport who had a troika set up to study the question of broadcasting, and latterly my immediate predecessor who had the Fowler committee set up—one subject of intense interest was the extension of services to the ultimate level throughout the whole of Canada.

I share with all hon. members who have spoken a desire to see as quickly as practicable the extension of service to every Canadian in Canada who can receive it. Unhappily, I am not in a position to say—

Mr. Caouette: Would the hon. lady permit a question, please. She just said service would be extended whenever it is humanly possible. Now, is it a question of being humanly possible or financially impossible?

Miss LaMarsh: I think I know to which slogan my hon. friend has reference. In the first place, I should like to say that it is a question of being humanly possible to some extent, because I am told that we cannot

hope under present technological advances to reach 100 per cent of the homes of Canada. So, that is an ideal which we are not going to reach in the foreseeable future, or at least while I am responsible for the C.B.C. We do reach a figure somewhat less than that, though it cannot be too much less than that because we are already able to reach through radio something like 96 per cent of all homes, and through television something like 92 per cent of all homes. So, we do not have far to go.

I have asked the C.B.C.—and the C.B.C., as members of the committee can imagine, is eager to comply—to give the government an estimate of the cost of doing something similar to that suggested by the hon. member for Churchill, namely, to put aside a fund so that the last big step toward the outer limit of practicability can be reached in an orderly way. Then, the C.B.C. can lay out its priorities and make a start toward providing a national service which is received, if possible, in every Canadian home. Unhappily, I cannot tell members of the house at this stage when this will come to pass. Hon. members will realize that I have been responsible for this portfolio for only a little over two months, and that the estimates currently before the committee do not contain money for this capital expansion. Nevertheless, it will not be too many weeks before this committee will have an opportunity to see another set of estimates for this department, and will have an opportunity as well to discuss the affairs of my department before a committee of the house. I should hope at that point we shall be able to give further information to hon. members.

One hon. member was kind enough to say, in passing, on the question of the extension of services with respect to programming that he thought he saw an improvement within the last few weeks. Even though I am patheticaly eager to find any kind of approval, and there was little enough this evening in any remarks of hon. members toward my stewardship in the last couple of months, unhappily I cannot claim responsibility for any improvement in programming. As has been said many times before, programming is the responsibility of the Board and the management. My responsibility is to act as a conduit pipe between the corporation and Members of Parliament.

An hon. Member: Some pipe.

Miss LaMarsh: I hope that there would be a steady improvement of programs. It may be the case, if programs appear to have improved to my hon. friend, that they may appear at the same time to be anything but an improvement to someone else in another part of the chamber. I was asked a number of questions by hon. members, for, I believe, Burnaby-Richmond, Dollard and finally by the hon. member for Sainte-Marie. The first question I was asked by the hon. member for Burnaby-Richmond concerned consolidation of services in the three largest cities of Canada, Montreal, Toronto and Vancouver.

As all hon. members know, these questions were specifically referred to the Fowler Committee which has been studying the matter for a considerable period of time. This is part of the general, over-all study. I cannot tell hon. members when they are likely to receive a white paper or an indication of the government's assessment of the Fowler Report on broadcasting in Canada. I, myself, have very recently come to this field; and having soaked myself for about two months in all the lore of broadcasting, and in learning all the information that I have been able to reach in that department, I feel that I have only scratched the surface.

Broadcasting is perhaps one of the most important things in the field of communication. Certainly, the impact of television on Canadians is tremendous.

I hope that within the confines of this calendar year we will be able to pass through the stages of a white paper, a committee study by a parliamentary committee, and perhaps even the formulation of legislation. I would explain to hon. members that I would not want them to feel that I am to be bound by such a timetable, since it takes a long time to discuss and lay out the framework of broadcasting. However, such questions as the consolidation plans I think can be decided on an ad hoc basis. They are being discussed by the cabinet at this time.

I should like to make very clear, however—and this might be of interest to the deputy chairman of committee in whose constituency the premises exist—that the government fully intends to go ahead with construction plans for the C.B.C. Montreal consolidation on the site which has been expropriated by the City of Montreal.

• (10:20 p.m.)

There has never been any suggestion otherwise. That is the site where construction will commence. But I do think it would be fool-

hardy for me at this point, while the Fowler report is being studied by the committee, to attempt to give hon. members here, or persons in the general public, a date upon which construction will be started or completed.

We are aware of the pressures which have built up in the city of Montreal with regard to this matter. Hon. members from Montreal, particularly the deputy chairman of committees, the hon. member for Saint Jacques, have brought this question to my notice almost daily. I appreciate that a great many people in Montreal have been dispossessed of their homes in this area so that the land might be cleared for this construction. For this reason, I should like to pledge to the committee that there shall be no delay in reaching a decision.

Other matters were raised, in particular the question raised by the hon. member for Carleton and answered by the hon. member for Lapointe. I should like to have the opportunity to make a statement at some length with respect to what was said by the head of the Civil Service Commission and the policy which has been undertaken in the last few years. I am not attempting to be provocative, but I believe the hon. member for Carleton—and I am sure he would not want to do this—has done a disservice to the commission. However, in view of the lateness of the hour and the few minutes left to me before ten o'clock, and since the Prime Minister indicated only today in the house that he would be prepared next week following a meeting with representatives of the Civil Service Federation to make a full statement in this chamber, I feel this is not an opportune time at which to pursue the matter. My poor words, in any case, would do nothing but foreshadow words which are far more responsible and important to all those engaged in the public service in Canada. This being the case, I think I have completed my remarks. I hope I have dealt with all the other questions asked this evening.

Mr. Knowles: Mr. Chairman, I rise on a point of order. We have refrained from mentioning the time. We did not even quarrel with the statement made by the minister a moment ago as to what time she thought it was. But we think there should be some understanding about what we are doing. My colleagues here are prepared not to notice the clock until the estimates of this department have been dealt with but we hope there may be an agreement after that point to call it ten o'clock.

[Miss LaMarsh.]

Mr. McIlraith: On the point of order, I should like to appeal to the committee to complete all the estimates tonight. As outlined in an answer to a question by the hon. member for Medicine Hat on Monday afternoon, there is a situation in which certain casual employees of the department cannot be paid. A good many of the small service contractors cannot be paid and many persons are suffering real hardship since they cannot receive their pay because of the delay in completing the estimates.

I therefore appeal to hon. members to complete consideration of that item in the R.C.M.P. estimates which it was thought by all hon. members had been called yesterday with the estimates of the Department of Justice, but which was inadvertently omitted, as well as the estimates of the Department of Fisheries. If we could do this tonight, it would be very much appreciated.

Mr. Starr: I want to say a word on the point of order. In the continuing spirit of co-operation which we have extended to the government in the consideration of these estimates throughout all the departments, and realizing the hardships which may be encountered by many who have to depend on their pay or salaries, we are prepared to sit until all the estimates have been passed tonight. We do this to help the government out of the predicament in which they find themselves, and in order that no hardship may be felt.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Grégoire: Mr. Chairman, I heard the Minister of Public Works (Mr. McIlraith) tell us earlier that the Government had no more funds to pay civil servants and contractors, and I intended to suggest that they borrow from Household Finance or some company of that kind in order to pay their employees.

However, I do want to tell the Government Leader that we are prepared to co-operate concerning the estimates.

The house leader of the Conservative Party also tells us that he is prepared to co-operate, but I should like to know what this means.

If that means that several Conservative members will rise and speak until two o'clock tomorrow morning, we object. As for us, we feel that the study of the estimates could be all over in five minutes.

Mr. Chairman, we do not know the intentions of the New Democratic party, or those of the Conservative party, for that matter,

but we feel that we should at least know what to expect.

For instance, if a definite time is set for ending the discussion of the estimates, say eleven o'clock, we are ready to co-operate. But if the idea is to have the debate drag until three or four in the morning, I suggest this is no longer co-operation but hypocrisy.

[*English*]

Mr. Starr: I am rising on a point of order in view of what has been said by the hon. member for Lapointe. I have been here for some 14 years. He has been here only a few years. If I had nothing more to contribute than he has contributed over that period of time, I think I would take my seat.

Mr. Knowles: Mr. Chairman, I am sure we are all anxious to arrive at an understanding on a basis of mutual agreement. We are not trying to throw invective at each other, but I would point out that a certain place in another part of this building adjourned at 9.30. Therefore, no matter how long we sit tonight, the estimates and the final bill will not be put through tonight. It will take until tomorrow, in any case.

I think the more responsible way to go at things is to finish up the department that is before us, and finish the other two departments tomorrow afternoon. If we get into fisheries and the R.C.M.P. tonight we are likely to be here until quite late. We will be doing a disservice to the staff of the house and it will not speed up payment of salaries because the other place has adjourned.

Mr. McIlraith: I think I should explain the reference to the other place. The fact is that the other place, when it meets tomorrow afternoon, should have before it the bill from this House. It cannot have that bill if we do not start considering it until after the other place has met tomorrow afternoon. It is purely a matter of getting the bill ready before hon. members of the other place meet, so that they can have a short time to consider and pass it before the royal assent, which has been arranged for tomorrow afternoon.

I must acknowledge that the other place has been very co-operative during what has been a difficult situation over the last few days. They arranged to come and deal with these matters on Friday evening and again tonight. If the arrangement for tomorrow could be met, I think it would be a fair treatment of the whole subject. I would again make my appeal to hon. members—forget whatever differences there might be between parties at the moment and try to complete all these estimates tonight.

Mr. Olson: I think we should try to get all the estimates passed, in keeping with the suggestion made by the hon. member for Ontario, but I also believe that we should do it, if possible, within a reasonable length of time. In other words, if we leave matters wide open for the Department of Fisheries and the R.C.M.P. item, without any gentlemen's agreement, we may be here until two or three o'clock in the morning discussing, for instance, the skinning of seals. Therefore, while we agree that it would be beneficial to have the balance of the estimates passed so that the appropriations bill can be sent to the Senate, we urge that it should be done in a reasonable length of time.

Mr. McIlraith: Would the hon. member indicate what he regards as a reasonable length of time?

Mr. Olson: I would think some time between now and midnight, if there is just one department to deal with.

Mr. Starr: I would agree with that and we are prepared, and give our word, that by twelve o'clock midnight we will pass all the items in all departments.

Mr. Howard: Mr. Chairman, individual members have particular problems that they want to raise, and this is taking advantage of them.

• (10:30 p.m.)

What this suggestion, in effect, would be doing, would be to almost eliminate the discussion of a vitally important department, namely, the Department of Fisheries. This department has been left until the last. If we proceed this evening to restrict ourselves as to time, in order to get the estimates through—and I am not objecting to that in principle because of the financial difficulty in which the government finds itself—we will be thumbing our noses at all the fishermen in British Columbia. Some 22 of them were down here recently trying to gain the support of members of parliament for their particular problems. I think the suggestion to brush this department to one side is unconscionable.

I think a better approach would be to proceed to deal with the estimates of the Secretary of State tonight and start off fresh in the morning on a fishing expedition. There is nothing better than fishing in the morning

when you are fresh and alert. Otherwise, we would be treating the fisheries and the problems of the fishermen with complete disdain. We would be asking members to pass the estimates through a process of exhaustion. I think we would be better off—

An hon. Member: In meeting in the morning.

Mr. Howard: You can meet in the morning if you like, but I think the house leader would be in a better position were he to propose that we should sit this evening until we finish the estimates of the Secretary of State and start tomorrow morning with the Department of Fisheries.

Mr. McIlraith: Mr. Chairman, we seem to be very close to an agreement or concensus on this. Would it be satisfactory to the hon. member if we could reach an agreement that we would finish the estimates of the Secretary of State; then give him an opportunity to take the full allocated time for his important speech on fisheries. I agree that this is quite an important department. If we could agree on a time limit in that way, it would permit the two hon. members to have their opportunity to make speeches on this very important subject, and they would be assured of their full time.

Mr. Howard: You can pass the estimates of the Secretary of State right now—

Mr. McIntosh: Mr. Chairman—

Mr. Valade: Mr. Chairman, on a point of order—

The Deputy Chairman: Does the hon. member for Swift Current-Maple Creek wish to speak on a point of order?

Mr. McIntosh: No, Mr. Chairman. I have one short question to ask the minister.

The Deputy Chairman: The hon. member for Sainte-Marie on a point of order.

Mr. Valade: Mr. Chairman, on a point of order; I cannot say, if I intervene to correct a statement made by the minister, whether it will take me two minutes, five minutes, or ten minutes. I do not think this is the way in which parliament should be conducted. If there is a point which is of particular importance and interest to a member of parliament, surely it is his duty not to pass this opportunity because of the pressure of time. We did not bring about this pressure of time. It results from the election being held at a bad time. I do not think, when there is a project such as the one of which I spoke a few moments ago which concerns one million people and hundreds of millions of dollars, that I would be carrying out my duty if I went along with this suggestion.

I wish to make it clear that I intend to ask for more information on this point. I will try to make it very short, but I certainly will not yield my right to make this point clear to the minister.

Mr. Howard: Mr. Chairman, on a point of order; we find ourselves in the position of stumbling from one minute to another. I think, in view of the failure to reach an agreement, the only responsibility which falls on your shoulders now, Mr. Chairman, is to say it is ten o'clock. It is unquestionably ten o'clock.

Mr. Starr: Sit until one o'clock.

The Deputy Chairman: Order, please. Is the hon. member for Skeena calling it ten o'clock?

Mr. Howard: That is correct, Mr. Chairman.

The Deputy Chairman: Shall I rise, report certain resolutions and request leave to sit again later this day or at the next sitting of the house, as the case may be?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Resolutions adopted in committee of supply this day reported and concurred in.

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE

MOTION TO SIT UNTIL 1 A.M.

Hon. G. J. McIlraith (Minister of Public Works): Mr. Chairman, I move, pursuant to standing order 6(2):

That this house continue to sit until one o'clock a.m. Wednesday morning.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: It has been moved by the Minister of Public Works (Mr. McIlraith), that pursuant to standing order 6(2), this house continue to sit until 1 a.m. Wednesday morning. Is the house ready for the question?

Mr. Howard: Mr. Speaker, I protest and ask that you seek to find out whether or not there are ten members who object.

Mr. Starr: The Chair does not have to ask. Let the hon. members stand and be counted.

And more than ten members having risen, the question on the said motion was not put.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: The Chair sees 11 members objecting. Therefore, the motion to sit until one o'clock will not be put.

Mr. Starr: Is it possible to have the names of those objecting recorded, Mr. Speaker? I ask that they be recorded.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order, please. Standing order 6(2) does not require that the names of those objecting be recorded.

Mr. Knowles: Mr. Speaker, may I ask the house leader whether he will agree to avail himself of the offer we made earlier this evening to consider and pass the estimates of the Secretary of State tonight?

Mr. McIlraith: Mr. Speaker, in reply to the question put to me I must say that there is a situation developing here in which it is difficult to reconcile the rights of parliament and the consensus of the committee to the rights of individual members. I recognize in the circumstances how important some of these matters are to individual members.

• (10:40 p.m.)

But I must also reconcile that with the fact that parliament has a right to take a decision on public business. We have now had a very lengthy and thorough discussion of estimates in this session, and have in prospect another lengthy and thorough discussion of estimates in this session under a new, and we hope improved, system.

I cannot ignore without comment the remark of the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre, who pretends that because some offer he made was not accepted parliament has somehow not acted correctly. It has acted wholly correctly here and the hon. member must, along with any other hon. members who may feel justified—

Mr. Barnett: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a question of privilege—

Mr. McIlraith: —in taking the position they have taken, assume his responsibility for what happens as a consequence of not passing these estimates.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order. I will listen to the point of order raised by the hon. member for Comox-Alberni because I have allowed the hon. Minister of Public Works to make a statement. But I suggest to the house that our procedure at the moment is quite out of order. The hon. member for Comox-Alberni (Mr. Barnett).

Mr. Barnett: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a question of privilege affecting myself and, in my view, all hon. members of this house.

Mr. Starr: Speak for yourself.

Mr. Barnett: I would suggest that it ill behooves the government house leader to rise at this time with a self-righteous lecture on the responsibility of members of this house.

Mr. Winkler: It is very reasonable. You know what the rules are.

Mr. Churchill: What is the question of privilege?

Mr. Barnett: I should like to suggest the question of privilege is that for the hon. member for Ottawa West, the Minister of Public Works (Mr. McIlraith), to suggest that the Department of Fisheries is not worthy of a proper allocation of time and consideration by this house—

Some hon. Members: Sit down.

Mr. Barnett: —is indicative of the fact that this government has been sloughing off fisheries as a matter of little consequence for far too long.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh.

Mr. Fairweather: Send that little speech out to your constituents.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order, please. The Chair must be guided by the rules and regulations which have been given to the Chair by the house. The Chair has seen that the provisions of provisional standing order 6(2) have been properly carried out.

It is therefore my duty pursuant to provisional standing order 39A to inform the house that a motion to adjourn the house has been deemed to have been made and seconded at this time. Therefore the question is that this house do now adjourn.

PROCEEDINGS ON ADJOURNMENT MOTION

A motion to adjourn the house under provisional standing order 39A deemed to have been moved.

LABOUR CONDITIONS—ENCOURAGEMENT TO UNEMPLOYED TO WORK IN GOLD MINES

[*Translation*]

Mr. Gérard Laprise (Chapleau): Mr. Speaker, on March 3 last, I asked—

[*English*]

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

Proceedings on Adjournment Motion

[*Translation*]

Mr. Laprise: Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. On March 3 last, I asked the future minister of manpower (Mr. Marchand) since the shortage of skilled labour is one of the main reasons for the closing down of a gold mine in the Timmins area, this month if he could tell the House whether he intended to direct our unemployed toward the mining industry.

It has been announced also that another mine in the Yukon, will be closing down; two others have announced their closing down in a few months, for the same reasons.

And it is a fact, Mr. Speaker, that for some months now we have seen in the newspapers job offers for qualified men in our mines, tradesmen, electricians, plumbers, machinists, drillers, dynamiters, and so on. We need qualified men in our mines.

The Department of Citizenship and Immigration thought it had found a solution to that problem by attracting experienced miners to Canada. But this does not seem to satisfy our mining industries, for mining methods here are different from European methods. So, as the immigrants have no experience in our mines, they do not satisfy the needs of our mining operators.

I should like to ask the future Minister of Manpower to direct to the mining industry the unemployed and the young people who want to become acquainted with mining operations, mining work.

The federal government could help the provinces open mining schools so as to allow people displaced by automation or young Canadians who enter the labour market to gain elementary knowledge of our Canadian mining methods.

In closing, I should like to point out to the minister that gold mines, because their income is lower than others, are the first to suffer from this shortage of skilled workers.

The minister should take into consideration the suggestions I made to him tonight, in order to enable our young and our unemployed to take the necessary courses to meet the manpower demands of the mining industry.

Hon. Jean Marchand (Minister of Citizenship and Immigration): Mr. Speaker, I believe the suggestion which has been made is a very useful one. It says that we should try to train the men to fill in the available jobs in mines, and in the industries in general as well.

[Mr. Speaker.]

It is one of the projects we hope to be able to put into operation by next July 1, with higher allowances, we can probably better adjust from the professional point of view, the qualifications of our workers to the needs of the market.

There is only one thing that I would like to point out to the hon. member for Chapleau (Mr. Laprise). Whatever the quality of our vocational training, whatever efforts we make to prepare our people, either for working in mines or at other trades, labour conditions in those mines or trades must be attractive enough so that workers will be interested.

I know that, in some businesses and mining operations, even if we import labour, even skilled labour, the workers will not stay because of the relatively low level of income. It means that when a high level of employment exists, as is the case in some regions of Canada right now, it is absolutely impossible to convince the workers, and I think they are right, to stay in jobs which do not pay enough.

Of course, gold mines are a special case since their operations are subsidized. But it remains that one of the problems in those operations is precisely that either the labour conditions are a little too hard, or the level of income is not enough to attract and hold Canadian workers.

There is one thing I am not ready to do as Minister of Citizenship and Immigration, and that is to allow labour to be imported so that it will be forced, directly or indirectly, to accept jobs which do not pay enough. It has happened that some businesses, in order to secure cheap labour, have loaned money to immigrants, paid their trip and told them that they will not have to repay their fare if they work for the business for two, three or four years. In my opinion, this is slavery, and I do not think that such a situation should be accepted in Canada.

The case presented to us by the hon. member for Chapleau is one which we may try to deal with to a certain extent through our rehabilitation and reclassification systems, but at the same time working conditions and wages must be on a level allowing these businesses to compete with others in the labour market.

● (10:50 p.m.)

[*English*]

BROADCASTING—FOWLER COMMISSION—ACCEPTANCE OF RECOMMENDATIONS

Mr. Robert C. Coates (Cumberland): Mr. Speaker, on Monday I posed the following question to the Prime Minister:

> Can the Prime Minister inform the house when the cabinet committee studying the Fowler report will be in a position to indicate which of the recommendations of that committee will be accepted by the government?

Mr. Speaker found difficulty in determining the urgency of this question, and as a result I wish to enlarge on the reason it was asked.

In 1964 the Fowler Committee was set up by the present government, and it reported on September 9, 1965. On receipt of the report the Prime Minister informed the house that a special cabinet committee, headed by himself, would study the report. The expected result was that legislation would be proposed.

During the period the Fowler Committee sat we were informed that a freeze would be applied to those aspects of broadcasting under consideration by the committee. We were later informed that the freeze in effect during the committee hearings would continue during the period the report was under consideration by the cabinet committee.

I have been personally concerned in this whole matter because the action of this government has prevented my constituents from receiving the alternate television service they desire from the C.T.V. network through CJCH-T.V. Halifax. Many other hon. members have found themselves in a similar position. I point to the hon. member for Pictou (Mr. MacEwan), who has questioned the government on the same problem. Now, we hear that the Board of Broadcast Governors has heard and ruled on the application of the 11 member stations of the C.T.V. network to take over this network, a procedure opposed in the recommendation of the Fowler Committee but approved of very recently by the Board of Broadcast Governors. I think the recommendation of the Fowler Committee was to the effect that such approval should not be given.

We are also informed that the Board of Broadcast Governors will hear the application of Ralph Snelgrove Limited regarding the shifting of channel 3 from Barrie to Toronto. Surely, it is the height of stupidity to which only this government can aspire, to have under consideration by a cabinet committee recommendations which the Board of Broadcast Governors is presently ignoring in the broadcasting field. This has led the *Globe and Mail* to editorialize in the following manner, and rightly so on Monday, March 7, 1966:

> The public is left to wonder. In permitting the B.B.G. to defy this one important Fowler recommendation, is the Government saying that it also rejects the recommendation but is still weighing other recommendations, or that, in fact, it rejects the whole report? And if either or neither is true, surely the people are entitled to be told the Government's reasons for taking (or not taking) a stand.
>
> But perhaps such public wondering is purposeless. In the accident-strewn history of this Government, perhaps we have just witnessed another accident.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Albert Béchard (Parliamentary Secretary to Secretary of State): Mr. Speaker, the report of the broadcasting commission, commonly known as the Fowler report, was submitted to the government early last September and, as all members know, certain events took place last fall which affected not only the government but all members, and prevented the government from giving serious consideration to that report in the latter part of 1965.

In addition to the said report, the government also obtained the views of the C.B.C., of the Canadian Broadcasters Association and of several groups of persons concerned.

In early January, a special cabinet committee, headed by the Prime Minister (Mr. Pearson) himself, was set up with a view to studying the Fowler report.

I believe that the government has begun serious consideration of the Fowler report. For some time, the government has been doing a vast amount of work, in addition to absorbing a report of this size as well as all the representations made by C.B.C. officials and other groups. Obviously, some time is required.

In addition, it was emphasized in the house several times by the Prime Minister and by the Secretary of State (Miss LaMarsh) that broadcasting was a most complex and most important problem and that decisions could not be taken lightly.

Several problems are involved, as is well known: programming, service expansion to areas not yet supplied with television, consolidation of services in Montreal and Toronto, financing of the C.B.C. and many others still.

These are problems on which we should not decide too quickly, and I believe that past experience shows that we should not jump to decisions.

The government's aim is and will always be to provide a true broadcasting policy which will give a certain amount of stability to this very important field for years to come. In addition, such a policy cannot be set out overnight. It is necessary to think about it very seriously and before finishing my remarks, I shall point out, for example, that if we scrutinize the policy which has been adopted following the presentation of the Fowler report in 1957 to implement the recommendations of that report, we see that the first decision concerning this report was taken at the beginning of 1958, that is one year after.

I should say also that the problems which have been raised in the report submitted in 1965 are not less important than those contained in the 1957 report.

[*English*]

Motion agreed to and the house adjourned at 11 p.m.

[The following items were passed in Committee of Supply this day:]

DEPARTMENT OF NATIONAL HEALTH AND WELFARE

Administration—

1. Department administration, $2,330,100.

Health services—

5. Administration, operation and maintenance, including grants as detailed in the estimates $7,175,200.

10. To authorize general health grants to the provinces, the Northwest Territories and the Yukon Territory upon the terms in the amounts detailed in the estimates and under terms and conditions approved by the governor in council including authority, notwithstanding section 30 of the Financial Administration Act, to make commitments for the current year not to exceed a total amount of $40,012,960, $32,000,000.

15. To authorize hospital construction grants to the provinces, the Northwest Territories and the Yukon Territory upon the terms and in the amounts detailed in the estimates and under terms and conditions approved by the governor in council including authority, notwithstanding section 30 of the Financial Administration Act, to make commitments for the current year not to exceed a total amount of $28,073,332, $20,000,000.

Medical services—

20. Administration, operation and maintenance including authority to make recoverable advances in amounts not exceeding in the aggregate the total of all amounts to be paid by the governments of provinces and territories under agreements to be entered on terms approved by the governor in council with such governments in respect of health assistance to persons residing on Indian reserves other than Indians and to residents of the territories other than Indians and Eskimos, $32,002,500.

25. Construction or acquisition of buildings, works, land and equipment including payments to hospitals and other institutions which care for Indians and Eskimos as contributions toward the construction of hospitals and related facilities, $5,050,000.

Food and drug services—

30. Administration, operation and maintenance, $4,883,000.

Medical services—

25d. Construction or acquisition of buildings, works, land and equipment, $700,000.

Food and drug services—

35. Construction or acquisition of equipment, $265,000.

Welfare services—

40. Administration, operation and maintenance including grants as detailed in the estimates, $4,762,000.

40b. Administration, operation and maintenance, $838,000.

41. Family assistance, under such terms and conditions as may be approved by the treasury board, in respect of children of immigrants and settlers (formerly under Citizenship and Immigration), $2,300,000.

41d. Family assistance, under such terms and conditions as may be approved by the treasury board, in respect of children of immigrants and settlers, $475,000.

45. National welfare grants—To authorize, on terms and conditions approved by the Governor in Council, national welfare grants to provinces and welfare agencies including schools of social work, and to individuals in the form of scholarships and fellowships, $1,500,000.

DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC WORKS

A—Department—

1. General administration, including grants as detailed in the estimates, $14,892,700.

Accommodation services—

5. Maintenance and operation of public buildings and grounds, acquisition of furniture and furnishings for government departments, and authority to provide assistance to (a) the international civil aviation organization in the form of office accommodation at less than commercial rates and (b) the Ottawa civil service recreation association in the form of maintenance services in respect of the W. Clifford Clark Memorial Centre in Ottawa, $61,280,800.

5b. Maintenance and operation of public buildings and grounds, acquisition of furniture and furnishings for government departments, $766,000.

10. Acquisition of equipment and furnishings other than office furnishings, $1,354,000.

15. Construction, acquisition, major repairs and improvements of, and plans and sites for, public buildings (including expenditures on works on other than federal property); provided that no contract may be entered into for new construction with an estimated total cost of $50,000 or more unless the project is individually listed in the details of estimates, $34,025,000.

15b. Construction, acquisition, major repairs and improvements of, and plans and sites for public buildings (including expenditures on works on other than federal property); provided that no contract may be entered into for new construction with an estimated total cost of $50,000 or more unless the project is individually listed in the details of estimates, $1.

Harbours and rivers engineering services—

20. Operation and maintenance, $6,982,300.

20b. Operation and maintenance, $600,000.

25. Construction or acquisition of equipment, $1,161,500.

30. Construction, acquisition, major repairs and improvements of, and plans and sites for, arbour and river works (including expenditures on works on other than federal property); provided that no contract may be entered into for new construction with an estimated total cost of $50,000 or more unless the project is individually listed in the details of estimates, $25,762,000.

30b. Construction, acquisition, major repairs and improvements of, and plans and sites for, harbour and river works (including expenditures on works on other than federal property); provided that no contract may be entered into for new construction with an estimated total cost of $50,000 or more unless the project is individually listed in the details of estimates, $1,200,000.

Roads, bridges and other engineering services—

35. Operation and maintenance including authority to make recoverable advances in amounts not exceeding in the aggregate the amount of the operating expenses of the New Westminster bridge, $6,224,400.

40. Construction, acquisition, major repairs and improvements of, and plans and sites for roads, bridges and other engineering works provided that the amounts within the votes to be expended on individually listed projects may be increased or decreased subject to the approval of treasury board, $6,400,000.

40b. Construction, acquisition, major repairs and improvements of, and plans and sites for, roads, bridges and other engineering works, $1.

Trans-Canada highway—

50. Construction through national parks, $515,000.

Testing laboratories—

55. Operation and maintenance, $1,146,000.

1967 World exhibition—

57. Towards federal share of the cost of construction of an ice control structure, $6,750,000.

B—National Capital Commission—

60. Operation and maintenance, general administration and interest charges on outstanding loans that were made for the purpose of acquiring property in the national capital region, $6,809,000.

65. Payment to the national capital fund, $12,100,000.

Loans, investments and advances—public works—

L70. Loans to the national capital commission in accordance with section 16 of the National Capital Act for the purpose of acquiring property in the national capital region, excluding property being acquired for the purpose of establishing what is commonly referred to as the "Greenbelt", $9,000,000.

HOUSE OF COMMONS

Wednesday, March 9, 1966

The house met at 2.30 p.m.

[*Translation*]

ELECTION ACT AMENDMENT

PROVISION TO VOTE ON SUNDAY

Mr. Fernand E. Leblanc (Laurier) moved the second reading of Bill No. C-137, to amend the Canada Elections Act (Elections on a Sunday).

Some hon. Members: Explain.

Mr. Leblanc (Laurier): Mr. Speaker, this bill has two distinct objects, one being of an economic nature and the other, of a political nature.

One of its objects is economic in that employers would no longer have to grant three hours' leave to their employees, since the vote would be held on a Sunday.

The other is political in character, because electors would find it easier to exercise their franchise, since Sunday is not a working day.

[*English*]

Motion agreed to and bill read the first time.

CIVIL SERVICE ACT AMENDMENT

PROVISION FOR HEARING UNDER INQUIRIES ACT

Mr. David Lewis (York South) moved the first reading of Bill No. C-138, to amend the Civil Service Act (to provide a full and impartial hearing for an employee dismissed under section 50 of the act.)

Some hon. Members: Explain.

Mr. Lewis: Mr. Speaker, this suggestion arises out of a very recent debate and would add a section to section 50 of the Civil Service Act so that any government employee dismissed under that section would be given a full and impartial hearing by a commissioner or commissioners appointed under part 1 of the Inquiries Act, if the employee or his agent requests it in writing.

Motion agreed to and bill read the first time.

[*Translation*]

OLD AGE SECURITY ACT AMENDMENT

PROVISION TO ALLOW DELAY FOLLOWING LATE FILING

Mr. J. R. Comtois (Joliette-L'Assomption-Montcalm) moved for leave to introduce Bill No. C-139, to amend the Old Age Security Act.

Some hon. Members: Explain.

Mr. Comtois: Mr. Speaker, this bill proposes to grant a 12-month extension to those people who, through ignorance, inadvertence or incapacity, did not file an application for these benefits at the time stipulated by law.

This 12-month extension would spare losses and great inconvenience to people who forget their age (an error of one year is frequent amongst the aged, and more particularly amongst women) or those who, because the law has been changed (the age of eligibility being progressively lowered from 70 to 65 years), might forget to file their application on time.

[*English*]

Motion agreed to and bill read the first time.

QUESTIONS

(Questions answered orally are indicated by an asterisk.)

CENTENNIAL COMMISSION EMPLOYEES FROM P.E.I.

Question No. 317—**Mr. MacDonald (Prince):**

What is the number of paid employees of the National Centennial Committee from Prince Edward Island and what are the names of these employees?

Hon. Judy V. LaMarsh (Secretary of State): The national centennial committee is an ad hoc committee made up of two federal ministers and two representatives generally a minister and a deputy minister of each province of Canada, under the chairmanship of the Secretary of State of Canada. It does not have any paid employees. A secretariat for the National Centennial Committee is provided by the Centennial Commission.

Questions

RELEASE OF K. H. KIRK FROM NAVY

Question No. 493—**Mr. McCleave:**

1. Has PiWS2 Kenneth H. Kirk been released from the Royal Canadian Navy?

2. If so, was Mr. Kirk given an opportunity to be heard concerning his release?

3. If Mr. Kirk was not given such an opportunity, will the Minister of National Defence direct that he be given a full hearing?

Hon. Paul Hellyer (Minister of National Defence): 1. Yes.

2. Yes.

3. Not applicable.

*ASSISTANCE FOR ONTARIO TOBACCO GROWERS

Question No. 520—**Mr. Madill:**

1. Has representation been made to the government by the tobacco growers of Central Ontario giving a survey of their losses incurred by frost damage on August 29, 1965?

2. Will extended credit be given to these tobacco farmers who have suffered losses and need credit for 1966?

3. Will crop insurance be available to these tobacco growers for 1966?

Mr. B. S. Beer (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Agriculture): 1. Representation on behalf of tobacco growers in central Ontario was received but no crop loss survey data supplied.

2. Where an individual farmer who ordinarily meets his commitments to the Farm Credit Corporation satisfactorily suffers a loss of income through circumstances beyond his control to the extent that he cannot make his payment without hardship, the corporation will consider a request to defer such payment.

Farm improvement loans are administered by the banks and there are provisions for re-arrangement of repayment terms where such action is warranted.

3. Since actual crop insurance programs are developed under provincial jurisdiction, any decision to make such insurance available for tobacco crops in 1966 will be made by the provincial government.

COST OF CONSTRUCTING CARGO SHIPS

Question No. 535—**Mr. Howard:**

1. Does the government have any (a) specific knowledge or (b) any means of estimating the cost, in Canadian dollars, of building cargo ships in other countries?

[Miss LaMarsh.]

2. If so, what is the cost in Canadian dollars by (a) specific knowledge or (b) an estimate of building (i) 10,000 ton cargo ships, and (ii) 20,000 ton cargo ships in each of the countries of Canada, Japan, United Kingdom and Sweden?

Hon. C. M. Drury (Minister of Industry): 1. (a) The government does have specific knowledge of the cost of building cargo ships in other countries secured through the co-operation of other governments.

2. (a) The information available to the Department of Industry has been secured from confidential foreign government sources. Under the circumstances it would not be in the public interest to publicize such information. (b) However in general terms we can state that of the four countries mentioned Canadian costs appear highest. United Kingdom and Swedish costs correspond approximately to one another. Japanese costs appear the lowest.

EXPENDITURES ON NAVIGATION AIDS, LAKE WINNIPEG

Question No. 573—**Mr. Stefanson:**

1. How much money was spent for the aids to navigation program for lake Winnipeg and adjoining rivers and lakes for the fiscal year 1965-66, listing projects and locations?

2. How much money is allocated for this program for the fiscal year 1966-67, listing proposed projects and locations?

Mr. J. A. Byrne (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Transport): 1. During the fiscal year 1965-66 $28,264 was spent for the aids to navigation program for Lake Winnipeg and adjoining lakes and rivers as per the list hereunder:

(1) Red River Range—W & T FA-240 range lanterns were installed in the upper and lower lights replacing the old galvanized iron case type lantern. Repairs to the lower light tower were also carried out; these included repairs to the balcony, a new landing platform and sway bracing on the pile foundation.

(2) Winnipeg Beach Range—W & T FA-240 range lanterns were installed on new galvanized steel towers, replacing wooden poles and galvanized iron boxes. Red and white fibreglass daymarks replaced small wooden ones and the rear tower was also moved back to improve range.

(3) Red River Mouth Lighted Buoy—A two foot pipe extension was placed on the structure to improve visibility.

(4) Willow Point—A new light was established on Willow Point, southeast of the Gimli Harbour. The installation consists of a 250 m.m. W & T lantern on a galvanized steel tower with a green and yellow fibreglass daymark.

(5) Gimli Harbour Range—New red and white fibreglass daymarks were installed to replace wooden ones.

(6) Hecla Island Range—A timber crib was constructed around the rear tower footings to protect them from the high water.

(7) Hecla Wharf Light—Light was converted from battery to hydro.

(8) Manigotagan River Ranges—Day beacons were repaired and painted. Scotchlits bands were nailed to daymarks and range lines were brushed out.

(9) Black Island Reef—Metal can buoy, top of spar painted blaze orange.

(10) Gull Harbour—Repaired footings of light tower.

(11) Matheson Island Wharf—Light was converted from battery to hydro.

(12) Black Bear Island—Repaired storm damaged wharf cribs.

(13) Bloodvein River Entrance—Placed spar to mark shoal area on main range.

(14) Cox's Reef—Built new boat slide and three rock-filled retaining cribs to replace those taken out by storm.

(15) George's Island Harbour Range—Installed battery operated FA-240 range lanterns to replace kerosene operated lamps. Built rock-filled crib around front light tower to protect it from high water.

(16) Poplar Point Reef—Painted daymarks and tower base.

(17) Big Black River—Painted day beacons.

(18) Warren's Landing Upper Range—Installed W & T FA-240 range lanterns to replace galvanized iron cases. Carried out repairs to walkway between upper and lower lights.

(19) Warren's Landing Lower Range—Converted from kerosene to battery electric. Installed W & T FA-240 range lanterns. Built new sea wall in front of lower light to protect it from high water.

(20) Selkirk Island Harbour—Installed new W & T 250 m.m. beacon at entrance to Selkirk Island harbour.

(21) Dauphin River Day Ranges—Painted and repaired day beacons and brushed out range lines.

Lake Winnipegosis

(1) Winnipegosis West Side Range—Installed hydro operated FA-240 range lanterns replacing old type galvanized iron case. Rear light was moved back 166 feet and installed on top of new 45 ft. hydro pole.

(2) Lunch Point—Installed new W & T 250 m.m. lantern on galvanized pipe tower.

(3) Dog Point—Brushed out range line.

(4) Three new lighted buoys were established on Lake Winnipegosis at Five Mile Reef, Dog Point turn and Weasel Island.

Cedar Lake

(1) Easterville—Hydro operated lighted range was established at Easterville Harbour consisting of two FA-240 range lanterns on steel pipe masts.

(2) Saskatchewan River—Cedar Lake—Four new spars were established to mark the entrance to the Saskatchewan River. Two spars were established marking shoals on Cedar Lake.

2. $33,000 has been allocated for this program in 1966-67 as listed below:—

(1) Bloodvein River—Improvements to three sets of ranges and lights on one.

(2) Winnipeg River Range—Converting three sets ranges to automatic electric.

(3) Winnipeg River—Place lighted buoy at turn into river.

(4) Poplar River—Day beacon at mouth.

(5) Selkirk Island North End—Establish land light.

(6) Red River Buoys—Position markers.

(7) Icelandic River Range—Steel towers and new lanterns.

(8) Hecla Island Range—New lanterns.

(9) Loon Straits Range—New lanterns.

(10) Barrel Rock, Pelican Island, Ironwood Point, Clements Point—New lanterns.

(11) Nelson River and Playgreen Lake—75 new steel buoys.

Questions

U.S. SECURITIES COMMISSION REGULATIONS

Question No. 583—**Mr. Dinsdale:**

1. Does the government know if the securities and exchange commission of the United States recently changed its regulations to require Canadian corporations engaged in interstate commerce and which have total assets of $1,000,000 or more than 300 shareholders resident in the U.S.A., to register with the commission and become subject to its regulations unless the corporations' shares are fully listed on the U.S. stock exchange?

2. Does Canada have similar requirements for American firms doing business in Canada and, if so, what are they?

3. Has the government of Canada taken any action to protect Canadian firms doing business in the U.S.A. against these new discriminatory regulations?

Hon. Paul Martin (Secretary of State for External Affairs): 1. Yes.

2. No.

3. Yes. As the house was informed on January 27, formal representations have been made to the United States government and consultations have commenced between officials of the two countries. My colleagues and I will also be taking up this matter with representatives of the United States cabinet when we see them at the Canada-United States ministerial committee meeting on March 4 and 5.

TELEVISION SERVICE

Question No. 586—**Mr. Korchinski:**

1. What percentage of the area in each of the provinces is not being serviced by any television?

2. What is the estimate of the number of people in each of the provinces not receiving television?

3. What percentage of the people in each of the provinces are within reach of (a) only one television station (b) two television stations (c) three television stations (d) four television stations (e) five television stations (f) six or more television stations?

4. What percentage of the people in each of the provinces are within reach of American television stations?

5. What is the estimate of the cost which would be necessary to provide television service to all the people in each of the provinces?

Hon. Judy V. LaMarsh (Secretary of State): The Canadian Broadcasting Corporation has provided the following information:

1. The C.B.C. does not have data on the percentage of area in each province not serviced by television.

2. Estimated Population (June 1, 1961) Outside A & B Service Area*: Newfoundland, 83,600; Prince Edward Island, 10,300; Nova Scotia, 8,600; New Brunswick, 11,100; Quebec, 82,300; Ontario, 85,000; Manitoba, 71,300; Saskatchewan, 169,300; Alberta, 88,100; British Columbia, 111,800.

NOTE: Statistics based on all Canadian television stations, relays and rebroadcasting stations in operation or recommended for approval by B.B.G., as of November 18, 1965.

*Satisfactory fringe reception is available in many of the areas outside the A & B Service Area.

3. Estimated Percentage of Population (June 1, 1961) Within A & B Service Area of:

	One Station	Two Stations	Three Stations	Four or more Stations
Newfoundland	32%	41%	—	—
Prince Edward Island	59%	31%	—	—
Nova Scotia	34%	52%	8%	2%
New Brunswick	47%	40%	11%	—
Quebec	13%	14%	14%	57%
Ontario	17%	15%	19%	47%
Manitoba	21%	3%	67%	—
Saskatchewan	53%	28%	—	—
Alberta	25%	61%	2%	—
British Columbia	21%	1%	68%	—

NOTE: Statistics based on all Canadian television stations, relay and rebroadcasting stations in operation or recommended for approval by B.B.G. before April 1, 1964.

4. While the C.B.C. does not have data on percentage of population in each province within reach of U.S. television stations, the estimated percentage of households (January 1, 1965) covered by U.S. t.v. stations is: Newfoundland, —; Prince Edward Island, —; Nova Scotia, —; New Brunswick, 12%; Quebec, 50%; Ontario, 77%; Manitoba, 63%; Saskatchewan, 4%; Alberta, —; British Columbia, 84%.

NOTE: A county (or census division) is considered as having U.S. station's coverage if the number of homes viewing a U.S. station, at least once a week, equals 35 per cent or more of all homes where English is spoken.

5. An overall cost estimate of facilities required to provide television service to all Canadians wherever located has not been undertaken because such complete coverage

is considered unrealistic at this time from a technical and economic standpoint.

To provide television service to about 50 areas with a population of 2,000 or more which are outside present national service coverage limits would involve an estimated capital cost of between 15 and 16 million dollars, the estimated annual operating cost of which would be between three and four million dollars.

TENDERS FOR PEAS FOR INDIAN AID PROGRAM

Question No. 594—**Mr. Enns:**

1. On what date were tenders called for peas in the Indian aid program?

2. Have McAllister Pea and Seed Cleaners Limited of Portage la Prairie, Manitoba, commenced loading peas on to box cars and, if so, on what date?

3. What is the amount of the tender awarded to McAllister Pea and Seed Cleaners Limited of Portage la Prairie and Ottawa Valley Grain Company of Renfrew?

4. What other tenders were received and what are the amounts offered in these tenders?

Hon. Paul Martin (Secretary of State External Affairs): 1. The Canadian Commercial Corporation called tenders on January 12, 1966.

2. McAllister Pea and Seed Cleaners Limited commenced loading peas onto box cars on January 25 for the Ottawa Valley Grain Company, who had successfully tendered.

3. McAllister Pea and Seed Cleaners Limited of Portage la Prairie, Manitoba, did not tender. Ottawa Valley Grain Company of Renfrew submitted a tender, which was accepted for 2,000 tons of peas, at a price of $268,487.50.

4. Two other tenders were received,—(a) Northern Sales (1963) Limited. The amount offered was 850 tons, (b) B.C. Pea Growers Association. The amount offered was 1,500 tons.

*FARMERS FINED FOR EXCEEDING QUOTAS

Question No. 612—**Mr. Rapp:**

1. How many farmers were fined for exceeding wheat board quotas in Alberta, Saskatchewan and Manitoba during the present 1965-66 crop year?

2. How does this compare with the 1964-65 crop year?

3. What were the highest and lowest fines?

Mr. B. S. Beer (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Agriculture): The answer to this question is in three parts as follows:

Questions

1. To February 28, 1966 the board had received reports of 50 convictions for exceeding wheat board quotas in Alberta, Saskatchewan and Manitoba.

2. During the entire 1964-65 crop year, from August 1, 1964 to July 31, 1965, 143 producers were convicted for exceeding wheat board quotas in the three provinces named.

3. The highest and lowest fines reported to the board to February 28, 1966 in the current crop year are $100 and $5 respectively.

The highest and lowest fines reported to the board during the entire 1964-65 crop year were $100 and $3 respectively.

GRANT TO PEACE RESEARCH INSTITUTE

Question No. 621—**Mr. Thompson:**

Has the Secretary of State for External Affairs been asked to grant $35,000 to the Canadian Peace Research Institute, and (a) if so, has the grant been approved (b) if not, has any grant been approved?

Hon. Paul Martin (Secretary of State for External Affairs): On October 8, 1965, the government received a request from the Canadian Peace Research Institute for a grant of $35,024. The reasons why the grant was not approved were outlined in my reply of January 24 to Mr. Alan Newcombe which was read to the house on March 2 in answer to Question No. 72.

BRIDGE CONSTRUCTION, PORTAGE DU FORT, QUEBEC

Question No. 631—**Mr. Lefebvre:**

Is a new bridge to be built at Portage du Fort, county of Pontiac, Quebec and, if so, what will be the approximate federal share of the cost of this bridge?

[*Translation*]

Hon. G. J. McIlraith (Minister of Public Works): Yes; the federal government's share will be 50 per cent.

[*English*]

STUDY OF PEMBINA RIVER WATER RESOURCES

Question No. 649—**Mr. Schreyer:**

1. Has the International Joint Commission completed its studies of the proposed development of water resources on the Pembina river?

2. Has the commission made detailed recommendations as to the methods of financing and cost-sharing of this proposed development of water resources?

3. Is the commission in possession of information as to whether or not construction of any works on the Pembina river is scheduled and, if so, the proposed date?

Hon. Paul Martin (Secretary of State for External Affairs): 1. No.

2. No.

3. I am advised by the International Joint Commission that no works are presently scheduled for construction on the Pembina river.

NATIONAL FLAG DAY

Question No. 677—**Mr. Saltsman:**

Will the Prime Minister consider declaring February 15 national flag day and a national holiday?

Mr. John R. Matheson (Parliamentary Secretary to Prime Minister): The government is giving consideration to this important matter.

AGRICULTURAL PRICES

Question No. 701—**Mr. Korchinski:**

1. Using the base period of 1949, what is the index of the average price received in each year to date for (a) wheat (b) cattle (c) hogs?

2. In each year since 1949, what was the total value of (a) wheat sold (b) cattle sold (c) hogs sold?

Hon. Robert Winters (Minister of Trade and Commerce): 1. The following table sets forth the required indexes. They are based on average prices at the farm which take into account all grades marketed. In the case of wheat, participation payments are included in the year to which they apply, i.e.—payments made in 1966 on the 1964 crop are included with the price for 1964. The index for 1965 cannot yet be calculated because final payments have not been made on deliveries in the 1965-66 crop year.

Index of Farm Prices, Wheat, Cattle, Hogs
1949=100

	Wheat	Cattle	Hogs
1949	100.0	100.0	100.0
1950	95.7	123.4	95.7
1951	96.9	161.4	108.6
1952	96.3	122.2	84.0
1953	90.7	96.8	97.1
1954	80.1	89.0	99.8
1955	78.9	92.2	81.1
1956	82.6	91.2	82.9
1957	77.0	90.0	98.3
1958	80.1	108.8	90.8
1959	82.6	118.6	76.7
1960	86.3	109.6	76.6
1961	100.6	110.3	88.1
1962	105.6	124.2	91.1
1963	104.3	118.3	87.9
1964	104.3	110.8	84.6
1965		115.1	101.9

2. The following table sets forth Dominion Bureau of Statistics estimates of farm cash receipts for these three products. In the case of wheat, two sets of data are supplied. The first column sets forth the cash received at the time of delivery. The second column provides information concerning Canadian Wheat Board payments; these payments are included in the year in which they are paid by the board, e.g. payments in 1965 on 1963 are included in the 1965 receipts.

Total Value of Sales of Wheat, Cattle and Hogs, Canada, 1949-1965

	Wheat Payments on Delivery	Canadian Wheat Board Interim & Final Payments	Total Wheat	Cattle	Hogs
		thousands of dollars			
1949	470,469	211,337	681,806	361,524	291,904
1950	378,533	7,525	386,058	423,394	286,869
1951	423,050	271,350	694,400	478,783	339,647
1952	587,500	165,708	753,208	350,778	337,823
1953	655,475	125,353	780,828	341,421	298,972
1954	323,854	97,393	421,247	334,806	321,641
1955	331,834	25,717	357,551	377,954	289,563
1956	461,795	61,987	523,782	390,982	298,246
1957	379,415	79,314	458,729	413,616	292,142
1958	437,053	64,258	501,311	509,850	325,094
1959	435,260	72,662	507,922	475,090	345,034
1960	444,652	70,640	515,292	484,954	277,590
1961	487,320	122,330	609,650	534,138	317,745
1962	526,527	152,523	679,050	573,669	330,301
1963	598,102	123,968	722,070	550,342	318,174
1964	741,004	199,744	940,748	559,577	325,526
1965	660,057	271,974	932,031	671,183	380,035

INTRODUCTION OF METRIC SYSTEM

Question No. 728—**Mr. Bell (Carleton):**

1. What consideration has been given by the government to the introduction in Canada of the metric system?

2. Has any report been made to the government relating to the advantages and/or disadvantages of the introduction of the metric system including the cost thereof and, if so, when and by whom?

3. Have any discussions or negotiations been undertaken with any international organization or other country on this subject and, if so, what is the nature and result of such discussions or negotiations?

Hon. Robert Winters (Minister of Trade and Commerce): 1. The metric system is already a legal system of measurement in Canada.

2. While various representations have been received no comprehensive report has been made to the government relating to advantages, disadvantages, and costs involved.

3. No formal discussions or negotiations have been undertaken.

OLD AGE ASSISTANCE

Question No. 738—**Mr. Godin:**

1. What was the total amount disbursed by the government, as old age assistance, during the years 1964 and 1965 (a) for Canada (b) for the province of Quebec (c) for the county of Portneuf?

2. For the same areas and during the same years, how many persons received the above assistance?

3. For the same areas and during the same years, how many applications were received by the government for such assistance and (a) how many of these applications were accepted and (b) how many were rejected?

[*Translation*]

Hon. A. J. MacEachen (Minister of National Health and Welfare):

1. Fiscal years	Canada	Quebec	County of Portneuf
1963-64	$39,208,181	$13,860,075	Not avail.
1964-65	$44,990,955	$16,589,045	Not avail.
2. 1963-64	105,241	38,206	Not avail.
1964-65	107,354	39,239	Not avail.
3. 1963-64	34,668	12,040	Not avail.
1964-65	35,054	12,266	Not avail.
(a) Approved			
1963-64	30,466	10,814	Not avail.
1964-65	31,004	11,193	Not avail.
(b) Rejected			
1963-64	4,202	1,226	Not avail.
1964-65	4,050	1,073	Not avail.

Questions

OLD AGE SECURITY PENSIONS

Question No. 739—**Mr. Godin:** (Supplementary)

1. What was the total amount disbursed by the government, as old age security pensions, during the years 1964 and 1965 (a) for Canada (b) for the province of Quebec and (c) for the county of Portneuf?

2. For the same areas and during the same years, how many persons received the old age security pensions?

3. For the same areas and during the same years, how many applications were received by the government for such pensions and (a) how many of these applications were accepted and (b) how many were rejected?

[*Translation*]

Hon. A. J. MacEachen (Minister of National Health and Welfare): 2. As at December 31, 1965: (a) 1,011,578; (b) 219,476; (c) No statistics available.

1.	Fiscal years	Canada	Quebec	County of Portneuf
	1963-64	$4,987,897	$1,642,869	Not available
	1964-65	$5,624,702	$1,892,813	Not available
2.	1963-64	8,581	2,855	Not available
	1964-65	8,586	2,843	Not available
3.	1963-64	1,133	339	Not available
	1964-65	1,217	401	Not available
	(a) Approved			
	1963-64	675	198	Not available
	1964-65	728	220	Not available
	(b) Rejected		141	Not available
	1963-64	458	181	Not available
	1964-65	489		

[*English*]

PENSIONS FOR THE BLIND

Question No. 741—**Mr. Godin:**

1. What was the total amount disbursed by the government as pensions for the blind during the years 1964 and 1965 (a) for Canada (b) for the province of Quebec and (c) for the county of Portneuf?

2. For the same areas and during the same years, how many persons received those allowances?

3. For the same areas and during the same years, how many applications for such allowances were received by the government and (a) how many of these applications were accepted and (b) how many were rejected?

[*Translation*]

Hon. A. J. MacEachen (Minister of National Health and Welfare):

[*English*]

CANADIAN EMBASSY IN ROME

Question No. 783—**Mr. MacLean (Queens):**

1. Does Canada own a residence for its ambassador in Rome?

2. If not, does Canada own property in Rome on which it is planned to build an embassy residence?

3. If a residence has not yet been built, when is it intended that such construction will commence?

Hon. Paul Martin (Secretary of State for External Affairs): 1. No.

2. Canada owns a building site in Rome, known as the Porta Latina property, which was purchased in March, 1950.

3. Plans for construction are under study.

[Mr. MacEachen.]

PRINTING BUREAU—CHIEF OF STAFF TRAINING

Question No. 790—**Mr. Irvine:**

1. Who is the chief of staff training and development in the Canadian government printing bureau?

2. How many are on the staff of the staff training and development section of the Canadian government printing bureau?

3. To whom is the chief of staff training and development responsible in the execution of his duties?

4. Does the Canadian government printing bureau offset division provide special after-hours courses for its staff in plate-making, stripping and lay-out, camera work, etc. and, if so, (a) to whom are the courses available (i) within the Canadian government printing bureau (ii) outside the Canadian government printing bureau (b) is there a fee or charge for any such course and, if so, what is the amount?

5. What is the duration of the course?

6. To date (a) how many people have taken this course (b) how many have qualified (c) how many have been advanced as a result of this training?

Hon. C. M. Drury (Minister of Industry): 1. Mr. A. M. Khan.

2. Seven.

3. The general manager through the acting personnel manager.

4. After hour training courses are provided by the Ottawa and Hull Training Institute for Lithography (founded in February, 1965), which is administered by an advisory board. This board consists of representatives from industry, labour and government; the board members are: Mr. C. B. Watt, General Manager, Canadian Government Printing Bureau; Mr. R. P. White, Executive Vice-President, British American Bank Note Company Ltd.; and Mr. R. J. Clarke, Vice-President, International Lithographers and Photoengravers Union. There is also a joint administration committee consisting of four representatives from industry; four representatives from labour; and four representatives from government (four officers of the Canadian Government Printing Bureau).

The Canadian Government Printing Bureau co-operates and encourages this after hour training endeavour by making available to the Institute a training room, audio visual equipment and press time in the evenings. All supplies utilized by the students during the courses are donated free of charge by graphic arts suppliers. OHTIL provides competent instructors paid from the fee revenue and, more recently, one of the largest manufacturers of offset equipment has supplied free of charge an offset press, for their use. This is the first undertaking of this kind in Canada where industry, labour and government have joined hands to upgrade the skills of lithographic craftsmen to meet the challenge of modern technology.

The aim of the Institute is to increase the quality of craftsmen for the lithographic trade and to upgrade their skills in order to better prepare the journeymen to carry out their responsibilities to the printing industry.

(a) (i) and (ii)—Courses are available to both union and non union journeymen and apprentice lithographic craftsmen employed by lithographic establishments in the Ottawa-Hull area, including the Canadian Government Printing Bureau. (b) Yes. $45 per semester for members of the Lithographers and Photoengravers International Union. $60 per semester for non members. The reason for the differential being that the members of the Lithographers and Photoengravers International Union are paying, through Union dues, a portion of the cost of the running of OHTIL program.

5. Courses started in February 1965 and are not yet completed. There are separate courses as follows: Camera: four semesters, 17 weeks per semester, one night per week, three hours per night. Press: three semesters, 17 weeks per semester, one night per week, three hours per night. Stripping and Layout: two semesters, 17 weeks per semester, one night per week, three hours per night.

6. (a) Camera course, 13; Press course, 15; Stripping and layout course; 8.

A total of 36 people, 16 of whom are Canadian Government Printing Bureau employees. (b) Courses are still in progress. (c) In so far as C.G.P.B. is concerned, none. No information available as to non-government employees.

CENTENNIAL COMMISSION ADVERTISING

Question No. 798—**Mr. Fairweather:**

1. Did the Centennial Commission recently arrange for about $5,000,000.00 of centennial advertising?

2. To which firms was this advertising allocated and what was the total of each allocation?

3. Were other advertising firms invited to submit proposals and, if so, which ones?

4. Can any competent advertising agency in Canada expect an invitation to bid for Centennial Commission accounts?

Hon. Judy V. LaMarsh (Secretary of State): 1. No. An estimate has been made of possible expenditures till the end of 1967 by the Centennial Commission and the Canadian Government Travel Bureau in the field of publicity, advertising and promotion for the centennial celebrations, including informational material, pamphlets, brochures, posters, press releases, film clips, radio tapes, and this estimate is $5,000,000. Of this amount approximately 50 per cent is expected to be spent on advertising.

2. (a) The Centennial Commission is entering into an agreement with three advertising agencies: Vickers and Benson, Ltd., Toronto; MacLaren Advertising Co., Ltd., Toronto; L'Agence Canadienne de publicité Ltée, Montreal; (b) The total of each allocation has not been determined as the agreements are still being negotiated.

Questions

3. (a) Yes; (b) Goodwin—Ellis Advertising Ltd., Vancouver; Ronalds—Reynolds & Co., Montreal and Toronto; La Maison Publicitex Ltée, Montreal; Bouchard, Champagne et Pelletier Ltée, Montreal; Cockfield Brown & Co., Ltd., Toronto and Montreal.

4. No. According to a well established practice, presentations were invited on a selective basis and three agencies were chosen with which to pursue negotiations. No further requirement exists at the present time.

BRETON COVE, N.S.—REPAIRS TO ROADWAY

Question No. 802—**Mr. Muir (Cape Breton North and Victoria):**

When will repairs be carried out to the roadway and haulout at Breton Cove, Victoria county, N.S.?

Hon. G. J. McIlraith (Minister of Public Works): After the funds for 1966-67 become available.

VAL D'OR NUCLEAR BASE EXPENSES

Question No. 808—**Mr. Caouette:**

1. Are the expenses of the nuclear base at Val d'Or entirely paid by the federal government, or is there some kind of joint plan whereby the United States share these expenses?

2. If the United States does share these expenses, what is the amount?

3. What is the Canadian government's share of these expenses?

[*Translation*]

Hon. Paul Hellyer (Minister of National Defence): 1. Canada provides 368 military and civilian personnel and pays the operating and maintenance costs of station Val d'Or. The United States provides some technical equipment and 40 military personnel.

2. The actual cost of the technical equipment and the rates of pay and allowances paid to the U.S. personnel at Val d'Or is not known.

3. The annual operating and maintenance costs are estimated to be $2,215,000.

[*English*]

CAMP PETAWAWA WATER MAIN CONTRACT

Question No. 809—**Mr. Thompson:**

1. What are the details of the services and material supplied in contract No. 6928 for a water main at Camp Petawawa?

2. What was the cost of each item?

[Miss LaMarsh.]

Hon. Léo Cadieux (Associate Minister of National Defence): 1. Defence Construction (1951) Limited advise that tenders closed on this project on February 23, 1966. A contract has not yet been awarded. The lowest tender was submitted by Gap Construction Company Ltd., North Bay, Ontario, for a total price of $136,119.20 based on estimated quantities.

2. This contractor's tender was composed as follows: Supply and installation of water mains (various sizes) in place including fittings, excavation, bedding and backfill, $119,387.20; Supply and installation of valves, $10,440.00; Supply and installation of line marker posts, timber shoring and concrete bridging $1,200.00; Supply and installation of hydrants in place, $2,592.00; Supply and installation of blow-off at river crossing, $1,000.00; Prime cost allowance re. alterations and repairs to existing engineers' office, $1,500.00.

CANADIAN VOLUNTEERS FOR VIET NAM

Question No. 813—**Mr. Dinsdale:**

1. Has a proposal reached the government of Canada urging approval of Canadian volunteers for Viet Nam?

2. If so, what action has been taken?

Hon. Paul Martin (Secretary of State for External Affairs): 1. Two private citizens, a Mr. Mitchell and a Mr. Echlin, both of Toronto, wrote to the Prime Minister and myself respectively enquiring as to the attitude of the Government of Canada regarding their proposal to recruit in Canada a Canadian Volunteer Battalion for service with the United States forces in Viet Nam.

2. The Department of External Affairs sought the opinion of the Department of Justice which advised that a proposal to enlist, in Canada, men for service with the United States forces in Viet Nam would, if implemented, appear to be incompatible with the laws of Canada applicable in this instance, in particular the Foreign Enlistment Act. Mr. Echlin and Mr. Mitchell have both been informed accordingly.

E.M.O.—STORAGE OF "INSTANT HOSPITALS"

Question No. 817—**Mr. Howe (Hamilton South):**

In what locations in Canada have emergency measures organization "instant hospitals" been stored, and in each case, what is the bed capacity of each hospital?

Hon. A. J. MacEachen (Minister of National Health and Welfare): Camp Chilliwack, British Columbia; Calgary, Alberta; Camp Shilo, Manitoba; Guelph, Ontario; Camp Borden, Ontario; Camp Petawawa, Ontario; Brockville, Ontario; Camp Valcartier, Quebec; Camp Debert, Nova Scotia; Ottawa, Ontario. Each hospital has a capacity of 200 beds.

INGONISH, N.S.—POST OFFICE BUILDING

Question No. 826—**Mr. Muir (Cape Breton North and Victoria):**

Is it the intention of the government to construct a new post office building at Ingonish, Nova Scotia and, if so, when will tenders be called?

Hon. G. J. McIlraith (Minister of Public Works): No.

GOGAMA, ONT.—PURCHASE OF LOTS BY POST OFFICE

Question No. 831—**Mr. Fawcett:**

1. Did the Post Office Department purchase lots 33 and 34, Poupore street, Gogama, Ontario in 1961 or 1962, for the purpose of building a post office?

2. If so, what was the purchase price and does the department still hold the deeds for the property?

3. If these lots were sold by the department, to whom were they sold and for what price?

Hon. G. J. McIlraith (Minister of Public Works): 1. The Department of Public Works purchased lots 33 and 34, Poupore street in May 1962 as the site of a future post office.

2. The purchase price was $2,000. and the Department of Public Works still hold the deeds for the property.

3. Not applicable.

RECEIPTS FROM PARI-MUTUEL BETTING

Question No. 842—**Mr. Coates:**

1. What was the total amount of receipts by the federal government for pari-mutuel betting in Canada during 1965?

2. What was the breakdown as between the receipts from thoroughbred racing and harness racing?

3. What was the breakdown by provinces?

4. Does the government intend to initiate any new practices for the protection of the betting public and more especially with regard to the testing of animals involved in races as to the possible use of drugs and, if so, of what would these new practices consist?

Hon. J. J. Greene (Minister of Agriculture): 1. The total amount of receipts by the federal government for pari-mutuel betting in Canada for the period January 1, 1965 to December 31, 1965, was $1,385,837.48.

2. Thoroughbred racing, $849,599.51; Harness racing, $536,237.97.

3.	Thoroughbred racing	Harness racing
British Columbia	$114,664.42	$ 4,793.51
Alberta	92,404.33	21,597.23
Saskatchewan ...	12,200.69	3,082.63
Manitoba	42,047.23	239.83
Ontario	509,348.22	389,130.48
Quebec	78,934.62	75,331.77
New Brunswick .		12,229.63
Nova Scotia		23,925.48
Prince Edward Island		5,443.18
Newfoundland ..		464.23

4. The procedures for the testing of animals involved in racing are continually reviewed, and desirable new practices and procedures are instituted as they become available.

EXTENSION OF EMERGENCY GOLD MINING ASSISTANCE ACT

Question No. 853—**Mr. Orange:**

1. Is any action being taken to extend the Emergency Gold Mining Assistance Act beyond its proposed expiry date in 1967 and, if not, when will a decision be made on whether or not to extend the Act?

2. If the act is to be extended, is it intended to remove the provisions excluding assistance to gold mines coming into operation in areas outside established gold mine communities as defined by the Act?

Hon. Jean-Luc Pepin (Minister of Mines and Technical Surveys): 1. The Emergency Gold Mining Assistance Act was extended in December 1963 for a period of four years to the end of 1967. The amendment to the act did not change the formula used in computing the amount of assistance payable to the gold mines. However, the amending legislation did introduce a restriction which affects a new gold mine coming into production after June 30, 1965. After that date a new gold mine is eligible for assistance only if it provides direct support to an existing gold mining community.

Although no direct action is presently being taken to extend the act, we are well aware of the needs of the gold mining industry and the situation is constantly under serious study.

A definite decision for the extension of the benefits of E.G.M.A. beyond the expiry date of December 31, 1967 will not be required during the present year.

2. The restriction of assistance to gold mines giving direct support to already existing gold mining communities was intended to prevent the establishment of new communities, supported by gold mining operations, which would be dependent on government assistance from the outset. Consequently, it is not intended to remove this restriction.

DEPARTMENT OF NATIONAL REVENUE—EXTRA SUMMER STAFF

Question No. 854—**Mr. Caron:**

1. How many extra employees were hired for summer positions by the Department of National Revenue (a) in Ottawa (b) in the taxation division (c) in the customs and excise division, during the summer of 1965?

2. Who recommended these employees?

3. Do they have relatives—father, mother, brothers, sisters, uncles and aunts—who work for the department?

Hon. E. J. Benson (Minister of National Revenue): 1. (a) In Ottawa, Customs and Excise, none; Taxation, none; (b) Taxation Division did not hire any employees for summer positions in Ottawa or outside Ottawa; (c) Customs and Excise Division employed 248 during the summer of 1965 outside Ottawa.

2. Appointments were made from Civil Service Commission eligible lists.

3. Information not available.

ROYAL CANADIAN MINT—EXTRA SUMMER STAFF

Question No. 856—**Mr. Caron:**

1. How many extra employees were hired for summer positions by the Royal Canadian Mint (a) at the head office (b) in the other Ottawa offices, during the summer of 1965?

2. Who recommended these employees?

3. Do they have relatives—father, mother, brothers, sisters, uncles and aunts—who work for the Royal Canadian Mint?

Hon. Mitchell Sharp (Minister of Finance): 1. The Royal Canadian Mint hires extra casual employees at anytime of the year when the work load so requires, but does not hire extra employees for summer positions as such.

2. Not applicable.

3. Not applicable.

[Mr. Pepin.]

DEPARTMENT OF FINANCE—EXTRA SUMMER STAFF

Question No. 857—**Mr. Caron:**

1. How many extra employees were hired for summer positions by the Department of Finance (a) at the head office (b) in other Ottawa offices, during the summer of 1965?

2. Who recommended these employees?

3. Do they have relatives—father, mother, brothers, sisters, uncles and aunts—who work for the department?

Hon. Mitchell Sharp (Minister of Finance): 1. (a) Nine at the head office of the Department of Finance and one at the head office of the Comptroller of the Treasury. (b) None.

2. The Civil Service Commission.

3. Not to the knowledge of the department.

DEPARTMENT OF TRADE AND COMMERCE—EXTRA SUMMER STAFF

Question No. 863—**Mr. Caron:**

1. How many extra employees were hired for summer positions by the Department of Trade and Commerce (a) at the head office (b) in the other Ottawa offices, during the summer of 1965?

2. Who recommended these employees?

3. Do they have relatives—father, mother, brothers, sisters, uncles and aunts—who work for the department?

[*Translation*]

Hon. Robert Winters (Minister of Trade and Commerce): 1. (a) 5; (b) Nil.

2. Civil Service Commission.

3. No.

DEPARTMENT OF NATIONAL HEALTH AND WELFARE—EXTRA SUMMER STAFF

Question No. 864—**Mr. Caron:**

1. How many extra employees were hired for summer positions by the Department of National Health and Welfare (a) at the head office (b) in the other Ottawa offices, during the summer of 1965?

2. Who recommended these employees?

3. Do they have relatives—father, mother, brothers, sisters, uncles and aunts—who work for the department?

[*Translation*]

Hon. A. J. MacEachen (Minister of National Health and Welfare): 1. (a) 16; (b) 45.

2. Hired through the Civil Service Commission and the National Employment Office.

3. No records are maintained to show where the relatives of an employee are employed.

[*English*]

STUDENT LOANS BY SASKATCHEWAN CREDIT UNIONS

Question No. 868—**Mr. Southam:**

1. How many Saskatchewan credit unions have requested the privilege of making loans under the student loan plan?

2. How many Saskatchewan credit unions qualified to make these student loans?

3. What are the names of those credit unions in Saskatchewan that were denied the privilege of making these student loans?

Hon. Mitchell Sharp (Minister of Finance): 1. Eighty one, including two credit unions whose requests for designation are currently under consideration.

2. Forty two.

3. Aberdeen District Credit Union Ltd.; Abernathy Credit Union Ltd.; Asquith Credit Union Ltd.; Bethune Credit Union Ltd.; Broadview Credit Union Ltd.; Bruno Savings & Credit Union Ltd.; Choiceland Savings & Credit Union Ltd.; Churchbridge Saving & Credit Union Ltd.; Denzil & District Savings & Credit Union Ltd.; Dinsmore Credit Union Ltd.; Dodsland & District Credit Union Ltd.; Dorintosh Savings & Credit Union Ltd.; Eastend Savings & Credit Union Ltd.; Gainsborough Credit Union Ltd.; Langham Credit Union Ltd.; Lashburn Savings & Credit Union Ltd.; Lestock Savings & Credit Union Ltd.; Macklin & District Savings & Credit Union Ltd.; MacNutt & District Credit Union Ltd.; Maple Creek Savings & Credit Union Ltd.; Marcelin Savings & Credit Union Ltd.; Meadow Lake Savings & Credit Union Ltd.; Milestone Savings & Credit Union Ltd.; Naicam District Credit Union Ltd.; Ogema District Credit Union Ltd.; Paddockwood Community Savings & Credit Union Ltd.; Pelly Savings & Credit Union Ltd.; St. Louis Credit Union Ltd.; Simpson Savings & Credit Union Ltd.; Spalding Savings & Credit Union Ltd.; Springside Credit Union Ltd.; Wadena Credit Union Ltd.; Weldon Savings & Credit Union Ltd.; Young Savings & Credit Union Ltd.

HIGHWAY ACCIDENT STATISTICS

Question No. 870—**Mr. Gundlock:**

What are the statistics concerning highway and street accidents resulting in bodily harm and fatalities that show make and model of the automobiles involved?

Hon. Robert Winters (Minister of Trade and Commerce): No information is available on the make of automobile involved in motor vehicle accidents. In 1964, the total number of passenger cars involved in accidents in Canada was 370,236. Of this number, 2,953 were fatal accidents and 97,130 involved non-fatal injuries. Information is not complete on the number of vehicles involved in accidents by year of model, as data are not available for the provinces of New Brunswick, Quebec, Ontario, Manitoba and British Columbia. However, information by year of model is available for the provinces listed below.

Number of Cars Involved in Accidents, 1964—By Model Year

Model Year	Newfoundland	Prince Edward Island	Nova Scotia	Saskatchewan	Alberta	Yukon and Northwest Territories
1965	32	13	85	179	190	4
1964	1,100	264	2,315	3,125	5,480	67
1963	1,319	280	2,565	2,875	5,431	66
1962	1,151	220	2,149	2,061	4,631	54
1961	932	199	1,892	1,853	3,548	40
1960	900	211	1,776	1,969	3,760	34
1959	660	148	1,669	2,158	4,202	49
1958	400	138	1,182	1,630	3,001	28
1957	479	118	1,074	1,980	3,757	26
1956	395	126	—	1,566	3,156	35
1952-55	451	234	2,836	3,811	6,004	53
1947-51	22	42	—	1,174	1,354	9
1942-46	1	1	6	16	30	—
Pre 1942	1	—	6	38	40	—
Not Stated	2	14	270	127	836	4
Totals	7,845	2,008	17,825	24,562	45,420	469

Questions

CRITERIA TO INDICATE POLITICAL AFFILIATIONS

Question No. 876—**Mr. Caouette:**

1. Under what criteria does the chief electoral officer indicate political affiliations in the list of candidates established for the armed forces?

2. Does the chief electoral officer forward instructions to the returning officers in order that all provisions of the electoral expenditures legislation be complied with and, if not, what is the reason?

Hon. Judy V. LaMarsh (Secretary of State): 1. The criteria under which the Chief Electoral Officer indicates political affiliations in the list of candidates established for the armed forces are from the best sources of information available to him, as prescribed by subparagraph (3) of paragraph 16 of The Canadian Forces Voting Rules in Schedule II to the Canada Elections Act.

2. Subsection (1) of section 60 of the Canada Elections Act provides for the governor in council establishing a tariff of fees, costs, allowances, and expenses to be paid and allowed to returning officers and other persons employed at or with respect to elections held under the said act. At such time as an election is called, special instructions are sent to all returning officers regarding any expenditures to be made by them pursuant to the said tariff of fees.

OPERATIONAL FAILURE OF CF-104 AIRCRAFT

Question No. 890—**Mr. Harkness:**

1. During the period that the CF-104 aircraft has been in operation in the R.C.A.F., how many of these aircraft have crashed?

2. How many of the aircraft which have crashed were of the operational configuration and how many of the training type?

3. How many of these aircraft have been salvaged, repaired and put back into operation?

4. Has there been any reduction in the number of these aircraft in the operational squadrons and, if so, what has been the amount of this reduction?

Hon. Paul Hellyer (Minister of National Defence): 1. 33.

2. Aircraft at the training school are interchangeable with squadron aircraft, therefore all but one of the above were of the operational configuration.

3. None, although some components were salvaged.

4. No.

[Mr. Winters.]

FINAL PAYMENTS ON VARIOUS GRADES OF WHEAT

Question No. 898—**Mr. Jorgenson:**

What was the amount of the final payment during the crop year 1964-65 for the following grades of wheat (a) No. 1 northern (b) No. 2 northern (c) No. 3 northern (d) No. 4 northern (e) No. 5 wheat (f) No. 6 wheat (g) feed wheat?

Hon. Mitchell Sharp (Minister of Finance): (a) 38.296 cents per bushel; (b) 38.711 cents per bushel; (c) 36.228 cents per bushel; (d) 36.888 cents per bushel; (e) 44.022 cents per bushel; (f) 46.426 cents per bushel; (g) 47.638 cents per bushel.

STATUTORY RESERVE BY CHARTERED BANKS

Question No. 899—**Mr. Hees:**

1. Do the chartered banks maintain a statutory reserve of 8 per cent on Canadian dollar deposits in cash and/or deposits with the Bank of Canada?

2. What was the amount of their aggregate deposit on their fiscal year ended October 31, 1965?

3. Does the Bank of Canada pay chartered banks any interest on these deposits and, if so, at what rate?

Hon. Mitchell Sharp (Minister of Finance): 1. Section 71(1) and (2) of the Bank Act prescribe the cash reserve in the form of a deposit with the Bank of Canada and of Bank of Canada notes held by the bank which each chartered bank is required to maintain. The percentage in question is 8 per cent.

2. Aggregate chartered bank deposits with the Bank of Canada on October 31st, 1965, were $1,018,157,106.

3. No.

EXPO '67—FAMILY PLANNING EXHIBIT

Question No. 901—**Mr. Prittie:**

1. What is the theme of Expo '67?

2. Will reference be made to the population problem in exhibits planned for Expo '67?

3. Did the Canadian federation for population planning (now the family planning federation of Canada) or the Montreal family planning association apply to Expo '67 for space to present an exhibit in line with the theme of Expo '67?

4. If so, what oral or written response was made to the federation?

Mr. Jean-Charles Cantin (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Trade and Commerce): 1. "Man and His World"—"Terre des Hommes".

2. It is too early to indicate with certainty whether foreign governments or Canadian industries will refer to the population problem

in their pavilions. With respect to the Canadian Corporation for the 1967 World Exhibition thematic pavilions, four at least will refer to the matter of population growth in their exhibits: "Man in the Community", "Man the Provider", "Man and His Health" and "Man, His Planet and Space".

3. The Canadian Corporation for the 1967 World Exhibition was approached by the Family Planning Association in Montreal, on their own behalf and on behalf of the Family Planning Federation of Canada and of the international organization known as Planned Parenthood World Population. One aspect of the approach was in the nature of a request for space in which these organizations could set up a booth. The approach also brought about discussions on references to the population explosion in our theme exhibits, particularly in the sub-theme "Man and His Community".

4. It was explained to the representatives of these organizations that the exhibition, being one registered by the International Bureau of Exhibitions in the first category, does not provide for the rental or the disposition on a free basis of booths for individual organizations. The discussions with the organizations concerned have proven useful in the development of thematic exhibits on the population explosion, and such discussions are continuing.

BAGOTVILLE, QUE.—PERSONNEL AT R.C.A.F. STATION

Question No. 903—**Mr. Howe (Hamilton South):**

1. How many air force personnel are stationed at R.C.A.F. station Bagotville?

2. How many dependent children are living with these personnel?

3. Is there a public school in the Bagotville area which provides college entrance level education for English speaking students?

Hon. Léo Cadieux (Associate Minister of National Defence): 1. As of 31 January 1966, 1137.

2. The latest figures available are for 30 September 1965, 1985.

3. Yes, two in Arvida.

SALARY OF R.C.A.F. FLIGHT LIEUTENANT

Question No. 907—**Mr. Howe (Hamilton South):**

What is the salary of an R.C.A.F. flight lieutenant, captain of a Cosmopolitan aircraft, after 10 years in that service?

Hon. Paul Hellyer (Minister of National Defence): The type of aircraft flown has no bearing on rates of pay for pilots in the R.C.A.F. An R.C.A.F. Flight Lieutenant with 10 years in that rank, if married, draws $833 per month, and a single officer of the same rank draws either $668 if quarters and rations are provided, or $763 if quarters and rations are not provided.

AVAILABILITY OF PERITRATE SA

Question No. 919—**Mr. Howe (Hamilton South):**

1. Has a drug of the trade name "Peritrate SA" ever been available in Canada and, if so, is it still available?

2. If it is still available, has consideration been given to removing it from the market, in the light of recent United States findings?

Hon. A. J. MacEachen (Minister of National Health and Welfare): 1. Yes.

2. No, since the United States action was not based on any question of safety or effectiveness of the drug.

MISSION TO JAPAN—HOLSTEIN-FRIESIAN BREEDERS REPRESENTATION

Question No. 926—**Mr. Macquarrie:**

1. What breeders of Holstein-Friesian cattle in the Atlantic provinces were invited to become members of the trade mission to Japan and Korea sponsored by the Department of Trade and Commerce?

2. By whom were the personnel of the mission selected?

Mr. Jean-Charles Cantin (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Trade and Commerce): 1. None.

2. The members of the mission were selected by the Department of Trade and Commerce in consultation with the Holstein-Friesian Association of Canada.

KINCARDINE, ONT.—SEWAGE TREATMENT PROJECT

Question No. 936—**Mr. Loney:**

1. Has the full amount of $127,600 awarded to the town of Kincardine to assist in a sewage treatment project been paid to the municipality?

2. If not, what amount remains unpaid?

Hon. J. R. Nicholson (Minister of Labour):

1. Full amount of loan based on final costs was $113,002.80.

2. Final loan disbursement was made to the municipality on June 4th, 1965.

Order for Return

[*Translation*]

QUESTION PASSED AS ORDER FOR RETURN

GROSS AND NET VALUE OF THE NATIONAL DEBT

Question No. 225—**Mr. Caouette:**

1. What is Canada's debt, gross and net?

2. What is the debt of Crown corporations, gross and net?

3. How much money do Canadians owe to banks and credit unions for personal loans?

4. What is the amount of the gross national product?

5. What is the total money supply in bank notes and coins in circulation?

6. What interest did the federal government pay during the last payment period on the national debt and on its bonds?

7. How many finance companies are there in Canada and what are the names of such companies in each province?

Return tabled.

[*English*]

Mr. Speaker: Shall the remaining questions stand?

Mr. Robert C. Coates (Cumberland): Mr. Speaker, last Wednesday I raised a question of privilege because of the fact that questions standing in my name, numbers 5, 163 and 210 had not been answered. Since that time there have been two opportunities for the government to provide the answers to these questions.

In view of the fact that there are now 198 questions standing on the order paper, and the question standing fifth from the beginning of the list has not yet been answered, this indicates the government is not providing the kind of co-operation which the opposition would expect if we are to go along with the provisional rules that have been given to the house.

Hon. G. J. McIlraith (Minister of Public Works): Mr. Speaker, these repeated allegations have been causing the government a great deal of concern. The number of questions that used to be asked in an entire session was about 600. So far, in less than two months of this session we already have had 998 questions on the order paper. I am not complaining about that; but I do want to draw the attention of the house to a problem that is pressing because of the form in which questions are asked and the resultant difficulty in answering them. I can give no better example than question No. 5 which reads:

> What is the total amount of expenditure of the federal government made as of this date, or undertaken, or planned directly or indirectly, in connection with Expo '67?

I know that the answer to the expenditures was prepared and sent forward some weeks ago by the minister responsible for Expo, but the hon. member's question necessitates the checking of every department and agency of government to find out what expenditures were planned indirectly in connection with Expo '67.

The question is not in a form that is capable of getting a reasonably prompt answer, and I respectfully suggest—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. The hon. member for Cumberland (Mr. Coates) has raised this matter for a second time as a question of privilege. I believe he will probably agree with the Chair if I say this is not truly a question of privilege.

If the hon. member would refer to citation 181 (3) of Beauchesne's fourth edition he will read:

> A minister may decline to answer a question without stating the reason for his refusal, and insistence on an answer is out of order, no debate being allowed. A refusal to answer cannot be raised as a question of privilege, nor is it regular to comment upon such refusal.

The hon. member is referring to three specific questions which he says have not been answered. My suggestion to him is that normally this type of objection would be raised as a grievance, when grievances are taken, or during the question period, by asking a minister why a specific question has not been answered, or whether a specific question will be answered.

Mr. Coates: On that point, Mr. Speaker, I would like to point out that the ruling you are now making is with regard to oral questions, and not with regard to written questions.

Mr. Speaker: The citation I have been quoting for the benefit of the hon. member refers not only to oral questions but applies equally to written questions.

Hon. Michael Starr (Ontario): Mr. Speaker, I feel I must rise on a question of privilege as a result of the point of order raised. The reason that there has been an increase in the number of written questions is because there have been rulings that these questions should

be put on the order paper. Now, if the same attitude is applied to written questions as is applied to oral questions, we will never get any answers. Even now—

Mr. Speaker: Order.

Mr. Starr: —we have some 126 questions unanswered for over a month or more.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. The hon. member now seems to be entering into a debate with the government house leader, the Minister of Public Works (Mr. McIlraith). My ruling has to remain that there is no question of privilege in the matter raised by the hon. member for Cumberland (Mr. Coates).

[*Translation*]

MOTIONS FOR PAPERS

Mr. Albert Béchard (Parliamentary Secretary to Secretary of State): Mr. Speaker, notice of motion No. 102 is acceptable to the government.

[*English*]

ADVERTISEMENTS IN U.S. PUBLICATIONS

Motion No. 102—**Mr. McIntosh:**

That an Order of the House do issue for copies of all advertisements in the February and March issues inserted in periodicals and newspapers in the United States by the Canadian Government Travel Bureau.

Mr. Speaker: Is it the pleasure of the house that notice of motion No. 102 be passed?

Motion agreed to.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Béchard: Would Your Honour be kind enough to call notice of motion 89? I would ask, Mr. Speaker, that the other notices of motion stand.

[*English*]

CORRESPONDENCE WITH INDUSTRIAL DEVELOPMENT BANK, SUDBURY AND TORONTO

Motion No. 89—**Mr. Nielsen:**

That an Order of the House do issue for a copy of all correspondence between the Prime Minister, or any minister of the crown, and the Industrial Development Bank at Sudbury and Toronto, and the replies thereto, within the last three months.

Hon. Mitchell Sharp (Minister of Finance): Mr. Speaker, the traditional position has been that it is not in the public interest to table anything which would reveal the affairs or identity of any individual applying for, or obtaining, a loan from the Industrial Development Bank, as such information is considered to be commercially confidential.

In any event, a search of the records shows no correspondence as described in the hon. member's motion, the terms of which refer to correspondence by the Prime Minister or any minister of the Crown.

I should add, however, that there is one letter to the Industrial Development Bank written by an executive assistant. This letter reveals the name of an applicant, and to produce it would offend against the principle I have just enunciated.

In view of what I have said, I suggest the hon. member may wish to withdraw his motion.

Mr. Eric Nielsen (Yukon): Mr. Speaker, did I understand the minister to say that the letter which was written was by an executive assistant to a minister?

Mr. Sharp: No, Mr. Speaker. I stated that the only correspondence between the Industrial Development Bank and any minister's office—and I was taking the interpretation of the motion very broadly so that I would be entirely fair to the hon gentleman—of such a kind is written by an executive assistant, and that letter mentions the name of an applicant. I said it offends against the principle I have enunciated in respect of the confidential nature of such information; but there is no correspondence which I or the bank have been able to find between any minister and the Industrial Development Bank at Sudbury or Toronto during the last three months.

Mr. Nielsen: The question, Mr. Speaker, included the Prime Minister's office as well. I cannot withdraw the motion because I believe the minister's statement, quite unknowingly to him, is inaccurate.

Mr. Speaker: Do I understand that the motion is not withdrawn?

Mr. Nielsen: I cannot withdraw it.

Mr. Speaker: Is it the pleasure of the house to adopt the said motion?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Some hon. Members: No.

Mr. Speaker: All those in favour will please say yea.

Some hon. Members: Yea.

Division

Mr. Speaker: All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. Members: Nay.

Mr. Speaker: In my opinion the nays have it.

And more than five members having risen:

The house divided on the motion (Mr. Nielsen) which was negatived on the following division:

YEAS

Messrs:

Aiken
Alkenbrack
Asselin (Charlevoix)
Bell (Carleton)
Bigg
Bower
Brand
Cadieu (Meadow Lake)
Cameron (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands)
Cantelon
Churchill
Clancy
Coates
Code
Crouse
Danforth
Diefenbaker
Enns
Fairweather
Fane
Flemming
Forbes
Forrestall
Grafftey
Grills
Gundlock
Hales
Harkness
Hees
Horner (Acadia)
Howard
Howe (Wellington-Huron)
Keays
Kennedy
Kindt
Korchinski
Loney
MacDonald (Prince)
MacEwan
MacInnis (Cape Breton South)
Macquarrie
MacRae
McCleave
McCutcheon
McIntosh
McKinley
McLelland
McQuaid
Madill
Martin (Timmins)
Monteith
Moore
More
Muir (Cape Breton North and Victoria)
Muir (Lisgar)
Nasserden
Nesbitt
Nielsen
Nowlan
Ormiston
Pascoe
Peters
Pugh
Rapp
Régimbal
Ricard
Rynard
Scott (Danforth)
Scott (Victoria (Ont.))
Sherman
Skoreyko
Smallwood
Southam
Starr
Thomas (Middlesex West)
Valade
Vincent
Wadds (Mrs.)
Watson (Assiniboia)
Webb
Woolliams—81

NAYS

Messrs:

Allard
Allmand
Andras
Asselin (Richmond-Wolfe)
Badanai
Barnett
Basford
Batten
Béchard
Beer
Benson
Berger
Blouin
Brewin
Brown
Byrne
Cadieux (Terrebonne)
Cameron (High Park)
Cantin
Caouette
Cardin
Caron
Carter
Cashin
Choquette
Chrétien
Clermont
Comtois
Côté (Dorchester)
Côté (Longueuil)
Cowan
Crossman
Davis
Deachman
Dionne
Douglas
Drury
Dubé
Duquet
Émard
Éthier
Faulkner
Favreau
Fawcett
Forest
Foy
Gauthier
Gendron
Gilbert
Godin
Gordon
Goyer
Granger
Gray
Greene
Grégoire
Groos
Habel
Haidasz
Harley
Hellyer
Herridge
Honey
Hopkins
Howe (Hamilton South)
Hymmen
Isabelle
Johnston
Klein
Knowles
Lachance
Laflamme
LaMarsh (Miss)
Lamontagne
Langlois (Chicoutimi)
Langlois (Mégantic)
Laniel
Laprise
Latulippe
Laverdière
Leblanc (Laurier)
LeBlanc (Rimouski)
Lefebvre
Legault
Lessard
Lewis
Lind
Loiselle
Macaluso
Macdonald (Rosedale)
MacEachen
MacInnis (Mrs.) (Vancouver-Kingsway)
Mackasey
McIlraith
McLean (Charlotte)
McNulty
McWilliam
Marchand
Martin (Essex East)
Mather
Matte
Mitchell
Mongrain
Morison
Munro
Neveu
O'Keefe
Olson
Orange
Orlikow
Otto
Pearson
Pelletier
Pennell
Pépin
Pilon
Prittie
Prud'homme
Reid
Richard
Rideout (Mrs.)
Rinfret
Robichaud
Rock
Roxburgh
Ryan
Saltsman
Schreyer
Sharp
Simard
Stafford
Stanbury
Stewart
Tardif
Teillet
Thomas (Maisonneuve-Rosemont)
Thompson
Tolmie
Tremblay
Trudeau
Tucker
Turner
Wahn
Walker
Whelan
Winch
Winters
Yanakis—148

[Mr. Speaker.]

• (3:10 p.m.)

Mr. Speaker: I declare the motion lost. Shall the remaining notices of motions stand?

Agreed.

• (3:20 p.m.)

INDUSTRY

STUDEBAKER COMPANY—POSSIBLE EFFECT OF GUIDE LINES

On the orders of the day:

Right Hon. J. G. Diefenbaker (Leader of he Opposition): Mr. Speaker, I would direct a question to the Minister of Industry and ask him whether the fact that the Studebaker Corporation joined the automobile producing death list came about in any way because of the fact that the guide lines laid down by Washington to United States corporations may have drained the Studebaker treasury.

Hon. C. M. Drury (Minister of Industry): Mr. Speaker, I think almost exactly the same question was asked—

Mr. Diefenbaker: No.

Mr. Drury: —arising probably out of the same newspaper article two days ago, and I replied then.

Mr. Diefenbaker: I want to ask the minister, is that a fact or not? The minister's reply previously was not definite. Has this been looked into?

Mr. Drury: Mr. Speaker, if the right hon. gentleman would consult *Hansard*, I think he would find that my words were that we have been unable to find any evidence that such was the case.

Mr. Diefenbaker: Have you tried?

Mr. Drury: Yes, Mr. Speaker.

An hon. Member: Don't be so arrogant.

[*Later:*]

POSSIBILITY OF RETAINING EMPLOYMENT FOR STUDEBAKER WORKERS

On the orders of the day:

Mr. William Dean Howe (Hamilton South): Mr. Speaker, I should like to address a question to the Minister of Industry. Is he planning to meet with the executive of the U.A.W. from the Studebaker Corporation within the next few days and, if so, has he a specific proposal to make for keeping the plant in operation at Hamilton, or a proposal for an alternative use to which it may be put?

Hon. C. M. Drury (Minister of Industry): Mr. Speaker, I would be delighted to meet with representatives of the labour union at any time. As I explained to the house yesterday and the day before, we are actively, but still, seeking alternative industrial uses for the Studebaker plant in Hamilton.

Inquiries of the Ministry

LABOUR RELATIONS

HALIFAX DOCKYARD—JOB EVALUATION WITHOUT CONSULTATION

On the orders of the day:

Mr. T. C. Douglas (Burnaby-Coquitlam): Mr. Speaker, may I direct a question to the Minister of National Defence, of which I have given him notice. Has the minister received a telegram from the Halifax Dockyard Trades and Labour Council, protesting the fact that a job evaluation program is being instituted by the department without any negotiations with the employees concerned? I want to ask the minister, will he consider delaying this action in order to permit negotiation of job evaluation as coming properly within the scope of collective bargaining of government employees?

Hon. Léo Cadieux (Associate Minister of National Defence): Mr. Speaker, there must be confusion here. We have this telegram.

An hon. Member: The confusion is on your side.

Mr. Cadieux (Terrebonne): You are talking of job evaluation. I am not aware that job evaluation has been instituted in Halifax or anywhere else. What is taking place now is a review of the classification structure in the dockyard, and this is carried out by the bureau of classification revision of the Civil Service Commission. We are acting as an agent of the Civil Service Commission, as many other departments do. What we do is to transmit the information that we have gathered for the Civil Service Commission, to the Civil Service Commission. I am very willing to go deeper into this particular matter to find out about it, but I am quite sure that there is no job evaluation there. Last summer, in an interview with people responsible in the dockyard it was said that we were not considering this subject before the bargaining was instituted. Certainly as I said in my opening remarks, there must be confusion.

Mr. Douglas: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. I want to ask the minister if it is true that the employees have received form S.C. 3 (2265) setting forth the new classifications and pay system for service and maintenance personnel which is to come into effect on October 1, 1966. Has the government refused to negotiate this job classification?

Mr. Cadieux (Terrebonne): I will have to take the second part of the question as notice.

Mr. Douglas: May I ask a further supplementary question.

Inquiries of the Ministry

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. The hon. member for Cumberland rises on a question of privilege.

Mr. Robert C. Coates (Cumberland): Mr. Speaker, I want to draw to your attention that two days ago the hon. member for Halifax asked this exact question of the Minister of National Defence, and at that time you found it out of order.

[*Translation*]

ADMINISTRATION OF JUSTICE

MR. CALVIN MacDONALD—REQUEST FOR HEARING

On the orders of the day:

Mr. Réal Caouette (Villeneuve): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the right hon. Prime Minister.

Has the right hon. Prime Minister received a communication or a telegram from a former member of the Royal Canadian Mounted Police, Mr. Calvin MacDonald, asking to be heard before the judicial inquiry on national security, and requesting that his case be looked into on a special basis?

[*English*]

Right Hon. L. B. Pearson (Prime Minister): Not to my knowledge, Mr. Speaker, but I shall be glad to make inquiries.

EXTERNAL AFFAIRS

NATO—INQUIRY CONCERNING COMMUNICATION FROM PRESIDENT DE GAULLE

On the orders of the day:

Mr. R. N. Thompson (Red Deer): Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the right hon. Prime Minister. In view of the exchange between President de Gaulle and President Johnson as it relates to NATO, wherein President Johnson has accused President de Gaulle of seeking to destroy NATO, could the Prime Minister tell the house whether or not he has any communication with President de Gaulle or the French government?

Right Hon. L. B. Pearson (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, we have not had, that I know of, any official communication from the French government on this matter. If and when it comes we shall naturally give it consideration and discuss the matter with our NATO allies.

[Mr. Douglas.]

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE

REQUEST FOR ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS ON ORDER PAPER

On the orders of the day:

Hon. Michael Starr (Ontario): Mr. Speaker, I wish to direct a question to the Minister of Public Works in his capacity as house leader and ask him whether, in view of the fact that during the 1962-63 session up until February 22 there were 1,467 written questions, compared with 900 odd questions on the order paper now, of which only 126 have been answered, he would prevail upon his colleagues to do something, to answer those questions.

Hon. G. J. McIlraith (Minister of Public Works): Mr. Speaker, I do not have the exact figure, but over 600 questions have been answered. Those are answers to written questions. There is, however, a real problem about questions on the order paper that are not in accordance with the rules. Some that are in accordance with the rules are put in such a form that a quick reply is impossible. A great deal of improvement could be made if there were better draftmanship of the questions.

Mr. Heath Macquarrie (Queens): A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. I wonder if the hon. minister who has just cast aspersions on hon. members would indicate in what manner question 71 is wrong, in which it is asked how many dominion-provincial conferences have been held since a certain date. That question has been standing there since January 18.

Mr. McIlraith: I think if the hon. member will look at that question—I can tell the hon. member what is wrong with it, in a moment.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. May I submit to the hon. member and to the minister that this exchange is not entirely according to the rules. The hon. member might ask why the question has not been answered, and whether it will be answered at an early date, but he cannot ask what is wrong with it. Neither can the minister say what is wrong with the question.

Mr. Macquarrie: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker; I was merely seeking guidance as to how I might conduct myself in accordance with the traditions of this house. Now I will ask why the question was not answered.

Mr. McIlraith: I can tell the hon. member why it was not answered. Question 71 on the order paper reads as follows:

1. Since June 15, 1963, how many Dominion-Provincial Conferences have been held?

2. Which of these conferences were held at the (a) ministerial and which at the (b) official level?

When it comes to meetings at the official level, you get into an area where there is a very large number of meetings.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh.

Mr. McIlraith: It is extremely difficult to know how many meetings are going on. For instance, today in my own department I do not know how many officials are meeting with officials from the various provinces. This is precisely the difficulty. If the hon. member would draft the question correctly we would produce an answer without delay.

Mr. Macquarrie: On a point of order; may I point out that the hon. gentleman has been very gratuitous with his misplaced comments and suggestions. I was asking about dominion-provincial conferences, a fairly distinct kind of meetings.

Mr. McIlraith: On a question of privilege, I should like to point out that in the Department of Fisheries alone, there have been over 50 such dominion-provincial conferences.

Mr. Speaker: That is not a question of privilege.

FINANCE

ATLANTIC ACCEPTANCE CORPORATION—EFFECT OF GUIDE LINES ON COMPANY COLLAPSE

On the orders of the day:

Hon. J. W. Monteith (Perth): I should like to ask a question of the Minister of Finance. Has the minister any comment to make concerning evidence given yesterday before Hon. Mr. Justice Hughes in Toronto to the effect that the United States guide lines instituted early last year contributed to the collapse of the Atlantic Acceptance Corporation?

Hon. Mitchell Sharp (Minister of Finance): Yes. I was hoping somebody would ask me a question about this. I am sure the house would not expect me to comment on the financial affairs of a particular company which is currently under investigation by a royal commission. I might point out, however, that the United States balance of payments measures, qualified as they were by exemptions negotiated on behalf of Canada, did not prevent Canadian borrowers as a group from obtaining substantial inflows of capital in 1965.

[*Translation*]

THE MINISTRY

POSSIBLE WITHDRAWAL OF RESIGNATION BY MINISTER OF JUSTICE

On the orders of the day:

Mr. Gilles Grégoire (Lapointe): Mr. Speaker, I should like to put a question to the Prime Minister (Mr. Pearson) in order to clear up a situation which has been going on for a few days.

Could the Prime Minister tell us whether it is true the Minister of Justice (Mr. Cardin) has withdrawn at noon the resignation he handed a few days ago?

Mr. Speaker: Order. The question is out of order.

[*English*]

TRADE

INCREASE IN COMMODITY EXPORTS TO OVERCOME TRADE DEFICIT

On the orders of the day:

Hon. George Hees (Northumberland): I should like to address a question to the Minister of Trade and Commerce. Would the minister advise the United States secretary of commerce that Canada must be allowed to ship greatly increased quantities of oil and gas, base metals, livestock, lumber and other commodities to that market this year as a positive means of overcoming the commodity trade deficit with that country which increased last year—

Some hon. Members: Order.

Mr. Hees: —by some $300 million to a total of more than $1 billion.

Mr. Speaker: The Chair has been unable to hear the whole question, so perhaps we might give the hon. member the benefit of the doubt and allow the minister to answer it.

Hon. Robert Winters (Minister of Trade and Commerce): The hon. gentleman was good enough to give me notice of his question so I am prepared to answer it. At last week's meeting of the Canada-United States joint committee on trade and economic affairs we emphasized the importance which Canada attaches to improvement in our current account with the United States, including in particular more exports to that market. While last year Canada's total exports increased by 5.6 per cent over 1964, our sales to the United States increased by 13 per cent and surpassed the $5 billion mark for the first time. They were more than $600 million higher than for

the previous year. Our December exports to the United States were up by nearly 19 per cent over the previous December.

Mr. Speaker: Order. It seems to me we are now witnessing an exchange of statistics between the hon. member for Northumberland and the minister. I think this is not the type of question and answer which should be allowed at this time.

[*Later:*]

[*Translation*]

Mr. Georges Valade (Sainte-Marie): Mr. Speaker, may I direct to the Minister of Trade and Commerce a supplementary question to the one asked by the hon. member for Northumberland?

Will the minister tell us if the trade increase between Canada and the United States which he mentioned a little earlier is due to the devaluation of the Canadian dollar which the Conservative government put into force in previous years?

[*English*]

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Northumberland.

Mr. Valade: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order—

Mr. Speaker: Order. The hon. gentleman's question is out of order.

Mr. Valade: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, I want to say you allowed the minister to reply to a question put by the hon. member for Northumberland, and mine is related to that question.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. I have allowed the hon. member to put his question and, with respect, I think his question is not in order. I felt that the original question placed by the hon. member for Northumberland had some aspects which indicated it was not entirely in order, and the response by the minister went beyond the terms of the type of reply that should be made to questions posed at this time.

SHIPPING

ST. LAWRENCE RIVER—ARRANGEMENTS FOR MEETING RESPECTING SAFETY

On the orders of the day:

Mr. Frank Howard (Skeena): In the absence of the Minister of Transport I would normally direct this question to his parliamentary secretary, but the intervention of that hon. member into the question period the other day made it obvious he does not know any more than the rest of us. I should like, therefore, to direct my question to the Minister without Portfolio, the hon. member for St. Lawrence-St. George, and ask him whether a telegram has been received today from the representatives of the Canadian Marine Officers Institute and the Seafarers International Union asking specifically for a meeting with the Minister of Transport to talk about safety on the St. Lawrence. If so, what response, if any, has been given? What is to happen with regard to this request?

Hon. John N. Turner (Minister without Portfolio): May I point out to the hon. member that the telegram was sent only by the S.I.U. and not by the Dominion Marine Association. In reply to this telegram, I stated that departmental officials and myself would be meeting in Montreal next week, on March 16, with all the interested parties, including the unions and the shipping industry, to begin a series of meetings on marine safety on the lakes and on the St. Lawrence river.

Mr. Churchill: Would those be conferences or meetings?

Mr. Turner: Meetings at the technical and official level with the interested parties.

Mr. Howard: May I be allowed to point out that I did not say the telegram came jointly from the Dominion Marine Association, but rather from the Canadian Marine Officers Institute and the Seafarers International Union? Could I ask the minister whether he is the only minister who will be in attendance at this meeting or whether the Minister of Transport will be there as well?

Mr. Turner: I will be the only minister present at this particular meeting, but of course the Minister of Transport will be fully aware of what is happening.

HIGHWAY SAFETY

REQUEST FOR MANDATORY GOVERNMENT SPECIFICATIONS

On the orders of the day:

Mr. Heward Grafftey (Brome-Missisquoi): Last week, Mr. Speaker, the Prime Minister said the government would soon be in a position to reply to my question relating to the imposition of mandatory government specifications for safety features in Canadian motor vehicles unless the industry acted voluntarily in this field. I should like to ask the Minister of Industry if he is yet able to reply to this question, and whether he can

inform the house of any conversations he had with the United States secretary concerned, a few days ago, on the subject of automobile safety.

Right Hon. L. B. Pearson (Prime Minister): Perhaps the Minister of Industry could answer that question. Before he does so, may I be permitted to express my congratulations to the hon. member on his forthcoming visit to the Congress in Washington?

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Hon. C. M. Drury (Minister of Industry): The hon. member's question was in two parts. With respect to the second part, may I say I did have a brief conversation on this subject with Secretary Connor in Washington indicating to him the interest we in Ottawa have in this question of automobile safety, and offering to co-operate. As to the question of mandatory safety provisions in relation to imported vehicles, it is clear that the federal government has jurisdiction. But the imposition of mandatory safety provisions applying to vehicles made in Canada might raise constitutional problems, and these problems are currently under study by the Department of Justice.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Réal Caouette (Villeneuve): May I put a supplementary question, Mr. Speaker?

Is the minister aware that the Chrysler company is the one providing the greater security at present?

Mr. Drury: Yes, Mr. Speaker.

[*English*]

PUBLIC SERVICE

REQUEST FOR ESCALATOR CLAUSE IN SUPERANNUATION ACT

On the orders of the day:

Right Hon. J. G. Diefenbaker (Leader of the Opposition): Could the Prime Minister say whether further representations have been received from the Federal Superannuates National Association for an upward adjustment in civil service retirement pensions with an escalator clause, and is any further consideration being given to this, additional to what the right hon. gentleman said on this matter some weeks ago?

Right Hon. L. B. Pearson (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, to my best knowledge there have been no representations received since those with which I dealt in answer to a question a couple of weeks ago, when I did receive representations and replied to them. I shall be glad to inquire if any have come in since.

Mr. Diefenbaker: Has there been any consideration given by the Prime Minister to them? I did not hear the earlier part of his answer.

Mr. Pearson: Consideration was given to these representations, and in the reply to the civil service superannuates I indicated the view of the government that no change could be made at this time.

Mr. Bell (Carleton): Shame.

THE CANADIAN ECONOMY

LUMBER PRICES—REQUEST FOR GOVERNMENT ACTION

On the orders of the day:

Mr. E. Nasserden (Rosthern): Mr. Speaker, I wish to direct a question to the Prime Minister. What action is the government prepared to take to offset the serious effects of increasing lumber prices, which are of concern to those desiring to build homes for their families?

Mr. Speaker: This is a very general question which I would invite the hon. member to place on the order paper.

IMMIGRATION

GRANTING OF ASYLUM IN CANADA TO YUGOSLAV SEAMEN

On the orders of the day:

Mr. Thomas M. Bell (Saint John-Albert): Mr. Speaker, I wish to direct a question to the Minister of Citizenship and Immigration with respect to the Yugoslav seamen at Saint John. Has the minister any information with respect to the status of the seamen not deported?

[*Translation*]

Hon. Jean Marchand (Minister of Citizenship and Immigration): Mr. Speaker, on January 19, 12 Yugoslav seamen broke ship in St. John, New Brunswick. Ten of them appealed to the immigration court of appeal from the deportation order which was maintained and they were deported. The other two will appear on March 24 before the immigration court and I do not know yet what judgment will be handed down.

Inquiries of the Ministry

[*English*]

FINANCE

EFFECT OF GUIDE LINES ON U.S. SUBSIDIARIES

On the orders of the day:

Hon. George Hees (Northumberland): Mr. Speaker, I should like to direct a question to the Minister of Trade and Commerce. Notwithstanding the communiqué read in the house on Monday by the Secretary of State for External Affairs, would the minister inform the house just where United States subsidiaries operating in Canada stand regarding the United States guide line policy?

Mr. Speaker: This may be a good question, but I wonder whether the hon. member is asking now for a statement of policy which the minister might want to make on motions. This is again the type of question which would normally require a rather lengthy reply. The Chair has to exercise some discretion on this type of question, and I suggest it should not be accepted now.

EXTERNAL AFFAIRS

SOUTHERN RHODESIA—APPLICATION OF SANCTIONS

On the orders of the day:

Hon. Gordon Churchill (Winnipeg South Centre): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Trade and Commerce which I drew to his attention on March 1 prior to his visit to Washington. Would he look at page 1999 of *Hansard* and let me have an answer to the question concerning the sanctions applied by Canada against Southern Rhodesia?

Hon. Robert Winters (Minister of Trade and Commerce): I shall be very glad to do that, Mr. Speaker.

HEALTH AND WELFARE

MEDICARE—POSSIBILITY OF IMPLEMENTATION BY STAGES

On the orders of the day:

Mr. P. B. Rynard (Simcoe East): Mr. Speaker, I should like to direct a question to the Minister of National Health and Welfare. Has he read a report on the Quebec medicare plan by Dr. Allan Goldbloom of Montreal, in which he states medicare must be accomplished in stages? Is the minister in agreement with this?

Mr. Speaker: Order; this question is not in order.

[Mr. Marchand.]

SPORTS

CANADIAN SITE FOR 1972 OLYMPICS

On the orders of the day:

Mr. H. W. Herridge (Kootenay West): Mr. Speaker, I wish to address a question to the Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Northern Affairs and National Resources, and it is based on a collective telegram which I received from Edmonton. Can the Parliamentary Secretary inform the house whether a decision has been made in connection with a Canadian site for the 1972 Olympics? If not, would certain professors from the University of Alberta, who are interested in this question, be given an opportunity to present their case to the minister and his officials?

Mr. Speaker: Order please. I would invite the hon. member to place his question on the order paper.

CASSIUS CLAY—PERMISSION TO HOLD BOXING EVENT IN CANADA

On the orders of the day:

Mr. Howard Johnston (Okanagan-Revelstoke): Mr. Speaker, I wish to direct a question to the minister in charge of immigration. Can he tell the house whether his department is prepared to allow the entry into this country of one Mohammed Ali, otherwise known as Cassius Clay, to participate in an event that no city in his own country would sponsor?

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Hamilton South.

AGRICULTURE

MILK—OUTSTANDING SUPPLEMENTARY PAYMENTS

On the orders of the day:

Hon. J. J. Greene (Minister of Agriculture): Mr. Speaker, yesterday the hon. member for Oxford asked me a question with respect to supplementary dairy payments, which I undertook to answer today. To date, 132,423 cheques have been issued, whereby the dairy farmers of Canada have received a total of $18,502,118 by reason of the government's supplementary payments policy. An additional 3,437 cheques totalling $412,440 will be issued by the end of this week, and there will then be 3,000 payments outstanding.

Mr. W. B. Nesbitt (Oxford): As a supplementary question, when a similar question was asked of the minister, I believe on February 8, did he not say at that time that he expected all these payments would be made by February 14?

Mr. Greene: No, Mr. Speaker.

LABOUR CONDITIONS

BANCROFT, ONT.—REQUEST FOR INCLUSION AS DESIGNATED AREA

On the orders of the day:

Mr. R. A. Webb (Hastings-Frontenac): Mr. Speaker, I should like to direct a question to the Minister of Industry. Because of the closing of the uranium mines in Bancroft, would the minister declare this area a designated area for industrial incentives?

Hon. C. M. Drury (Minister of Industry): Mr. Speaker, we have looked at the problem of Bancroft in an endeavour to find some way of alleviating its plight, and I would be glad to look at it again.

FISHERIES

FILLING OF SEAL PELT QUOTA

On the orders of the day:

Mr. J. R. Tucker (Trinity-Conception): Mr. Speaker, I wish to direct a question to the Minister of Fisheries. Would the minister advise the house whether the quota of 50,000 seal pelts has been filled?

Mr. MacInnis (Cape Breton South): Yes, it has. Didn't you listen to the news?

Mr. Speaker: Order. I understand the Minister of Fisheries will be facing the committee of supply when presenting his estimates this afternoon, and I think that would be the proper time to ask this question.

Hon. H. J. Robichaud (Minister of Fisheries): On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, I heard a statement made on the other side, that the quota had been reached. This is false news that came over the radio this morning and I would like to be allowed to make a statement to correct this.

Mr. MacInnis (Cape Breton South): Who is giving the false news?

Mr. Speaker: Order. I understand the minister is seeking the permission of the house to revert to motions in order to make a statement, but I suggest he will have an opportunity to make whatever statement he has in mind when we consider the estimates of the Department of Fisheries later this afternoon.

EXTERNAL AFFAIRS

VIET NAM—COMMONWEALTH CONSULTATION ON FIGHTING FORCE

On the orders of the day:

Mr. Barry Mather (New Westminster): Mr. Speaker, I wish to direct a question to the Secretary of State for External Affairs. Having in mind the minister's reports on Canada's efforts to pacify the Viet Nam war, and likewise having in mind the announcement by Australia today that she is going to quadruple her fighting force in Viet Nam, would the minister say what consultation exists between Commonwealth members on this grave situation?

Hon. Paul Martin (Secretary of State for External Affairs): Mr. Speaker, the decision of the government of Australia to increase its military assistance to Viet Nam was made known to us in Ottawa yesterday by the Australian High Commission, as part of the continuing exchanges of view which we have both here and in Canberra.

AGRICULTURE

FEED GRAIN—CHARGING OF UNREASONABLE PRICES

On the orders of the day:

Mr. E. R. Schreyer (Springfield): Mr. Speaker, I should like to address a question to the Minister of Agriculture. Has the minister received any reports alleging that farmers in areas of eastern Canada, where there is a shortage of feed, are being charged completely unconscionable prices for feed, screenings and so on, sometimes as high as $6 per cwt.? Further, has he received reports that purchases of feed grain from western Canada are not being taken up because of lack of organization at the receiving end, namely eastern Canada.

Hon. J. J. Greene (Minister of Agriculture): Mr. Speaker, we have had complaints in this direction from time to time. It is my hope and belief that the government policy in respect of the eastern feed grain agency, which we hope soon will be before this house, if the house proceeds with its business with some expedition, will help to solve the problem.

BONNYVILLE, ALBERTA—REQUEST FOR ACREAGE PAYMENTS

On the orders of the day:

Hon. J. J. Greene (Minister of Agriculture): Yesterday the hon. member for Athabasca asked me a question which I undertook to answer. The answer to the question is that I had not received the report from the Farmers Union of Bonnyville, Alberta, but I am very pleased that the hon. member sent it to me. I might point out that this requests payments

supplementary to the P.F.A.A. payments, and I think indicates I trust to the satisfaction of the hon. members for Peace River and Medicine Hat the soundness of the government's policy not to supplement P.F.A.A. payments in the three areas requested by the province of Alberta. This would in fact have been discriminatory, as this request now clearly indicates.

Mr. Schreyer: Mr. Speaker, I have a supplementary question. The minister made reference to a government policy in respect of feed grain. Does the government have any policy in respect of the immediate crisis which is being faced?

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. This appears to be a good time at which to advise the house that the question period now is completed.

SUPPLY

The house in committee of supply, Mr. Batten in the chair.

DEPARTMENT OF THE SECRETARY OF STATE

1. Departmental administration, $481,600.

The Chairman: Shall vote No. 1 carry?

Mr. Starr: Before vote No. 1 carries, Mr. Chairman, I wonder whether the minister has anything further to say with regard to some of the questions which have been asked, or which have been given to her in written form?

Miss LaMarsh: Mr. Chairman, I received today questions from each of two hon. members opposite. One is from the hon. member for Churchill, who asks me to agree to provide a special sum of money during this session to allow the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation to complete its job of providing extended service, presumably in his own constituency. I thought last evening, in response to his remarks and those of others, I had made it very clear that while I was in sympathy with the request, the matter was being considered now by a cabinet committee, which the Prime Minister announced and which he chairs, and that this is a part of general policy on broadcasting.

I think my hon. friend realizes that, although it is the responsibility of the Secretary of State to be a conduit pipe, it is not my place to tell the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation where they should extend service. As a government it is our responsibility to draw up plans in respect of how much money we will ask parliament to vote, depending on the request put to us by the C.B.C.

[Mr. Greene.]

I think my hon. friend also will realize that I cannot give him the assurance he wishes, particularly in respect of the estimates before this committee, the spending of which will be completed in about two weeks' time. He had some figures, which I now have had an opportunity to check, concerning the per-household cost for provision of service, of something in the order of $4 or $5. I should like to correct him, because I think if he checks he will realize that he made a slip. The $4 or $5 is per capita, and the per household figure on which we presently are working is $20.

I am informed by the corporation that they hope, even under present financing, they will be able to work up to a figure of something like $10 per capita in the next few years. If the government is able to recommend an accelerated policy and parliament agrees, that figure will rise much more sharply.

I also was asked by the hon. member for Swift Current-Maple Creek that I give an undertaking to the effect that some money would be forthcoming to provide service by the C.B.C. in his constituency. I think it is quite obvious that constitutionally I cannot provide such an assurance. Last evening, in stating the government's position, I went further than any previous minister responsible for the C.B.C. ever has done before. I indicated, notwithstanding the fact that some of the hon. member's constituents feel aggrieved, as was shown in the return tabled February 7, the cost per capita today for Canadians is only .03 cents for radio and .09 cents for television. However, this still is a service which, when extended in certain areas, becomes extraordinarily expensive.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to assure my hon. friend that he will have service on such and such a date, or the year after, but I cannot do that. Also I am informed I was wrong in my recollection last night when, referring to the Fowler Report, I said our service now extends to 92 per cent of our homes for television and 96 per cent for radio. The figures properly should be 94 and 98. There are some people in Canada to whom we are not going to be able to bring television, partly because they are so scattered, partly because the cost per capita is extremely high, and partly because there is no way under present technology to extend the service there.

However, I should like to draw to the attention of my hon. friends, who I know are anxious to see the estimates of this department and the other two remaining departments pass quickly, that I am sincerely in accord with as rapid as possible extension of service. I know the management and board of the C.B.C. are of the same opinion. Although I cannot say it will be by the time the next set of estimates is before the house, it may very well be that within this calendar year we will be in a position to say when this policy of extension of facilities will be undertaken.

• (4:00 p.m.)

[*Translation*]

Mr. Valade: Mr. Chairman, last night, when the house adjourned, I was endeavouring to find out from the minister if the present government intends to postpone the date agreed upon for the construction of the C.B.C.'s Place des Ondes.

The minister did not give a satisfactory reply to that question.

Although I voted for the adjournment, I wish to say I did not intend to join the members of the N.D.P. in an attempt to delay the adoption of the department's estimates. I merely wanted to find out from the Secretary of State, whether she intends to make an early statement on this project of considerable importance to the city of Montreal.

On September 17, 1965, her predecessor made a statement in Montreal to the effect that this government had allowed an extension of one year, starting on October 1, 1965, for the carrying out of this project which is most important for the city of Montreal and particularly for that part of the city.

Yesterday, during the debate, the minister stated just the opposite, as can be found on page 2419 of *Hansard*:

> But I do think it would be foolhardy for me at this point, while the Fowler report is being studied by the committee, to attempt to give hon. members here, or persons in the general public, a date upon which construction will be started or completed.

Mr. Chairman, I suggest that answer is in disagreement with everything suggested by the former Secretary of State, that is that the work would start on October 1, 1966.

The purpose of this intervention—I would like the minister to help me shorten the time allocated to me to discuss this matter—is to ask the minister to tell us that she will be ready to make a statement in the house of commons within a week, 15 days or three weeks concerning a final date for the start of the construction. I feel that would remove the prevailing anxiety and uncertainty from the people who live in the eastern part of the Canadian metropolis. Surely, the minister is aware that this situation seriously affects businessmen in that part of the city of Montreal.

This indecision on the part of the Secretary of State is detrimental to the implementation and execution of this extensive project. I feel the minister should study the merits and the objectivity of my request. I do not know why she persists in her refusal to tell us whether the project will be started as promised by her predecessor, or whether she intends to make a statement in the house within a few weeks so as to inform the public and Montreal authorities, who have asked for information, when this Place des Ondes project will start.

It seems to me that my question is not difficult, it is simple, perhaps too simple for the minister. She must admit that an answer would surely avoid anxiety and especially complications for businessmen of the eastern part of Montreal.

So, I ask the minister to confirm or deny the statement made by her predecessor, the former Secretary of State, in Montreal before the city authorities, when he said that a period of one year would be granted for the start of construction work, which then was to have started on October 1, 1965.

I ask the minister whether this statement was only a political football in the midst of an election campaign or whether it was a formal and official commitment on the part of the present government.

It seems to me that my request is logical and reasonable. I ask the minister to inform us on this point. I know that the problem concerns not only the voters of my riding but those of every riding in the City of Montreal who hope for the early implementation of this major project.

Therefore, I ask whether the minister is ready to give her answer to the effect that the project will be implemented without further delay, or undertake to make a statement in the house on this matter within a few weeks.

[*English*]

Miss LaMarsh: Mr. Chairman, I thought I had explained this to my hon. friend last night. Let me first say that I did not, initially, pay the honours due my predecessor last night, for the very reason that I thought this

committee, being so delayed, would permit me to do so during the study of next year's estimates.

I should like to say, however, that in the time I have been in office I have never found such evidence of a man's devotion to the subject matters of a portfolio of government. The former Secretary of State I think is a shining example throughout the country of the stimulation and cultivation of cultural pursuits in this country. He is held in highest regard by all of those in the various fields of culture, who believe that he is the real hope for the people of Canada with regard to the advancement of these fields. My predecessor was, as a cultivated man, no cheap politician who would make promises which he did not intend to keep, nor is this government attempting in any way to retreat from any promise or undertaking ever made in this regard.

My hon. friend and all hon. members of the committee must realize that the Fowler committee was asked to look into a number of things regarding C.B.C. financing and its arrangements, and one of these was its consolidation plans. I assume that the hon. member for Sainte-Marie understands that it is intended to go ahead with the consolidations in Montreal, Toronto and Vancouver. Indeed, I have just received a request in respect of the city of Winnipeg regarding consolidation.

All of the facilities of the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation need to be updated, which will require a great deal of money. But when public money is spent in setting up a committee which studies the problem thoroughly, and recommends certain things very much at variance to what the management of the board of the C.B.C. has recommended, I know my hon. friend will understand why the government believes it would be an arrant disregard of its responsibilities not to restudy these individual matters before committing itself to asking parliament for the necessary money.

The funds to be expended on each of these consolidation plans are very considerable. The buildings to be constructed we hope will last at least 50 years into the future, and will fit the requirements of broadcasting in the public sector. That being the case, the government is reconsidering the two opposed positions. I hope it will in a very short period of time be able to make its decision known with respect to the consolidation plans for these three cities.

[Miss LaMarsh.]

I said last night, and I should like to repeat, that there has never been any suggestion from any responsible source that the C.B.C. was not going to build. In fact, I want to make this very clear; the C.B.C. intends to build and the government intends that it shall build. The government intends that this construction shall take place in Montreal on the site which is known as "Place Radio Canada".

Mr. Favreau: It is Place des Ondes.

Miss LaMarsh: Yes, it is Place des Ondes on Dorchester east, in Montreal. As I said last night, the chairman of the committee, in whose constituency part of the building is to be located with the other part being in Sainte-Marie, has been extremely helpful to me in this regard. We have consulted almost daily on this as to what will happen on the site, and as to the requirements of the people in the area of the municipality, etc.

I want to say to the hon. member, and to all members of the committee, that the government is moving as quickly as it can in the whole field of broadcasting in order to arrive at certain dicisions, such as those in respect of consolidation, which need not await the white paper on broadcasting policy generally. I am very happy to undertake to all hon. members that as quickly as possible these decisions will be made and will be at once made public.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Caouette: Mr. Chairman, I have but one question to ask the Secretary of State.

Yesterday, we talked about radio and television for the Chibougamau area. Well, this morning, I learned that during last fall's election campaign the Liberal candidate in the riding of Chapleau, Mr. Gaston Labrèche, of Amos, who incidentally lost his deposit, was assuring the people of Chibougamau that the C.B.C. had agreed to provide Chibougamau and Chapais with television and radio service in the weeks following November 8.

And I should point out that Mr. Labrèche, the Liberal candidate, was being accompanied throughout the riding by the present Quebec minister of Lands and Forests, Mr. Lucien Cliche. They were both promising Chibougamau and Chapais that, right after November 8, the services of the C.B.C. would be made available to those two towns, if Mr. Labrèche were elected.

Does the minister know if the C.B.C. did promise a Liberal candidate that its services

would be provided to the people of Chibougamau and Chapais?

I should like the Secretary of State to enlighten us on this, because I think there is some political interference within the administration of the C.B.C. and I wonder whether this is a fact.

• (4:10 p.m.)

[*English*]

Miss LaMarsh: Mr. Chairman, I hope that my hon. friend will forgive me for answering in what is my mother tongue. I am certain that no such special information was given to any candidate, Liberal or otherwise. It would seem to me that if such a promise were made, it was the kind of promise my hon. friend would make in his constituency or I would make in mine, namely that we would do everything possible to improve or bring service to the constituency if we were elected a member of this house. I am certain that if such a promise were made, that was the extent of it. I point out to my hon. friend that yesterday he brought in delegates from Chibougamau and Chapais, to discuss service there.

Contrary to a suggestion made by the hon. member for Churchill last night, and I checked this carefully again today with the C.B.C. authorities, no attention at all is paid to whether a constituency that is asking for service elects a member who is, politically speaking, blue, orange, red or any other colour. Everyone in this country who pays taxes pays for this service, and the service is extended on a basis that has nothing to do with the political complexion of the people in the area. It may be that had a Liberal member been elected the problem might have been brought to me and laid on my doorstep the day after I assumed this office. None the less, all I could have done with it is what I have done in this instance, that is pass it on to the C.B.C. to consider and list in their priorities. Then, as parliament votes them money to develop and extend their service they can make sure that every city needing and requesting service is included.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Caouette: Mr. Chairman, I wish to put a supplementary question to the minister.

I do not want to delay the passage of the estimates, but I would like to mention that in our region the company *Radio-Nord Incorporée* serves all of Abitibi and Témiscamingue. Soon, it will serve as well the areas of Miquelon and Matagami, north of Amos and east of Senneterre, on the road to Chibougamau and Chapais.

Now, if *Radio-Nord Incorporée* were willing to extend its services to Chapais and Chibougamau, would the C.B.C. be willing to look into the possibility of extending the *Radio-Nord Incorporée* network, and thus enable the people of Chibougamau and Chapais to receive the C.B.C. television signals as well as those already coming from Rouyn?

Then, there would be a possible agreement between the crown corporation and the Company *Radio-Nord Incorporée*, so that the people of Chibougamau and Chapais can get the service as soon as possible.

[*English*]

Miss LaMarsh: I shall be glad to stress that matter with the C.B.C. authorities.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Valade: Mr. Chairman, I take it for granted that the Secretary of State does not intend to, or cannot, under the circumstances, confirm that the time limit for the beginning of the work at Place des Ondes, in Montreal, will definitely be October 1, 1966. I have to reach that conclusion since the minister will not tell us if she will make a statement to that effect within a few weeks or will confirm the date set by her predecessor, for whom I have great respect and whose devotion and loyalty I never suspected when he headed that department.

But that is not the question. I understand the difficult situation in which the minister finds herself. I know that there is the report of the Fowler commission and that there were discussions between the authorities of the C.B.C. and the government. I know also that a ministerial committee is trying to find solutions to those various problems, but it remains that the situation is serious for the city of Montreal and that the important projects already elaborated by development companies and organizations in the east end of the city cannot be carried out until the present government has reached a decision.

I must point out to the minister that by including in the discussion all the projects of the C.B.C. throughout the country, she is confusing the issue somewhat, because the construction of the Cité des Ondes, in Montreal, was the first pilot project of that kind which was decided on.

As a matter of fact, as far back as 1958, the city of Montreal proceeded with the confirmation of the land and everything was

signed on June 26, 1962, as expected by the former government and the authorities of the city of Montreal, as well as by the senior officials of the C.B.C. and the Central Housing and Mortgage Corporation, the latter having cleared the land.

In view of the fact that all parties have fulfilled their obligations up to now, I wonder why the present government keeps the contractors waiting so long, as they would be interested in great development projects in that part of Montreal, thus increasing the economic growth of the whole city.

I wonder if the minister could not help us—

Mr. Prud'homme: Mr. Chairman, would the hon. member allow a question?

Mr. Valade: Certainly, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Prud'homme: Mr. Chairman, would the hon. member say that not knowing exactly the starting date for construction will delay the construction or the development planned in the city of Montreal? On the other hand, if we are certain that Place des Ondes will be erected on the site described by the hon. member for Sainte-Marie, if the C.B.C. authorities assure us of the implementation of this project, I cannot see why the contractors concerned cannot proceed with their project.

The hon. member insists on an exact date. I think this has nothing to do with implementation of the project.

I feel that my hon. friend is right in insisting on the implementation of this project. Besides, he should be aware of all the pressure applied by the members for Montreal Island on the government and on the C.B.C. authorities in this regard, and I know also that the hon. member for Saint-Jacques (Mr. Rinfret) is also interested in seeing that project carried out—

Mr. Valade: Mr. Chairman, on a point of order. In my remarks yesterday, I was referring to the hon. member for Saint-Jacques, and the acting chairman of the committee interrupted me to say that I could not do so. So, I do not see why the hon. member for Saint-Denis (Mr. Prud'homme) would be allowed to make the same remarks I was not allowed to make myself.

Mr. Chairman, I feel that the remarks of the hon. member for Saint-Denis should be examined. However, I do not think the matter is very important and the hon. member seems to forget that the city of Montreal has presented an ultimatum to the present government, because the municipal budget for the current fiscal year depends on the government's decision in this respect. If the city of Montreal has some plans concerning the site, it must wait if it does not know the final decision of the government.

On the other hand, the contractors who are getting used to delays in official decisions will not commit themselves to undertake these major projects without knowing exactly what the decisions are.

I believe that this project will be carried out, but when? In one year, five years, ten years, 20 years? That is the question, and until the government makes a formal decision, until they tell us that this project will be carried out within a certain reasonable length of time, I believe that investors will hesitate to invest any money in this area of the city of Montreal and will not be able to make a definite decision.

• (4:20 p.m.)

The chairman of the Montreal executive council, in reply to my friend from Saint-Denis, had made the following remark when the then Secretary of State visited Montreal and had just announced that the government had decided to postpone for a year the execution of the contract.

For the information of my good friend and as can be found in *La Presse* of September 14, 1965, Mr. Saulnier would have said at the press conference of the former Secretary of State, after his statement at city hall, and I quote:

> He reminded Mr. Lamontagne that official statements like the one made today about the projects of the C.B.C. in Montreal are starting to become a fine tradition.

Those are comments of the chairman of the Montreal executive council, who has the responsibility of looking after execution of the project.

I find that, in spite of my requests for information in this house, in an effort to discharge my responsibilities to the riding directly concerned in this endeavour, the minister persists in refusing to give the people any assurance that the project will be implemented within a certain time limit. I fail to see why the Secretary of State could not commit herself to the extent of promising a statement on the matter within the next few weeks, or possibly a month, so that by that time we might at long last know the decision of the government.

Should the project be postponed for a year, I would consider it a great disadvantage but

at least the authorities of the city of Montreal, the investors, the businessmen, in short, the whole population could act accordingly and would surely not venture in developments and undertakings the success of which precisely depends on the implementation of that project.

I wonder why the government refuses to give an undertaking. For my part, I think I have accomplished here the duty for which I was elected, that is to see to it that the government respects its obligations. If the minister does not want to give a further undertaking, there will be only one course left open to me, that is to inform the population through all available media, that the government and the Secretary of State would not respect the undertakings of the former Secretary of State and that we will have to await further promises which, apparently, will not be worth more than those of the past.

I wonder whether the minister could not treat with a little more fairness the population of Montreal which has been faithful to the Liberal party, a faithfulness which is deplorable unfortunately, but which was nevertheless given to the Liberal party. If it were only for this reason, the minister should be more grateful and should now tell the people who showed so much loyalty what the present government intends to do in the metropolitan area.

[*English*]

The Chairman: Shall vote No. 1 carry?

Some hon. Members: Carried.

Mr. Valade: Then the answer is no.

Item agreed to.

PATENT AND COPYRIGHT

20. Patent division, copyright and industrial designs division and trade marks office including contributions to the International Office for the Protection of Literary and Artistic Works and the International Office for the Protection of Industrial Property and authority for the Governor in Council, notwithstanding the Patent Act, to prescribe the fees payable for the registration of assignments and other documents, which fees shall be deemed for the purposes of the Patent Act to be the fees set forth in section 75 thereof, $3,171,900.

Mr. McIntosh: Mr. Chairman, I just want to say one word before the whole of the estimates are carried. We on the opposition side do want to respond to the plea of the government to pass these estimates as soon as possible. However, I now feel that we have been misled. Before the estimates of the C.B.C. come before us next time, I want to say that I am going to move a motion that they be reduced to one dollar.

Item agreed to.

NATIONAL FILM BOARD

5. Acquisition of equipment, $407,700.

Mr. Herridge: Mr. Chairman, I just want to say a word or two before the estimates for the National Film Board are carried; I was called away in a hurry.

I should just like to ask the minister whether she could tell us how that film to which all Canadians are looking forward on the Kootenay and Columbia region is progressing, and when can we expect the preview of the same?

Miss LaMarsh: Mr. Chairman, I am sorry but I have not heard of the film before. However, if it is anything like the still pictures which my hon. friend has in his office of that very beautiful area, I know that the film could be nothing less than successful in its concept, its design and its reception.

Item agreed to.

The Chairman: This completes the estimates of the Department of the Secretary of State.

The committee will now proceed to the consideration of the estimates of the Royal Canadian Mounted Police.

ROYAL CANADIAN MOUNTED POLICE

1. Administration, operation and maintenance including grants as detailed in the estimates and pensions to families of members of the Royal Canadian Mounted Police who have lost their lives while on duty, $64,370,494.

The Chairman: Estimates of the Royal Canadian Mounted Police, vote No. 1. Shall vote No. 1 carry?

Mr. Brewin: Mr. Chairman, on discussion of these estimates I wish to raise the case of an Ottawa businessman who, in my opinion, has suffered a serious injustice. I do not apologize for any criticism of the Royal Canadian Mounted Police or of the Department of Justice, because in my view the excellent reputation of the force can be maintained only if we in this house are frank and fearless in our criticism in cases where we believe the high standards of the force have not been maintained.

• (4:30 p.m.)

I want to discuss the case of a Mr. David Maunder, an Ottawa businessman. He is 36 years old, married, three children, a former

Canadian army officer who was cleared while in the army to handle top secret information. In 1962 Mr. Maunder, who was in the export business, was approached by the commercial counsellor of the embassy of the U.S.S.R., and this commercial counsellor sought to arrange the export of certain articles to that country. Mr. Maunder at once telephoned the Royal Canadian Mounted Police. A constable contacted him immediately and after discussion told him to go ahead with meetings arranged with the representative of the embassy of the U.S.S.R. As these meetings developed, Mr. Chairman, Mr. Maunder gave to this representative of the R.C.M.P. full accounts of his discussions with the Russian representative and he furnished him copies of all invoices, and other documents.

Initially the shipments were made to Russia directly, but later, difficulties were encountered in getting permits under the Export and Import Permits Act. Mr. Maunder was advised by his own lawyer that there was a loophole about which I will not go into details, which involved shipping goods to Ireland, to be transshipped later to the U.S.S.R. He swore at the trial, which I will come to, that he discussed this proposed loophole with the R.C.M.P. constable, and asked him to check into its legality. The constable returned and told him that the loophole had been found in the act, and that he should proceed in the normal business manner.

At this stage I must say, and I do not want to spin it out, for the sake of completeness that he had had previous dealings with the export of goods to Cuba without the prior knowledge of the R.C.M.P. However, he says that he informed the R.C.M.P. of this, and was told that they were not interested.

On May 28, 1963, all the company's records were seized by officers of the Customs Investigation Branch, in co-operation with the R.C.M.P. The Russian Embassy staff members who had been involved in this matter were sent back to the U.S.S.R., and after more than one year's delay Mr. Maunder was arrested and charged with 12 breaches of the Export and Import Permits Act. Three charges were withdrawn. He was acquitted on one and found guilty on eight counts. He was sentenced to a fine of $41,000 or three years in jail, which was later reduced by the Court of Appeal to $16,000 or 18 months.

Mr. Maunder was unable to pay his fine and he served nine months in jail. He has recently been released on parole. His business, as the committee will well understand, has been completely ruined.

At the trial he gave evidence of his dealings with the R.C.M.P. I have a transcript of the evidence given at the trial. In that, the Crown took the view that the discussions he had with the R.C.M.P. were irrelevant. Nevertheless, he was subjected to cross-examination, and his story in respect to his full disclosure of the Russian transactions, to the R.C.M.P., was neither shaken nor contradicted.

At no stage does it appear that the Crown requested that in considering an appropriate sentence, Mr. Maunder's actions in informing the security branch of the R.C.M.P. of his Russian dealings should be taken into account.

On September 23, 1965, Mr. Maunder wrote to the Prime Minister reminding him of his statement in another case, that the action of a person who gave information relating to a security matter to the R.C.M.P. should be praised and not censured; that there would be no question of prosecution. This is related to another case.

The text of the Prime Minister's remarks will be found in *Hansard*, May 11, 1965, at page 1139.

In his letter to the Prime Minister Mr. Maunder recounted the fact that his dealings with the U.S.S.R. had been fully disclosed to the R.C.M.P. and all documents placed at their disposal. In his letter he said, and I adopt Mr. Maunder's words, as he wrote them to the Prime Minister:

> I cannot believe that persecution, prosecution, incarceration and financial ruin are just rewards for the service which I have given my country with the full knowledge of the Department of Justice through the R.C.M.P. Should you wish to corroborate any of the statements contained herein the R.C.M.P. records will substantiate what I have pointed out. The transcript of the trial of course bears my own testimony under oath.

No reply, Mr. Chairman, was received from the Prime Minister to this letter, or from anyone on behalf of the Prime Minister.

I have discussed this matter with the Solicitor General, who will no doubt make his own statement in regard thereto. Although I do not believe that there will be any denial that Mr. Maunder did consult the R.C.M.P. about his dealings with the U.S.S.R. It may be denied that the R.C.M.P. were aware of or authorized in any shape or form the illegality of his action under the Export and Import Permits Act.

It is very strange, Mr. Chairman, that if Maunder's version is not correct, this was not raised at the trial or in cross-examination or in some reply to his letter to the Prime Minister. I remind the committee that he swore this in court, that he was under cross-examination, and that he had written to the Prime Minister, setting out this story, and there was absolutely no denial or contradiction of his statements. Without the production of the records of the R.C.M.P. it may be difficult to assess whether his statement is fully correct. I know it is correct in some particulars.

I bring this matter forward because it seems to me that it is a shocking case of lack of sensitivity to the rights of individuals. It is not the duty of the prosecution to hide extenuating factors. Indeed, as I understand it, it is their duty to put them forward. It is not enough to say, as counsel for the crown said at the hearing, that the dealings of Mr. Maunder with the R.C.M.P. were with the branch that deals with security and that the prosecutions were the responsibility of another branch dealing with export and import matters. The excuse that the right hand does not know what the left hand is doing is, under these circumstances, not good enough.

In my view the treatment of Mr. Maunder does not live up to the high standards of justice in this country. I ask, what sort of impression does this story leave on those who may be considering whether they should co-operate with the R.C.M.P. in security matters.

The seizure of his books, which were not returned to him until very recently after I spoke to the Solicitor General and then only in part, seems to me to have been in clear disregard of the provisions of the Criminal Code. The books were only returned recently, and many of the documents were found to be missing.

Mr. Chairman, Mr. Maunder has paid a heavy penalty, a very heavy penalty for offences which in the light of his co-operation with the R.C.M.P. might well have been treated as minor, or at least visited with a modest penalty. He is a young man, a former officer in the army, and his reward for co-operation in the field of security has been the ruination of his business, the ruin of his reputation and a substantial term of imprisonment.

An hon. Member: Perhaps the Prime Minister would phone him.

Mr. Brewin: Mr. Chairman, I suggest that this case underlines the necessity for the creation of the office of ombudsman. As a member of parliament I do not have access to the documents of the R.C.M.P., but an ombudsman I take it, would have the right to look at this information and determine whether or not a grave injustice had been done.

Mr. Chairman, I urge even at this late date that a full and proper inquiry be undertaken by an impartial authority. If it is found that an injustice has been done, his name can be cleared by a statement that he is a loyal citizen who co-operated with security officers, deserving, in the Prime Minister's words: "praise and not censure." I suggest that some form of assistance might be made available to him to help him recover from the tragic position in which he has been put if not with the encouragement, at least with the connivance, of one branch of the law enforcement officers of the R.C.M.P.

I hope that the minister will look into this matter very seriously, and make sure that an injustice has not been done.

Mr. Pennell: Mr. Chairman, I will certainly take any suggestions coming from the hon. member for Greenwood seriously. I take no exception to his raising this point, because I know that he has a genuine and deepseated feeling for the rights of the individual. However, I must say, with respect, that I cannot accept all the implications that he left during the course of his remarks.

• (4:40 p.m.)

I must say that in the brief time I have had the privilege of being the minister responsible in the house for the R.C.M.P. I have found them fair, efficient and courteous. I hope I do not appear to be taking flight from the question but I think it is clear that a full discussion of this matter might carry us into the sensitive area of security. I can only say this—as I told the hon. member, who was courteous enough to come to me privately—that I have conducted some investigations and the information coming to me does not confirm the submissions he has made today. I cannot give the full undertaking that he has suggested, but I would give an undertaking to look at the files closely again.

Mr. Herridge: I asked the Solicitor General some questions when the estimates were before the house. Is he able to answer them today?

Mr. Pennell: Yes, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Herridge: They concerned my beloved S.I.U.

Mr. Pennell: The hon. member for Kootenay West raised questions about the status of certain investigations being conducted by the R.C.M.P. into S.I.U. activities. I can assure him that the measures, which were brought to a halt by certain court actions, have now been reactivated. A large volume of documents has been put back into the possession of the R.C.M.P. Obviously, there will have to be a thorough examination of these documents to determine in which direction further steps are to be taken.

I believe the hon. member also asked whether special counsel had been engaged in this case. Though I speak from memory, I feel quite sure that the special counsel who was originally engaged in these matters is still being retained. All the relevant documents are being placed in his posssesion and the matter is being vigorously pursued.

Mr. Herridge: Has the attorney general of Quebec shown any interest in this case?

Mr. Pennell: I believe there were some consultations between the Department of Justice and the Quebec authorities, but since the conduct of this matter fell upon the federal authorities we are continuing to act.

Mr. Herridge: One other question; I suggested that this Mr. Heakes be given an opportunity to present his case to the officials of the department, in view of developments since the last occasion on which he had an opportunity to discuss the matter with them.

Mr. Pennell: I apologize to the hon. member for Kootenay West. I am not familiar with the point he has just raised. I do not wish to appear to avoid it, and I would be glad to look into the matter if the hon. member would consult with me privately.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Caouette: Mr. Chairman, I wish to ask the Solicitor General just one question.

This morning I received the following telegram:

[*English*]

Sir, request judicial inquiry into my case and that I be called to testify in security inquiry
Calvin M. MacDonald Ex R.C.M.P. under cover agent.

[*Translation*]

Does the minister intend to examine the possibility of granting Mr. MacDonald this judicial inquiry and allowing him to give evidence during the inquiry on national security, so that he may be treated equitably?

[*English*]

Mr. Pennell: I was not aware that any such telegram had arrived at my office up to the time I entered the house this afternoon. Of course, I cannot give any undertaking until I have had an opportunity to acquaint myself with the facts.

Mr. Brewin: I wish to thank the minister for his statement about the Maunder case. I urge that the inquiry go into the original records of what took place at the time. Here is a clear case of a conflict of view, and without a searching examination it might be impossible to determine the accuracy of Mr. Maunder's allegations on the one hand, and the apparent denial on the other.

Mr. Pennell: So there should be no misunderstanding, the inquiry to which I referred today will be a personal one carried out with legal advisers and the assistance of the Department of Justice. I will look up all the files and I would have to determine at that stage what other action should be taken.

Mr. Gilbert: I wish to ask the Solicitor General one short question. I should like to know whether he is planning to set up a separate branch in the R.C.M.P. to deal with the investigation of fraudulent bankruptcies in much the same way as there is a separate branch dealing with narcotics cases.

Mr. Pennell: I can tell the hon. member with complete sincerity that I have had discussions along this line with officials of the R.C.M.P. and the Department of Justice, but no final conclusion has yet been reached. The Minister of Justice announced the other day, I believe, that there was a development within his department relating to the setting up of a squad for bankruptcy investigations. We are having discussions now to see how the R.C.M.P. can work with the squad which will be set up within the Department of Justice.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Caouette: Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the Solicitor General this last question. According to the statements made by the Quebec Minister of Justice, Mr. Claude Wagner, who complains that the R.C.M.P. does not co-operate with the Quebec Department of Justice, can the Solicitor General tell

the house what action he has taken with regard to those complaints from the province of Quebec?

Is the R.C.M.P. working openly and co-operating wholeheartedly with the various police forces or the Department of Justice of the province of Quebec?

It is very important that there should be some understanding and liaison between the various law enforcement agencies in Canada, for instance between the Quebec Provincial Police, the R.C.M.P. and even the municipal police forces. There must be some co-ordination in the administration of justice, not only in Quebec but throughout the country.

But with regard to the matter which is of particular interest to us—because the complaints came directly from the Quebec Minister of Justice and the Solicitor General and high officials of the R.C.M.P. are aware of them—is the department taking action to ensure greater co-operation and understanding between the R.C.M.P. and the Quebec Department of Justice?

[*English*]

Mr. Pennell: I made inquiries along these lines following the federal-provincial conference on crime. I was very impressed by the report I received that at the working level there was very good co-operation between the members of the forces. Following that conference, a committee was set up by the representatives of the governments concerned, of the Quebec provincial police, the Ontario provincial police and the R.C.M.P., to see how they could work in close co-operation with regard to a central intelligence bureau. This committee has met at least twice. There was to have been a third meeting last week but it was postponed because certain officers had to be here for the estimates. I understand these meetings will be resumed very shortly.

The Chairman: Shall item 1 carry?

Some hon. Members: Carried.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Caouette: Mr. Chairman, I rise on a point of order. When you called vote No. 1, you did not notice that the hon. member for Trois-Rivières (Mr. Mongrain) was up and that he had something to say or questions to ask probably on that item.

[*English*]

The Chairman: I apologize to the hon. member for Trois-Rivières. I call on the hon. member for Trois-Rivières.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Mongrain: Mr. Chairman, I cannot blame you because we, independents, are far removed from you and have not learned as yet how to indicate our presence by noisy interventions, but we will.

I should not like to extend the debate, nor make the life of the Solicitor General more difficult because I know that it is not easy, but there is a principle at stake in the question I should like to put to him.

A few weeks ago I wrote to the Minister of Justice, but I am under the impression that my letter was passed to the Solicitor General.

I pointed out the case of a citizen from Trois-Rivières, who was taken to the R.C.M.P.'s office a few weeks ago and kept there for about 12 hours. In the course of the interrogation, even though that citizen was only in custody because no charges had been laid, and he had to be presumed innocent, until further proof to the contrary, he was beaten up to such a degree that he lost consciousness and had to be under the doctor's care.

I know the Solicitor General would not tolerate that treatment known as the third degree, which goes back to the middle ages. I known it is no longer permitted in the R.C.M.P.

If I raise the question, it is not so much to insist upon an immediate answer from the minister, because it is my impression that an inquiry is being made about that. I merely ask the minister to give strict instructions to all members of the R.C.M.P. so that no rough treatment be given to persons suspected of wrong-doing, even if they are found guilty, but above all if they have not been proven guilty. This is quite unacceptable.

I wish to insist on a letter I wrote asking that an inquiry be made and, if the prisoner is found guilty, as I think he will be, that sanctions be applied, and also that strict and clear instructions be given to the whole R.C.M.P. so that rough bodily treatment be prohibited when constables have to question someone who is merely a suspect and could very well be innocent.

• (4:50 p.m.)

[*English*]

Mr. Pennell: Mr. Chairman, I am certainly concerned at a suggestion that a citizen was held by the R.C.M.P., questioned for some time and not charged. The allegation that he was struck adds to my concern, and I shall certainly look into the matter.

The Chairman: Shall vote No. 1 carry?

Some hon. Members: Carried.

Item agreed to.

The Chairman: This completes the estimates of the R.C.M.P.

Mr. Pennell: I thank the committee, Mr. Chairman, and I am sure all members will agree it was not a design on my part that these estimates should be overlooked so that the debate could be prolonged.

The Chairman: The committee will now proceed to the estimates of the Department of Fisheries.

DEPARTMENT OF FISHERIES

1. Departmental administration including grants and contributions as detailed in the estimates, $1,387,000.

The Chairman: Shall vote No. 1 carry?

Mr. Barnett: Mr. Chairman, I thought the Minister of Fisheries would make an introductory statement.

Mr. Robichaud: Mr. Chairman, following a commitment made during the question period I wish to correct a C.B.C. news report this morning which said that the quota of 50,000 seals had been filled last night. This is not true. I immediately asked officials of my department to contact the C.B.C. and ask them to make a correction. At noon I listened to the C.B.C. news again, but unfortunately the correction was not made. At 2 p.m. I contacted the area director in charge of the sealing operations and I was informed the quota of 50,000 seals would be reached before dusk this evening. I immediately issued instructions to close the season on white coat seals at the end of operations on this day.

Mr. Barnett: Mr. Chairman, according to the rules we have about two and a half minutes to deal with this department. I have no desire to make an examination in detail of its operations, something which could better be done when discussing the estimates for the next fiscal year in the committee to which those estimates will be sent. But there are certain aspects of the department, in relation to the picture which it occupies in the minds of the government as a whole, that require urgent discussion before the current estimates are passed. A rather gratuitous contribution to the discussion in this chamber last night by the government house leader stole a bit of my thunder in this connection. However, since the government took office I have become increasingly concerned that the Department of Fisheries seems to be an orphan among all the government departments. Matters concerning fisheries resources and potential fishery resources apparently receive little attention from the government.

[The Chairman.]

I have before me a copy of the Canada Year Book for 1961, and at page 596, under the heading "Commercial Fishery Resources" I find these words:

> The waters of two mighty oceans—the Atlantic and the Pacific—and the most extensive inland system of rivers and lakes in the world provide Canada's fishermen with valuable harvests. The annual catch of some 2,000,000,000 lb. of fish and shellfish has a marketed value of more than $200,000,000.

In the 1962 Canada Year Book, at page 568, under the same heading I find these words:

> The waters of two mighty oceans—the Atlantic and the Pacific—and the most extensive inland system of rivers and lakes in the world provide Canada's fishermen with valuable harvests. The annual catch of some 2,000,000,000 lb. of fish and shellfish has a marketed value of more than $200,000,000.

At page 606 of the 1963-4 Canada Year Book I find the following words:

> Canadian fishermen reap the harvests of two mighty oceans—the Atlantic and Pacific—and the most extensive inland system of rivers and lakes in the world. The annual catch of some 2,000,000,000 lb. of fish has a marketed value of more than $200,000,000.

• (5:00 p.m.)

Then, in the Canada Year Book for the year 1965 at page 622, under the heading Commercial Fishing and Marketing, I find the following words:

> Canadian fishermen reap large harvests from two mighty oceans—the Atlantic and the Pacific—and from the most extensive system of lakes and rivers in the world. The annual catch amounts to some 2,000,000,000 pounds of fish and shellfish, which has a total marketed value of about $250,000,000.

Mr. Chairman, I suppose I should have brought down a somewhat larger number of issues of the Canada Year Book, but they are rather heavy volumes. What I should like to do is send to every member of the present government a copy of the Canada Year Book with the suggestion that they read the section concering commercial fisheries, because it is becoming increasingly evident to me that most of the members of this government do not know we have an Atlantic and a Pacific ocean as well as the largest system of inland rivers and lakes in the world, at least in so far as it is evident in the activities and the policies of the Canadian government. I only wish they would take the trouble to realize that, in addition to having quite a number of

acres of land we are a nation, because of our geographic arrangement, which has some pretty important resources potentially available to us. By and large, however, these resources are receiving very little attention from the Canadian government.

Mr. Chairman, not very long ago a delegation visited us here representing some of the fishermen of my own province of British Columbia. They presented, distributed and discussed with many members of this house a brief entitled "Crisis in the British Columbia Fishing Industry". They outlined at considerable length, using a considerable number of statistics, the situation in respect of fishing on the Pacific coast. Fishermen's Union of British Columbia is not the only organization in Canada which takes some interest in where we are heading with regard to our fisheries; there is another organization. I have one or two documents here from this organization, which is called the Fisheries Council of Canada. The views of this council and those of the Fishermen's Union do not always coincide in all respects, but there are some important areas in which there is pretty close agreement and outlook.

I am going to confine myself, so far as my remarks today are concerned, to the context of our fisheries in relation to the dealings of the government particularly with regard to our outside waters and what is being done to protect and conserve Canada's position as a fishing nation in the world. In its bulletin of January 1966, the Fisheries Council of Canada says in part:

> What this industry had hoped to read, somewhere in the Speech from the Throne, which was read on January 18 on the opening of Canada's 27th Parliament, was something of this order: "My government will recommend to parliament further measures calculated to give effect to Bill S-17 "An Act respecting the Territorial Sea and Fishing Zones of Canada", which parliament passed in 1964. Our object must be, without undue delay, to protect Canada's fisheries for Canadian fishermen.

Then, a little later on in their review of what should be in the Speech from the Throne, they have this to say:

> Among other measures, my government will propose a comprehensive program for the greater development of the salmon resources of our Pacific coast.

Well, Mr. Chairman, the Fishermen's Union brief had quite a lot to say about what is happening to the fisheries resources on the Pacific coast, in particular with reference to the situation arising out of the international North Pacific Fisheries Commission, its operations and the state of the negotiations surrounding that treaty. They point out that this salmon fishery, which is a high seas fishery, did not exist until 1952 and began following the signing of the Norpac Treaty between Canada, Japan and the United States of America. They point out further that from that time this fishery increased from 11.1 million pounds in 1951 to a peak of 438.4 million pounds in 1958. That is the amount taken by the Japanese in the mid-Pacific salmon fishery. Since then, it has tapered off due to a general decline in both Asian and North American salmon resources.

The brief points out that Dr. W. Royce, director of the Fisheries Research Institute of the University of Washington College of Fisheries, speaking in Seattle on March 17, 1964, described this rape of North Pacific salmon resources as "intense, continuing, wasteful fishing by methods which largely prevent any special protection of weak runs".

Mr. Chairman, I should like to make a brief reference to the situation in which we find ourselves at the moment. I am going to quote from the statement that was issued following the twelfth annual meeting of the commission in Seattle last November 12:

> The matter of the high seas salmon fishery in the area of intermingling of Asian and North American stocks west of 175 degrees west longitude was discussed. No agreement was reached concerning this problem.

Mr. Chairman, this is a situation in respect of which there appears to be very little action and very little interest on the part of the Canadian government. We have a Secretary of State for External Affairs in this country. He concerns himself, of course, with a broad variety of questions. He makes fairly lengthy statements from time to time on such questions as Viet Nam and our future relations with the United Nations.

Just before the minister leaves the house for a very important appointment, I am sure, I should like to suggest to him that if he cannot find the time and the energy to deal with some of these other very important national problems involving the economic future of this country and its welfare, perhaps he should suggest to the Prime Minister that he needs an associate minister such as there is in the Department of National Defence. Then, perhaps we can get greater attention paid to some of these problems. There is another aspect of our international relations with which I intend to deal. I wish to point out, in connection with the 12 mile fishing

zone and the minister's recent visit to Washington, that the *Globe and Mail* of February 21, 1966, reports Mr. Martin as saying he made some progress on the problem of Canada's 12 mile fishing limit with adjacent United States waters. I do not know whether or not it is fair to judge the relative importance which the minister attaches to certain subjects in his mind by the length of the statements he makes about them, but if this is an illustration of how important this matter is in the minister's mind, then I would suggest it is a very long way down on the totem pole.

• (5:10 p.m.)

Mr. Martin (Essex East): May I assure my hon. friend that this question is a matter of great importance, and I share his view of that importance.

Mr. Barnett: Mr. Chairman, I know we can always enjoy the words of the Secretary of State for External Affairs, but I am much more concerned at the moment to have some more tangible evidence of his interest than has been given to this house in response to questions.

However, Mr. Chairman, just to get on with this matter of the 12 mile fishing limit, I should like to draw the committee's attention to a brief which was submitted on January 28, 1963 by the Fisheries Council of Canada in which they set forth their conclusion. It reads in part as follows:

> Action by the Government of Canada is required to:
>
> 1. declare certain bodies of water as Canadian national waters,—

I should like the minister to note the priority given to that statement. Then, I continue:

> 2. establish a straight base line to enclose the national waters,
>
> 3. proclaim an exclusive fishing zone to seaward of the base line,—

Then, the Council talks about recognizing and negotiating historic treaty fishing rights. They state:

> 5. make a unilateral declaration with regard to the aforesaid decisions, and
>
> 6. enforce the above progressive steps.

That was in January of 1963. On June 4, 1963 the Prime Minister made a statement in this house on motions in which he said:

> In the light of the failure of efforts to bring about an agreement on the breadth of the territorial sea and the contiguous fishing zone, the government has decided, after careful deliberation, that the time has come to take firm action to protect Canada's fishing industry. It is well known that foreign fishing operations off Canada's east coast, which have increased enormously over the past five years, are not only depleting our offshore fisheries resources but are posing other problems. There are indications also that Canada's west coast fisheries may soon be threatened.

Some events that have occurred since 1963 confirm the statement made by the Prime Minister at that time.

A little later in his statement, the Prime Minister said:

> With these considerations in mind the Canadian government has decided to establish a 12 mile exclusive fisheries zone along the whole of Canada's coast line as of mid-May, 1964, and to implement the straight base line system at the same time as the basis from which Canada's territorial sea and exclusive fisheries zone shall be measured.

That was on June 4, 1963. The Territorial Sea and Fishing Zones Act was assented to on July 16, 1964, somewhat over a year later, and was proclaimed on July 23 of that year. I should like to ask why it is that the government, has not fulfilled, either in that bill or up until this day, the statement the Prime Minister made on June 4, 1963, in which he said:

> —and to implement the straight base line system at the same time as the basis from which Canada's territorial sea and exclusive fisheries zone shall be measured.

I responded to the Prime Minister's statement at that time and said:

> —we welcome the announcement made by the Prime Minister.
>
> We are, of course, concerned even more with the details of the manner in which the government intends to work out this proposal and what its end result will be—

I suggest that my hedging of the commendation at that time was very well founded, in view of events which have taken place since then.

We still have nothing more from the Secretary of State for External Affairs than the statement he made in Washington on February 20 or 21 that some progress had been made on the problem of Canada's 12 mile fishing limit with adjacent United States waters. I understood that to mean some progress on the question of establishing straight base lines.

Mr. Martin (Essex East): That is right.

Mr. Barnett: But on June 4, 1963 the Prime Minister informed this house that the government would establish these straight base lines at the same time they established a 12 mile territorial fishing zone. Today is March 9, 1966 and this has not yet been done.

The events that have been transpiring in respect of our negotiations on north Pacific fisheries, the events that have been transpiring in respect of this complete about face, which is all I can call it in light of the Prime Minister's words, in the intentions of the government regarding the establishment of base lines and a territorial sea, can only lead one, after a lapse of this time, to ask why. Is it only because of a complete lack of interest on the part of the government regarding this question?

Mr. Martin (Essex East): Certainly not.

Mr. Barnett: Is there something more sinister involved than a lack of interest? Is this part of a deliberate deal by the government to sell out Canada's potential fisheries resources?

Mr. Martin (Essex East): Certainly not.

Mr. Barnett: Is this part of a deal to sell out the wealth of the two oceans? Is this part of some broader deal? If the Minister of National Defence were here I would ask him if this were part of some deal involving defence commitments.

Mr. Martin (Essex East): Certainly not.

Mr Barnett: I should like to ask the Minister of Finance whether this is mixed up somehow with our negotiations on the Canada-U.S. auto trade package.

Mr. Martin (Essex East): Certainly not.

Mr. Barnett: I should like to ask the Minister of Trade and Commerce whether this refusal on the part of the government as a whole to do something along the lines the Prime Minister suggested in 1963, and again in the election campaign that preceded that time, is part of some kind of deal. If it is, it is not without precedent in the history of this country.

The Secretary of State for External Affairs may recall that when the bill on the territorial sea was before the committee I referred to some of the old treaties between Great Britain and the United States. In many of these treaties this fisheries picture was treated as part of a package deal. The reason the United States now has these lop-sided treaty rights and historic rights is that years ago, in some of these package deals, the interests of Canadian fisheries were ignored. The negotiating authorities did not properly recognize the potential wealth which we might in Canada enjoy as a result of our geographic relationship to the rich producing areas of the oceans. The interests of Canadian fisheries were shoved aside because of some other matters that apparently were considered more important.

This was probably the result of Britain's strategic commitments in those days on the continent of Europe. I hope the fact that we are now a member of the NATO partnership does not mean our government is passing by our real interests in this economic field because of some strategic commitment in Europe.

Mr. Chairman, this is the kind of question this government should answer before we pass those fisheries estimates. Perhaps it is not the kind of question that the Minister of Fisheries alone can answer. As far as I am concerned, I share the admiration of the minister for the kind of Canadians we have manning and operating our fisheries department, and for the kind of scientists we have who are attempting to enlarge the field of knowledge which will enable us to conserve, protect and extend our resources in the salmon spawning streams of British Columbia.

• (5:20 p.m.)

Unless there is some real recognition of the importance of this industry by people like the Minister of Industry and the government as a whole, we shall have to begin asking ourselves whether it is worth while spending even these few paltry millions of dollars a year that are in the fisheries estimates to develop, conserve and expand salmon production so it can disappear in the high seas of the North Pacific.

These are the kind of questions to which we need answers but to which answers have not yet been given. I do not know that there is much more I can add, Mr. Chairman, to what I have said on this point. In conclusion I wish to say, as I said last night, that this business of putting off consideration of the estimates and of the future of the fisheries resources of Canada to the eleventh and the dying hour of our consideration of estimates is just not good enough. There should be ample time, not only for an opposition member who happens to come from an area where fisheries are important to contribute to this discussion, but there should be an opportunity for members from the province of Newfoundland to have their day in court.

These hon. members should not feel constrained by the whip of the government house leader to remain silent when we are discussing important matters of this kind. It is perhaps unfortunate, if this is the way in

which the business of the house is going to be managed, that all the members from the province of Newfoundland happen to sit on the government side of the house where they are subject to that kind of throttling. I suggest that we should hear their views about the fisheries problems of the Atlantic coast.

We should hear from members from the maritime provinces and the province of Quebec on the question of fisheries. This strange silence today on the part of representatives of provinces such as Nova Scotia, New Brunswick and Prince Edward Island, where all the members do not sit on the government side of the house, is passing strange. I hope that before these estimates are passed—

Mr. Crouse: Mr. Chairman, I rise on a question of privilege. The hon. member who is now speaking has referred to the maritime provinces and the fact that members from those provinces have not participated in the study of the fisheries estimates. I point out to him that those of us who represent the province of Nova Scotia, and in fact members from all the maritime provinces, are just as aware of the problems facing the fishing industry as he is, but we are also desirous of assisting the government in the present situation.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Crouse: It is for this reason, and this reason alone, that we have refrained from participating in this debate. I appreciate the hon. member's position and the fact that he wants to get his points on the record. We are refraining from participation in order to allow the hon. member and his party to make the points they wish to make. We hope to make these points at a later date. But I do hope the hon. member will confine himself to the area and the party that he represents, and will make the points he wishes to make, so that the committee can get on with the business of the house and pass these estimates fairly quickly.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

The Chairman: Order. I must advise the hon. member for Comox-Alberni that his time has expired. The Chair is also in some doubt—

Mr. Barnett: On a point of order, Mr. Chairman, could I—

The Chairman: One moment, please. The Chair is also in doubt as to the method to be used at this time to regularize our proceedings.

[Mr. Barnett.]

Mr. McIlraith: Mr. Chairman, I wonder whether it would be agreeable if we just do not see the clock. I think in the circumstances that would probably be the fairest procedure. I should like to add that if the hon. member wishes to continue, I am sure the committee is agreeable to allowing him to complete his remarks.

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

The Chairman: Order. Does the committee agree that we proceed without seeing the clock?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

The Chairman: Does the committee also give unanimous consent to the hon. member for Comox-Alberni continuing his remarks?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Mr. Douglas: The hon. member does not need it, Mr. Chairman. He has been interrupted by two different speakers and has a perfect right to speak.

Mr. Starr: On a point of order, Mr. Chairman, I think the hon. member for Burnaby-Coquitlam has not the proper perspective of the way in which we proceed. After all, they were questions of privilege that were raised, not interruptions of the hon. member's remarks.

Mr. Douglas: Mr. Chairman, if you can see any question of privilege in the last interruption I am sure you have greater sagacity than anybody else.

Mr. Starr: It was much more a question of privilege than your interruption.

Mr. Barnett: Mr. Chairman, may I assure you that I was on the point of concluding my remarks, in any event, before I was interrupted by the hon. member for Queens-Lunenburg. I certainly recognize his right of decision about whether he participates in the debate. That is entirely a matter for his own judgment. However, I do not agree with the hon. member's contention that I should confine my remarks merely to the interests of my constituents. I am trying to put this matter in national perspective.

Mr. Monteith: Oh, sit down.

Mr. Barnett: If the hon. member for Queens-Lunenburg or any other member of this house does not wish to participate in this discussion, it is entirely their right to so decide. In conclusion, Mr. Chairman, I do hope it was not implied in the remarks made by the hon. member for Queens-Lunenburg

that he disagrees completely with the arguments I was advancing with regard to the lack of interest being displayed by the government of Canada as a whole in their dealings with fisheries problems.

I hope that he and other members of the house who have some reason to be interested in the future of the fisheries of Canada will perhaps, on a future occasion, display more backbone in discussing these questions and in challenging the government to take decisive action, than they displayed when some of us were trying to introduce an effective bill in respect of the 12-mile fishing zone.

Item agreed to.

Fisheries management and development—
5. Operation and maintenance including Canada's share of the expenses of the international commissions detailed in the estimates and of the costs of programs and projects shared jointly with the provinces and industry, $14,557,000.

Mr. Johnston: Mr. Chairman, I should like to intervene just briefly in this debate. I too, heard the very able presentation made by the United Fishermen and Allied Workers' Union delegation that came to Ottawa. The matter that concerns me about that brief—and this was alluded to by the previous speaker—is the way in which the causes of the decline in the salmon fishery were categorized therein. The question of Japanese fishing on the high seas was placed at the beginning of the causes. I asked the spokesman for the delegation, Mr. Stevens, whether they had placed it there because it was the most important reason. He said no, he could not say that it was the most important factor in the decline of this fishery.

• (5:30 p.m.)

I also asked him if he did not feel that salmon fishing in the Soviet Union was suffering probably more than the Canadian fishery, and that this might be our best lever in attempting to get the Soviet Union to become a signatory to the salmon fishing treaty in the Pacific. In reply, he said that he thought it would.

I think we need to be extremely careful, when we discuss fisheries, which points we are talking about. We must remember that one is very strategically placed. The province of British Columbia has a very great interest in fisheries. It also has very great interest in trade with Japan over a great variety of areas.

I should like to urge on the Minister of Fisheries three courses of action. I would urge that the budget of the Department of Fisheries for research be raised to a level where we can begin to find some of the answers to our problems. In going back to the fishery people's own newspaper, the "Fisherman", how many times has one read that it is not known what are the factors involved; that there are a multiplicity of factors which result in the decline of salmon fishing. Japanese fishing on the high seas is only one of these factors. Therefore, I urge a much larger budget for research, which will enable the fishermen to know which are their most important problems.

I also urge the Minister of Fisheries to request the government to take every possible step to bring the Soviet Union into this fishing treaty. I do not think we should be satisfied with the reasons given earlier this session by the minister when he was questioned about this. He implied that we did not know whether the Soviet Union would want to participate in this treaty, and we would wait until we did know. I do not think we can afford to wait, Mr. Chairman.

If necessary, we should ask the co-operation of all members of the treaty to invite the Soviet Union to become a signatory. We have various levers which the other members of the treaty can use, and I am sure they would be amenable to issuing this invitation. We could then have an all-inclusive treaty participated in by all countries concerned. Surely, conservation must be of equal value to all; not just to Canada but to the United States, to Japan—a country very conservation-minded—and to the Soviet Union.

Lastly, I would urge as rapid action as possible over the headlands question or the 12-mile fishing limit, so that we can protect our fisheries to a greater extent than we have the fishery inshore. Perhaps the high seas question may take a little longer to resolve, but there are some areas where we can move more rapidly.

It seems to me that one of the reasons we press for further restrictions on Japanese fishing is this is the country which has been amenable to restrictions. In the fisherman's brief you will find a suggestion that the United States has not been amenable to conservation ideas which have been put forward by this country. The government of the Soviet Union has not been particularly amenable to conservation on the high seas or to being drawn into this type of agreement. Outside of North America, the one nation which has been amenable has been Japan.

I think we should also realize that because Japan has acceded to restrictions on their fishing in the North Pacific, they have all also had to accede to restrictions on their fishing in other areas. The justification for drawing arbitrary lines has been that they have accepted restrictions in the North Pacific. For a nation with so large a population and so many problems, the question of fishing is, to them, a very vital one, one in which they have as much interest in conservation as we have.

Item agreed to.

Fisheries research board of Canada—

25. Construction or acquisition of buildings, works, land and equipment, $2,100,000.

Mr. Howard: Just a few brief words, Mr. Chairman. This is the last vote in the estimates of this departmnet and I think it is rather regrettable that in the whole course of considering, albeit scantily, the estimates of the Department of Fisheries for this fiscal vear we have not heard a single, solitary word from the minister except when he made a correction to an erroneous newscast of this morning concerning seal hunting. In view of the important points put on the record so very ably by my hon. friend from Comox-Alberni, and also the important question just dealt with by the hon. member for Okanagan-Revelstoke concerning the relationship of the Soviet Union with the North Pacific treaty, it seems regrettable, shameful, a rather shoddy treatment of parliament and a rather callous disregard for the fishermen of this nation, for the Minister of Fisheries to sit, silent during consideration of these estimates.

In the last few years, we have seen the Department of Fisheries treated as a sort of orphan of government. On one occasion not too long ago the marine and fisheries committee made a recommendation to the house that the fisheries estimates be referred to it for study. Because of the intervention of the government, that committee report was never acted upon. Because of the approach of cabinet to the then chairman of the committee, the matter was sidetracked, indicating at that time a disregard for the desirability of considering fisheries as fully as we might.

During the current session, within the last two or three weeks we have seen on two or three occasions, to my mind, an attempt by government to push through the estimates of the Department of Fisheries without any debate. There has been an attempt to stifle consideration of these departmental estimates by the government at the very time when the delegation from the United Fishermen and Allied Workers of America were buttonholing members in the corridors and presenting their problems to them. This indicates an absolute disinterest on the part of the government, a sort of thumbing of its nose at the delegation.

Incidentally, we have seen this proposal not only emanate from the government side, but supported by the Conservative party. I say it is a shame—

Mr. Vincent: Speak for yourself.

Mr. Howard: I am telling my hon. friend what the attitude of the Conservative party was on two occasions to the estimates of the Department of Fisheries within the last two or three weeks. It was an attitude of: Let us get the fisheries estimates through without any discussion. On two occasions that has been the approach, which is a shameful commentary on both these two old parties. This is their attitude to a department which is vital, and of much concern to the welfare of fishermen on both coasts, as well as in other areas of Canada.

• (5:40 p.m.)

I hope more than anything else that when the next fiscal year starts, and I say this now because we are almost at the end of the consideration of the past year's estimates, that the Department of Fisheries' estimates will be included in the first supply motion. I hope that they will be referred to the fisheries committee for examination. I hope that when the committee looks into these matters that it will give an opportunity to people interested, to private citizens, to appear before it and express their views.

Mr. Crouse: Before the hon. minister answers the hon. member for Skeena, I want to say one or two words to impress upon him that although there are many issues that could be raised by hon. members of the Conservative party with respect to last year's estimates, in keeping with our desires to expedite the passing of these estimates we have refrained from debating them at any length at this time.

I would ask the minister if, when next year's estimates come before the house, he would give them priority and place this department high on the list so that it may be assured of early study. I ask this in view of

the fact we have dealt with last years estimates quickly, since time is pressing and they are last on the list. Second, may I ask the minister to give his assurance that next year's estimates will be referred to the committee, so that we may delve into the many problems that are affecting the fishing industry not only on the west coast, but in the Atlantic provinces and in Quebec as well.

Hon. members who represent the maritime provinces or the Atlantic provinces and Quebec, or whereever there are large fishing areas, have just as much interest in fisheries problems as others who have spoken today. We have exercised restraint, so as to expedite the passing of the estimates. However, I hope that the minister will give us an assurance that the matters I have raised will be dealt with when next year's estimates are brought before the house.

Mr. Robichaud: Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the co-operation which I have received from all sides of the house in the passing of these estimates. I am pleased to see that all hon. members understood the situation we are in. I want to assure the hon. member for Queens-Lunenburg, who has just spoken, that if his party requests of the house leader that the Department of Fisheries' estimates be included in the first list of departments to be sent to committee, we shall certainly be pleased to do this.

I want to tell the hon. member for Comox-Alberni, that I am just as anxious as he is about obtaining exclusive rights for Canadian fishermen. I hope to be in a position, when the fisheries estimates come before the committee, to be able to answer the questions which he has raised today. I hope to be in a position to answer them in a responsible way, and to answer them with all possible details.

I want to say to the hon. member for Skeena that at no time do I recall the government interfering to prevent estimates coming before the committee. I had agreed that this year's estimates, the ones we are discussing now, would be brought before the committee but this could not be done. However, I am looking forward to the meeting of the fisheries committee in the very near future.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Barnett: Mr. Chairman, I have no desire to cast any aspersion whatever on the intention of the Minister of Fisheries to have the estimates go before the fisheries committee. However, I should like to point out to you, Mr. Chairman, that the minister said the government had not interfered in any way with that intention, and that is really not in accordance with the facts. We know perfectly well that the action of the Prime Minister, as the head of the government certainly interfered with that.

Before I sit down, I should like to ask the Minister of Fisheries one question: will the Minister of Fisheries undertake to light a fire today under the tails of some of his colleagues to get them a little more interested in the important fisheries questions that should be of concern to the whole Canadian nation.

The Chairman: Shall vote 25 carry?

Item agreed to.

The Chairman: Order, please. This completes the Department of Fisheries and also the main estimates for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1966.

Resolutions adopted in committee of supply this day reported and concurred in.

WAYS AND MEANS

House in committee of ways and means, Mr. Batten in the chair.

Mr. McIlraith moved

Resolved, that towards making good the supply granted to Her Majesty on account of certain expenses of the public service for the fiscal year ending the 31st day of March, 1966, the sum of $398,062,262.60, be granted out of the Consolidated Revenue Fund of Canada.

Motion agreed to.

Resolution reported and concurred in.

Hon. G. J. McIlraith (Minister of Public Works) thereupon moved for leave to introduce Bill No. C-140, for granting to Her Majesty certain sums of money for the public service for the financial year ending the 31st March, 1966.

Motion agreed to, bill read the first and second times and the house went into committee thereon, Mr. Batten in the chair.

On clause 2—

Mr. Knowles: May I ask a question with respect to clause 2, or with respect to the bill in general. When we pass this bill are we taking any final steps that need to be taken to approve the expenditures that were made during the election period by Governor General's warrants?

• (5:50 p.m.)

Mr. Benson: The expenditures made by Governor General's warrants were, I believe,

approved in the interim supply motion which was passed previously. This bill brings us up to the end of the fiscal year. The amounts indicated there are sufficient to include all the estimates for the fiscal year.

Mr. Knowles: In any case the passing of this bill is the last act we need to perform as far as this year is concerned.

Mr. Benson: Except for Royal Assent.

Perhaps I should correct that statement. There will be final supplementary estimates for 1965-66. These will be introduced in the very near future.

Mr. Knowles: Mr. Chairman, before we end this stage of our proceedings there is one comment I should like to make. A good deal has been said about the interest of civil servants in our getting this bill through, so that there might be no delay in their getting their cheques. I agree, but I should like to say to the government that its concern for civil servants could be expressed in another way, and that is by doing something for those who have already retired.

I was sorry to hear the negative answer given today by the Prime Minister when this question was raised once again by the Leader of the Opposition. I hope that during the coming fiscal year something will be done to improve the position of our civil servants who have already retired.

Mr. Bell (Carleton): So say we all on this side.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Caouette: Mr. Chairman, about what the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Knowles) said concerning civil servants, we of the Créditistes do not always believe the government house leader when he maintains that civil servants will not get paid until the house votes the estimates.

The government and the departments keep on receiving money from the Canadian taxpayers. So stop telling us that tomorrow civil servants will not be able to get their pay. The government is perfectly able to borrow any amount of money anywhere in Canada or to call upon the Bank of Canada. Let them pay their employees and stop threatening us by saying that civil servants will not be paid. That is not true.

[*English*]

Mr. Benson: I should indicate that the government has not threatened anyone with respect to the payment of civil servants. But it is a fact that the government cannot expend money, no matter how much it borrows, until it has the authority of this parliament to do so.

Mr. Caouette: Can the minister collect money in the meantime?

Clause agreed to.

Clauses 3 to 5 inclusive, agreed to.

Schedules A, B, and C agreed to.

Clause 1 agreed to.

Preamble agreed to.

Title agreed to.

Bill reported.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: When shall this bill be read the third time? By unanimous consent, now?

Some hon. Members: Now.

Mr. McIlraith moved the third reading of the bill. Motion agreed to, bill read the third time and passed.

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE

Mr. McIlraith: Before indicating the business for tomorrow I would ask the concurrence of the house in an agreement to suspend the sitting at six o'clock until eight o'clock, for the purpose of having Royal Assent to this bill, rather than adjourn it.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Does the house agree to suspend today's sitting until eight o'clock?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Is it to be eight o'clock precisely, or until the call of the bell?

Mr. McIlraith: Eight o'clock—with the assurance that the bell will be rung when the suspended sitting is reconvened.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Perhaps, then, we can suspend the house until the call of the bell at eight o'clock.

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: It is so ordered.

Mr. McIlraith: I should like to indicate the business we propose to call Thursday and Friday—or beginning tomorrow until we finish the business I shall indicate.

I should like to call, first, item 11 on the order paper, the second reading of the bill to extend the Bank Act. Then, items nos. 16, 18 and 21 which are the three motions to set up joint committees. Then item 7 on the order

paper which is a resolution to introduce a measure to amend the Bretton Woods Agreements Act, item 8, which is a resolution to introduce a measure for the development of the commercial fisheries of Canada; item 4, which is a resolution to amend the Research Council Act, and item 15 which is a resolution for leave to introduce legislation to establish a science council of Canada.

Next I should like to call item 3 on the order paper, the resolution concerning the automotive products agreement with the United States, followed by items 23 and 24, the second reading of the Ottawa Terminal Railway Company Bill and the second reading of the bill to authorize the construction of a bridge over the St. Croix River. Depending on the progress we make tomorrow, this order could be changed to meet the wishes of hon. members.

Mr. Starr: Will there be a supply motion on Monday?

Mr. McIlraith: Yes, there will be a supply motion on Monday.

An hon. Member: And capital punishment?

Mr. McIlraith: On Wednesday.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: The sitting is suspended until eight o'clock. I do now leave the chair.

At 6 p.m. the sitting was suspended.

SITTING RESUMED

The House resumed at 9.04 p.m.

THE ROYAL ASSENT

Mr. Speaker: I have the honour to inform the house that I have received the following communication:

Ottawa, March 9, 1966

Sir:

I have the honour to inform you that the Hon. Gérald Fauteux, Puisne Judge of the Supreme Court of Canada, acting as Deputy to His Excellency the Governor General, will proceed to the Senate Chamber today, March 9, at 9.15 p.m. for the purpose of giving the royal assent to certain bills.

I have the honour to be,
sir,
Your obedient servant,
A. G. Cherrier,
Assistant Secretary to the Governor General.

A message was delivered by Major C. R. Lamoureux, Gentleman Usher of the Black Rod, as follows:

Mr. Speaker, the Honourable the Deputy Governor General desires the immediate attendance of this honourable house in the chamber of the honourable the Senate.

Accordingly, Mr. Speaker with the house went up to the Senate chamber.

And being returned:

Mr. Speaker informed the house that the Deputy Governor General had been pleased to give, in Her Majesty's name, the royal assent to the following bill:

An Act for granting to Her Majesty certain sums of money for the public service for the financial year ending the 31st March, 1966.

At 9.40 p.m. the house adjourned, without question put, pursuant to standing order.

DEPARTMENT OF SECRETARY OF STATE

A—Department—

1. Departmental administration, $481,600.

1b. Departmental administration—to extend the purposes of Vote 1 of the main estimates for 1965-66 to include the expenses of the Committee on Broadcasting, the Committee on Feature Films and the Committee on Election Expenses, the grant detailed in these estimates, and to provide a further amount of, $540,000.

5. Companies and corporations branch, $160,600.

5b. Companies and corporations branch, $6,500.

10. Translation bureau, $2,497,900.

10b. Translation bureau, $60,000.

National museum of Canada—

15. Administration, operation and maintenance including a grant of $5,000 to the Canadian museums association, $1,707,400.

Patent and copyright—

20. Patent division, copyright and industrial designs division and trade marks office including contributions to the International Office for the protection of literary and artistic works and the International Office for the protection of Industrial property and authority for the governor in council, notwithstanding the Patent Act, to prescribe the fees payable for the registration of assignments and other documents, which fees shall be deemed for the purposes of the Patent Act to be the fees set forth in section 75 thereof, $3,171,900.

B—Centennial commission—

25. General administration, including the national conference on the centennial of confederation, $1,360,000.

25b. General administration, $582,300.

30. Programs and projects of national significance including grants toward such programs and projects, $6,876,500.

30b. Programs and projects of national significance including grants toward such programs and projects, $3,902,800.

35. Payment to the centennial of confederation fund to enable grants to be made to the provinces for local projects of a lasting nature (the total of such grants made from the said fund not to exceed $18,935,000) and to enable grants to be made to the provinces for projects included in the federal-provincial confederation memorial program, $9,000,000.

Supply—Items Passed

C—Economic council of Canada—

40. Administration, $990,000.

40b. Administration, $132,500.

Loans, investments and advances—

L74b. To authorize the operation of a revolving fund in accordance with section 58 of the Financial Administration Act, for the purpose of acquiring, for resale to the public, articles related to the purposes and activities of the National Museum of Canada; the amount to be charged to the revolving fund at any time not to exceed, $10,000.

BOARD OF BROADCAST GOVERNORS

1. Salaries and other expenses, $393,000.

1b. Salaries and other expenses, $100,000.

Canadian Broadcasting Corporation—

1. Grant in respect of the net operating amount required to discharge the responsibilities of the national broadcasting service, $97,044,000.

International broadcasting service—

5. International broadcasting service including authority to credit to the appropriation revenue from the rental of facilities in Montreal, Sackville and Vancouver to an amount of $427,000 and to re-expend these moneys for the purposes of the international broadcasting service, $2,400,000.

Loans, investments and advances—

L10. Loans to the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation for the purpose of capital expenditures subject to terms and conditions prescribed by the governor in council, $14,000,000.

Office of the chief electoral officer—

1. Salaries and expenses of office, $115,600.

National film board—

1. Administration, production and distribution of films and other visual materials, $6,272,500.

5. Acquisition of equipment, $407,700.

National gallery of Canada—

1. Administration, operation and maintenance including the payment of $300,000 to the national gallery purchase account for the purpose of acquiring works of art in conformity with section 8 of the National Gallery Act, and grants as detailed in the estimates, $1,462,000.

1b. Administration, operation and maintenance—to increase to $692,900 the amount of the payment to the National Gallery purchase account for the purpose of acquiring works of art in conformity with section 8 of the National Gallery Act, $392,900.

Public archives and national library—

A—Public archives—

1. General administration and technical services, $1,068,600.

1b. General administration and technical services, $26,000.

B—National library—

5. General administration including a payment of $100,000 to the national library purchase account for the purpose of acquiring books, in conformity with section 12 of the National Library Act, $683,500.

5b. General administration, $22,500.

Civil Service Commission—

1. Salaries and contingencies of the commission including compensation in accordance with the incentive award plan of the Public Service of Canada, $7,139,600.

1b. Salaries and contingencies of the commission, $61,500.

DEPARTMENT OF SOLICITOR GENERAL

Royal Canadian Mounted Police—

National police services, federal law enforcement duties and provincial and municipal policing under contract—

1. Administration, operation and maintenance including grants as detailed in the estimates and pensions to families of members of the Royal Canadian Mounted Police who have lost their lives while on duty, $64,370,494.

1b. Administration, operation and maintenance—to increase as detailed in these estimates the pensions to families of members of the Royal Canadian Mounted Police who have lost their lives while on duty, $2,130.

5. Construction or acquisition of buildings, works, land an dequipment, $3,908,000.

5b. Construction or acquisition of buildings, works, land and equipment, $814,000.

DEPARTMENT OF FISHERIES

1. Departmental administration including grants and contributions as detailed in the estimates, $1,387,000.

Fisheries management and development—

5. Operation and maintenance including Canada's share of the expenses of the international commissions detailed in the estimates and of the costs of programs and projects shared jointly with the provinces and industry, $14,557,000.

5b. Operation and maintenance including Canada's share of expenses of the international commissions detailed in the estimates and of the costs of programs and projects shared jointly with the provinces and industry, $2,121,200.

5d. Operation and maintenance including Canada's share of expenses of the international commissions detailed in the estimates—To extend the purposes of Fisheries Vote 5 of the main estimates for 1965-66 to approve any agreement entered into between Canada and the United States to amend the convention on Great Lakes Fisheries between Canada and the United States as set out in the schedule to the Great Lakes Fisheries Convention Act increasing each section's membership in the commission from three to four members and to authorize payment of the expenses of the fourth member, $1.

10. Construction or acquisition of buildings, works, land and equipment including acquisition of land for the International Pacific salmon fisheries commission, as required by article VIII of the convention, $2,761,000.

10b. Construction or acquisition of buildings, works, land and equipment, $632,000.

10d. Construction or acquisition of buildings, works, land and equipment, $559,600.

15. Grants, contributions and subsidies in the amounts and subject to the terms specified in the subvote titles listed in the details of estimates, $1,710,000.

15b. Grants, contributions and subsidies in the amounts and subject to the terms specified in the sub-vote titles listed in the details of estimates, $2,150,000.

15d. Grants, contributions and subsidies in the amounts and subject to the terms specified in the subvote titles listed in the details of the estimates, $866,000.

Fisheries Research Board of Canada—

20. Administration, operation and maintenance including an amount of $100,000 for grants for fisheries research and for scholarships and authority to make recoverable advances of amounts not exceeding in the aggregate the amount of the share of the international great lakes fishery commission of the cost of work on lamprey control and lamprey research, $6,906,000.

20b. Administration, operation and maintenance, $388,300.

25. Construction or acquisition of buildings, works, land and equipment, $2,100,000.

HOUSE OF COMMONS

Thursday, March 10, 1966

The house met at 2.30 p.m.

PRIVILEGE

MR. HARKNESS—ALLEGED INSINUATIONS AND ALLEGATIONS BY MINISTER OF JUSTICE

Hon. D. S. Harkness (Calgary North): I rise on a question of privilege, one which affects not only myself personally but a considerable number of other Privy Councillors both in the house and outside the house. It also affects every member of the house. I intend to move a substantive motion based on this question of privilege.

The question concerns the insinuations and allegations made by the Minister of Justice in this house on Friday—

Mr. Speaker: Order. I should like to bring to the attention of the hon. member the provisions of standing order 41-A. I will read the standing order.

Unless notice of motion has been given under standing order 41, any member proposing to raise a question of privilege other than one arising out of proceedings in the Chamber during the course of a sitting shall give to the Speaker a written statement of the question at least one hour prior to raising the question in the House.

I might mention that the hon. member did give me oral notice, which was brought to my attention before I entered the house, but no written notice was given to the Chair as required by the standing order. I suggest to the hon. member that in these circumstances no question of privilege can be raised at this time.

Mr. Nielsen: Has Your Honour not received written notice on this matter from the hon. member for Winnipeg South Centre?

Mr. Speaker: This is a very embarrassing question. I myself did not receive such a notice. If the Chair could be given two minutes I will have the matter checked. This is the kind of thing which could happen even in the Speaker's office, I suppose; such a notice could have been sent without being brought to the attention of the holder of the office.

• (2:40 p.m.)

I can only say at the moment, so far as the hon. member for Calgary North (Mr. Harkness) is concerned, that he himself has brought to the attention of the Chair that before 2.30 he did not send written notice. Therefore, this applies to his case in any event; but I am having a search made in my office with regard to such written notice.

Mr. Harkness: On the point of order you have raised, Mr. Speaker, while it is quite true I did not send you the written notice an hour beforehand, I did give you verbal notice. Under the circumstances it was virtually impossible for me to send the written notice because the information which I have subsequently secured, in regard to the press conference which the minister held this morning, came to me later than that.

In view of the importance of this matter and the seriousness of the situation, and particularly in view of the seriousness of the motion, which I now intend to read:

That the Minister of Justice—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. In so far as the hon. member's question of privilege is concerned there is no doubt whatever that no written notice was given. The hon. member called the Speaker's secretary, who relayed a verbal message later on. The Speaker has been in his office since at least eleven o'clock this morning, if not before that, and written notice could have been given at any time between then and now.

The rule is clear, and it seems to me it is designed to cover the very type of instance which the hon. member is raising at the present time. But if there were unanimous agreement between all hon. members that we suspend the operation of this rule—

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Mr. Speaker: Well, I appreciate that some hon. members will agree to its being suspended, but I suspect others will not.

Mr. Horner (Acadia): There was no opposition to it.

Mr. Speaker: Is there unanimous agreement?

Some hon. Members: Yea.

Some hon. Members: Nay.

Mr. Speaker: I hear some nays.

Mr. Horner (Acadia): What are they afraid of?

Mr. Speaker: Order. I now have the report from the Speaker's office that there is no written notice, that no written notice has been found. This is the situation facing the Chair now.

Hon. Gordon Churchill (Winnipeg South Centre): On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, you stated in the course of your remarks—and I do not want to quarrel with Mr. Speaker—that you were in your office from 11.30, on. That was not the case when I had a phone call put through to your office at 1.30, and I think, sir, you will have to hear me on that.

Mr. Speaker: Order please. The Speaker was in his office, and this is perhaps a little picayune in the sense that the Speaker took visitors to room 202 for approximately 25 seconds around, I would say, two o'clock. But the Speaker has been in his office, had lunch in his office, and worked in his office since approximately eleven o'clock this morning.

Mr. Harkness: Mr. Speaker, without questioning your ruling in any way, and I recognize that under the strict application of the rules it is correct, I would make a plea to the house to give unanimous consent to have this matter heard now rather than delaying the hearing of it for 24 hours, or less than that, because I will certainly raise it tomorrow in any event.

Mr. Speaker: The Chair did what could be done in the circumstances. I was quite pleased and prepared to give effect to the suggestion of the hon. member for Calgary North to invite the consensus of the house to waive the provisions of the standing order, but there was no unanimous agreement. The Chair has no alternative whatsoever except to turn down the motion of the hon. member. I assume he will give written notice in the meantime and a new ruling can be given then.

Mr. Harkness: Mr. Speaker, I just made an appeal to the house. I will now make an appeal to the Prime Minister that he agree this matter should be heard at the present time because it was only on the Liberal side of the house that there was any opposition.

Mr. Speaker: Order please. That motion—

Mr. Starr: The Prime Minister sits silent.

Mr. Pearson: Obeying the rules.

[Mr. Speaker.]

Mr. Starr: Covering up behind the rules is what you have been doing.

Mr. Speaker: The ruling has been made.

Hon. Marcel Lambert (Edmonton West): On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, so far as this is concerned, if this motion should be put tomorrow I trust that it will not be stated that according to the rules it was not raised in time.

Mr. Speaker: I think there is no question about this. I appreciate the point made by the hon. member for Edmonton West (Mr. Lambert) and I really do not think 24 hours would make that much difference. I myself would not raise that objection.

Mr. Bell (Carleton): Mr. Speaker, it makes this difference that some of us have to sit in the House of Commons in the presence of somebody who is not a gentleman.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Speaker: Order please.

Some hon. Members: Withdraw.

Mr. Harkness: Mr. Speaker, I would like to give notice now that I will raise this matter in an hour's time.

Mr. Speaker: I would like to give notice to the hon. member that he has to do it according to the rules.

Mr. Churchill: May I have your guidance, Mr. Speaker. The rule, No. 17, says:

> Whenever any matter of privilege arises, it shall be taken into consideration immediately.

I received in my office, just at 2.30 p.m., the Ottawa *Journal*, which contains certain statements made by the Minister of Justice. That, sir, has come to my attention just within that time. Surely this is the proper time to raise a question of privilege based on these statements.

Mr. Speaker: It is subject to the rule, and the rule does not allow the hon. member to raise it at this time. The rule is very simple and clear. I invite the hon. member to give written notice to the Chair according to the rule. Unless the rules are changed, they will not be interpreted in this way. This is the only way the Chair can look at the situation when the rule is clear and simple. I interpret it the way I see it. I would invite members of the house to follow the rule and give written notice such as is suggested by the standing order.

Presenting reports by standing and special committees.

Mr. Lambert: Mr. Speaker, may I suggest that in so far as the hon. member for Winnipeg South Centre (Mr. Churchill) is concerned, the matter has come during proceedings, and therefore, is not subject to the one hour rule.

Mr. Speaker: This is an ingenious interpretation of the rules, but I suggest to the hon. member that he cannot interpret the rule to the effect that the matter involved is a matter having come out of the proceedings of the house when the house started at 2.40 p.m. and the only proceeding we have had—if that is a proceeding—is the very question of privilege. The hon. member cannot say he raises a question of privilege and therefore the proceeding has started. This would be circumventing the rule.

I again appeal to hon. members to accept the ruling of the chair and to raise the question at the first opportunity tomorrow.

Presenting reports by standing and special committees.

[*Translation*]

MISCELLANEOUS PRIVATE BILLS

FIRST REPORT OF STANDING COMMITTEE

First report of the standing committee on miscellaneous private bills—Mr. Loiselle.

[Editor's note: The text of the said report will be printed as an appendix to *Votes and Proceedings.*]

[*English*]

Mr. Speaker: Motions.

NATIONAL HOUSING ACT

SEWAGE TREATMENT PROJECT LOANS

Hon. J. R. Nicholson (Minister of Labour): Mr. Speaker, I should like to make a brief statement concerning sewage treatment project loans under the National Housing Act.

To assist in the elimination or prevention of soil and water pollution—

Mr. Woolliams: Get the Minister of Justice; he knows all about pollution.

Mr. Nicholson: —and to help ease the serious unemployment situation that existed at the time, an amendment to the National Housing Act in December 1960 authorized Central Mortgage and Housing Corporation to make loans to provinces, municipalities or municipal sewage corporations. These loans were offered for projects consisting of trunk sewage collector systems, central treatment plants, or both, for the collection and treatment of sewage from one or more municipalities.

Under this provision of the National Housing Act, such loans are made in an amount not exceeding two thirds of the cost. They are made at a favourable interest rate, which is currently 5¾ per cent, for a term not exceeding the useful life of the project, or 50 years. Central Mortgage and Housing Corporation is also authorized by the said Act to forgive 25 per cent of the loan on the completion of a project.

• (2:50 p.m.)

Hon. members will perhaps recall that on August 2, 1965 the Prime Minister (Mr. Pearson) announced that certain measures would be taken by the government to stretch out the excessive demands being placed on the construction industry in 1965 and 1966. The government believes that one way to help bring about this result is to extend until March 1970, the period within which all such sewage treatment projects may be completed, in order to qualify for forgiveness of 25 per cent of the loan. Consequently proposals to amend the National Housing Act will be brought forward by the government within a few months, and these will include a recommendation to parliament to extend from March 31, 1967 to March 31, 1970 the time during which expenditures on such projects might qualify for forgiveness for part of the loan.

I trust hon. members will co-operate in helping to bring this announcement to the attention of municipal and other interested officials in their respective ridings, so they may know that it will not be necessary to meet the deadline on March 31, 1967.

Hon. Alvin Hamilton (Qu'Appelle): Mr. Speaker, we have listened to the announcement with all the concentration we can muster under the circumstances. My first observation has to be that as a result of this stretching out, as I understood the minister's statement, there will be no incentive for our cities which are suffering from water pollution to press forward with their sewage disposal plants. If I am right in that interpretation I would suggest that in part this is a bad decision, and I say that for this reason. If this is merely a stretching out, one of the things it will have the effect of doing is slowing down the speed at which cities assume the necessary task of clearing up the pollution of our waters.

There is another argument in this regard. When we attempt to apply restrictive acts to hold down inflationary pressures by applying this type of restriction across the country indiscriminately, we are actually giving the country what I would call a castor oil treatment.

In those areas and regions where there is no inflationary pressure a policy to stop inflation such as that announced by the minister should be applied according to where the need is greatest. In other words, we should have a regional policy of restrictive acts by the government in respect of fiscal policies to check inflation.

In conclusion, I should like to remind the house, in the event that hon. members do not already know, that this program regarding sewage disposal plants in cities is a program which we started and of which we are very proud. I hope the government continues it.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Réal Caouette (Villeneuve): Mr. Speaker, we listened with attention to the statement made by the Minister of Labour (Mr. Nicholson) to the effect that the application of the act authorizing the Central Mortgage and Housing Corporation to make loans to municipalities, provinces, municipal corporations has been extended until 1970.

I am grateful to the minister for sending me a French copy of his statement.

I would also like to tell him that we are happy that the application of that act has been extended until 1970, because I have been asking the government for several years now to help the municipalities as much as possible. On the other hand, we are not asking that they be helped by taxing them or charging them an interest rate which will increase considerably the debt they will contract with the Central Mortgage and Housing Corporation.

As an example, let us assume that the city of Rouyn borrows $100,000 from the Central Housing and Mortgage Corporation at 5¾ per cent for a period of 50 years. This means that, in 50 years, the city of Rouyn would have paid, in interest only, the amount of $287,500 all the capital being due, that is $100,000, or a total of $387,500 for a $100,000 loan.

Now, we ask the government to study the possibility of interest-free loans to municipalities and provinces, so that these public bodies would pay once only for the projects to be carried out within the limits of their jurisdiction.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I wish to call the attention of both the government and the hon. Minister of Labour to that point. I understand that this is just a question of sewage and waterworks, but there are other things to do in the municipalities.

In any case, we are glad that the government has agreed to extend the assistance to municipalities but let us help them without making them sink into unpayable debt.

[*English*]

Mr. R. N. Thompson (Red Deer): Mr. Speaker, we are grateful to the minister for giving us prior notice of this motion. We are also grateful that this further step is being taken to assist municipalities in financing a certain aspect of their capital development. We believe it is only a portion of the assistance which must be given to them but it is certainly a step in the right direction. We are glad the minister has seen fit to recommend it.

CRIMINAL CODE AMENDMENT

EXTENSION TO HUMAN BEINGS OF PROVISIONS AFFECTING ANIMALS

Mr. M. L. Klein (Cartier) moved for leave to introduce Bill No. C-141, to amend the Criminal Code (Cruelty to animals and to human beings).

Some hon. Members: Explain.

Mr. Klein: Mr. Speaker, the purpose of this bill is to amend the section of the Criminal Code which makes it an offence to stage a fight between animals and between birds by adding the category of human beings so as to extend to human beings the protection now extended to animals.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh.

Motion agreed to and bill read the first time.

DIVORCE

MOTION TO ESTABLISH JOINT COMMITTEE

On the order: Government notices of motion:

That a special joint committee of the Senate and House of Commons be appointed to inquire into and report upon divorce in Canada and the social and legal problems relating thereto, and such matters as may be referred to it by either house;

That 24 members of the House of Commons, to be designated by the house at a later date, be members of the special joint committee, and that standing order 67 (1) of the House of Commons be suspended in relation thereto;

That the committee have power to engage the services of such technical, clerical and other personnel as may be necessary for the purpose of the inquiry;

That the committee have the power to send for persons, papers and records, to examine witnesses, to report from time to time, and to print such papers and evidence from day to day as may be ordered by the committee, and that standing order 66 be suspended in relation thereto; and

That a message be sent to the Senate requesting their honours to unite with this house for the above purpose, and to select, if the Senate deems it so advisable, some of its members to act on the proposed special joint committee.

Mr. McIlraith: Stand.

Mr. Speaker: Pursuant to section 2 of standing order 21 this government notice of motion stands transferred to and ordered for consideration under government orders at the next sitting of the house.

FISHERIES

SLAUGHTER OF SEALS—CRIMINAL PROSECUTIONS

On the orders of the day:

Hon. Michael Starr (Ontario): Mr. Speaker, I wish to address a question to the Minister of Fisheries. In view of the report that charges will be laid by the Humane Society arising out of, as described, the sadistic and stupid cruelty in the slaughter of baby seals, will the minister assure the house that action will be taken to put an end to this inhumane and senseless killing?

Hon. H. J. Robichaud (Minister of Fisheries): Mr. Speaker, in reply to the hon. member I wish to say that I understand there have been a few cases of cruelty to animals since the opening of the seal season on Monday last. I am awaiting a report from the S.P.C.A., the Humane Society's representatives, who were present during the whole operation. As soon as this report is received I intend to make a complete statement in the house on motions.

In the meantime I have instructed that action be taken to proceed with charges against those responsible for violations of the sealing regulations. I also wish to inform the hon. member that prior to the amending of the regulations there was no clause therein which prohibited the skinning of seals alive, if I may use that expression. I understand there have been some abuses this year by a few seal hunters and charges will be laid against them.

I repeat that I will make a full and complete statement on motions as soon as I receive the report.

Mr. Starr: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. In view of what has been brought up and factually evidenced on television—the minister himself was a witness—does he not think that the regulations must be tightened now?

Mr. Robichaud: Mr. Speaker, on two different occasions, in 1965 and again in 1966, I did indicate there was an intention to tighten the regulations because there was room for improvement. That is why we had representatives of the S.P.C.A. with us. We provided them with transportation to the sealing areas with a view to finding out what amendments can be made to the existing regulations so that no cruelty would take place in the killing of seals.

Mrs. Grace MacInnis (Vancouver-Kingsway): Mr. Speaker, may I ask the Minister of Fisheries whether or not he will now give consideration to finding a more humane method of killing these baby seals?

Mr. Robichaud: That is exactly what I have just said I will do, Mr. Speaker.

LABOUR RELATIONS

HALIFAX DOCKYARD—JOB EVALUATION WITHOUT CONSULTATION

On the orders of the day:

Mr. David Lewis (York South): Mr. Speaker, yesterday the hon. member for Burnaby-Coquitlam asked the Minister of National Defence a question with regard to the Halifax dockyard and the job evaluation or classification program in progress there. He particularly asked the minister whether the employees there had been provided with certain forms and whether the government had refused to negotiate regarding job classification with the organization concerned. The minister said that he would take the question as notice. Would he now inform us as to his answer?

Hon. Léo Cadieux (Associate Minister of National Defence): Mr. Speaker, so far as the determination of pay rates is concerned, I believe that is the responsibility of Treasury Board. As far as I know, what has been sent to the dockyard is a booklet describing the particular reclassification job which is being done. Now, I am supposed to receive this booklet at any moment, and at that time I will be in a position to give the answer I promised yesterday.

Mr. Lewis: A supplementary question. Would the minister undertake to look into

correspondence which passed between the department and the president and secretary of the Halifax Dockyard trades and labour council with respect to the job evaluation program and be prepared to tell us tomorrow whether what is indicated in this correspondence has now been abandoned?

Mr. Cadieux (Terrebonne): I would be very glad to do that, Mr. Speaker.

[*Translation*]

THE MINISTRY

PRESS COMMENT RESPECTING FUTURE ACTIONS OF PRIME MINISTER

On the orders of the day:

Mr. Réal Caouette (Villeneuve): Mr. Speaker, I should like to ask the Prime Minister a question.

According to this morning's *Le Devoir*, the Prime Minister is getting ready to leave his post of party leader and Prime Minister within the next three months. Did he inform *Le Devoir*'s editor of the fact? What is the truth about the report published this morning?

Mr. Speaker: Order. The hon. member knows that he cannot ask the Prime Minister whether a news report is true or not.

Mr. Caouette: Is it true that the Prime Minister intends to resign within the next three months?

[*English*]

Right Hon. L. B. Pearson (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, perhaps you would let me say that there is not a word of truth in that statement; it has already been denied.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. R. Gordon L. Fairweather (Royal): A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Does this applause mean that the mystical bond has been refurbished?

EXTERNAL AFFAIRS

NATO—INQUIRY CONCERNING COMMUNICATION FROM PRESIDENT DE GAULLE

On the orders of the day:

Mr. R. N. Thompson (Red Deer): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Prime Minister and is a follow-up of the question asked him yesterday regarding NATO. Has the Prime Minister received the message which the minister of information of the French government said he has sent Canada? If so, what are the expected actions of the government with regard thereto?

[Mr. Lewis.]

Right Hon. L. B. Pearson (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, I am informed that the communication from the French government was delivered to our embassy in Paris this morning and it is being cabled to Ottawa. As soon as it arrives—I expect later today—we will at once begin to give it the consideration that its importance deserves.

ADMINISTRATION OF JUSTICE

MUNSINGER INVESTIGATION—SUGGESTED IMPLICATION OF PRIVY COUNCILLORS

On the orders of the day:

Mr. Eldon M. Woolliams (Bow River): I should like to ask the Minister of Justice a question. Did the Minister of Justice state outside this house that he had certain facts and references in regard to a certain case alleged to have occurred during the term of the former government, and did he also suggest certain facts existed which were far worse than those of the Profumo scandal, implicating two members of the Privy Council? Did he make that statement outside the house?

Hon. Lucien Cardin (Minister of Justice): Mr. Speaker, I did inform members of the press that I learnt of the Munsinger case while I was minister in another department of government; that I did—

Mr. Churchill: Which department?

Mr. Cardin: I also stated files existed in connection with that particular case and that these files were not referred to the legal officers of the Department of Justice. I can also say that I am seriously considering making a judicial inquiry into the decision and the conduct of the Leader of the Opposition in that particular case. But I have not yet had the opportunity to discuss this with the Prime Minister and with my cabinet colleagues.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh.

Mr. Churchill: He will pull the rug out again.

Mr. Starr: Make sure the chair is there before you sit down.

Mr. Cardin: However, Mr. Speaker, if the hon. members of this house will refer to the words used by the Leader of the Opposition some time ago, they will find he said that he would welcome such an inquiry; and if that is so, then I think the inquiry should be set up.

PRIVILEGE

MR. HARKNESS—MUNSINGER INVESTIGATION —ALLEGED INSINUATIONS AND ALLEGATIONS BY MINISTER OF JUSTICE—MOTION TO SUBSTANTIATE CHARGES

Hon. D. S. Harkness (Calgary North): Mr. Speaker, as a result of the answer just given by the Minister of Justice I must rise on a question of personal privilege. My question of privilege concerns the matter just now under discussion, namely the insinuations and allegations made by the Minister of Justice in this house on Friday last in connection with the alleged Munsinger case, and the subsequent statements which he made at a press conference this morning to which reference has just been made.

The statements he made, as reported in the press this morning, are these, and I will instance only a few of them to indicate that a question of privilege exists. They are along the following lines:

Mr. Cardin said he understands the R.C.M.P. has a file on the case but that Mr. Diefenbaker never referred it to the law officers of the crown.

He himself had not seen the file but had learned a great deal about the case while he was in another department, presumably as Associate Defence Minister.

An hon. Member: Hearsay.

Mr. Harkness: Yes, it is hearsay.

Justice Minister Cardin charged today that two or more former cabinet ministers in the Diefenbaker cabinet were involved with a former east German spy.

In a Southam news report there occurs this statement:

• (3:10 p.m.)

Today, answering a barrage of questions on the Munsinger matter—it quite overshadowed his decision to resign his ministry, since withdrawn—Mr. Cardin asserted that though he had never examined the Munsinger file personally, he had heard of the case when he was associate minister of national defence.

In the front page of the Ottawa *Journal* which I have just secured, again it is stated, or reported to have been said by the minister:

—"the Munsinger scandal" involving "more than one member of the Diefenbaker Cabinet."

And again he was asked:

—had there been an actual security leak?

"I don't know—but there definitely was a security risk."

He is again making allegations on this line.

The justice minister has yet to see the R.C.M.P. file.

Where then, did he hear of the Munsinger case, the initial word of which he exploded Friday in the Commons?

The answer is:

"At the Defence Department."

At the time it came to his ears he was associate defence minister.

Now, Mr. Speaker, all of these statements, allegations and insinuations made by the Minister of Justice have only and can have had only one effect, and that is to put every person who was a member of the Conservative cabinet of that period, which I understand is supposed to be the 1960 to 1962 period, under suspicion.

This is an extremely unfortunate situation for me and for every other person who was a member of that cabinet to find himself in, and I think there is no question whatever but that the statements the minister has made cannot be allowed to hang in the air and rumours, speculations and stories of all kinds to be circulated against all of the hon. members of the Privy Council who were members of that government. It is an intolerable situation and it is a particularly bad situation, I consider, from my own point of view, because the minister has now inferentially, or pretty directly pointed the finger really at the Department of Defence, because he said that it was from there that he secured the information.

An hon. Member: Well now—

Mr. Harkness: There is nothing to laugh at in this whole situation, Mr. Speaker. It is an extremely serious one, and one which I, and I know every other cabinet minister upon whom suspicion has been cast, feel extremely strongly.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Harkness: Mr. Speaker, the minister having made these statements, as I say, the question cannot remain at that point. I wish to say, and I state very categorically, that until the minister mentioned this matter in the house on Friday last, I had never heard the word "Munsinger" or the name "Munsinger". I had never heard anything whatever in connection with that alleged case, and I am prepared not only to state that here, but to state it under oath in any inquiry of anything else which may be held in connection with the matter.

Now, I do not think that we can have the—we will say the undignified spectacle of every minister who was a member of that cabinet rising and being required, or having,

in order to clear his name, to make a statement along this line. And this is part of the intolerable situation which the minister has put the ex-members of that cabinet into by the statements which he has made. In view of this whole situation, Mr. Speaker, and in order that it may be cleared up definitely and that there may be an end put to the many rumours and speculations and what not which have run around the country as a result of this, I move this motion:

That the Minister of Justice be required forthwith to substantiate the charges made inside and outside this chamber which have reflected unfortunately and improperly upon members of Her Majesty's Privy Council, or alternatively that he be asked to submit his resignation and to atone by the forfeiture of his seat.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

An hon. Member: Don't be suspicious.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

Mr. Woolliams: It is about time the Prime Minister opened the letter.

Mr. Muir (Cape Breton North and Victoria): He has not spoken with him.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. As hon. members realize, the first and perhaps most important duty that the Chair has in a situation such as this one, is to determine whether there is actually a prima facie case of privilege. Perhaps hon. members might like to say a few words about this matter, that a decision might be rendered.

Hon. Lucien Cardin (Minister of Justice): Mr. Speaker, I want everyone in the house to know, and I am quite sincere in this, that I feel very badly about the way things are turning out.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh.

Mr. Cardin: And I can also appreciate the fact that the hon. member for Calgary North and other Privy Councillors may have been offended by what I am alleged to have said.

If hon. members in the house will recall what I said on Friday they will see that I made no reference to any hon. member in this house. What I asked was—

Mr. Winkler: That is not right.

Mr. Cardin: —that the Leader of the Opposition express to the committee his actions in this particular case. Period. I said no more than that, and it is the right hon. gentleman himself, the Leader of the Opposition, who at a political party gave more information on the Munsinger case than anybody else.

[Mr. Harkness.]

Mr. Churchill: You are attacking him in his absence again.

Mr. Cardin: The press itself amplified that far more than perhaps the Leader of the Opposition did or I did.

An hon. Member: Who spread the rumours?

Mr. Cardin: I did not at any time mention the details of the case, either to the press or to anyone else, except by confirming today what I already have confirmed in the house.

The hon. members in this house I think have a responsibility in this.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Cardin: I suggested a moment ago that the only question before the committee is the conduct, or the decision of the Leader of the Opposition in this particular case when he was prime minister. That is the point.

Mr. Winkler: Who put the rumours in the press gallery?

Mr. Cardin: In having a judicial inquiry into the conduct of the Leader of the Opposition this problem could be solved. There are members of the Privy Council on this and on the opposite side of the house who in fact, I think, would like to have that conduct looked into.

• (3:20 p.m.)

I have suggested that this perhaps would be the best, the most honest, the most orderly and the most diplomatic way of solving this problem without there being any kind of aspersion cast on any hon. member.

Mr. Starr: You have already done that.

Mr. Cardin: The one thing that is in the minds of the people is to decide upon the conduct of the Leader of the Opposition when he was Prime Minister during the Munsinger case.

Mr. Lambert: What about this morning?

Mr. Harkness: The Minister of Justice has now made some further allegations and suggested a further course of action. But those allegations and that suggested course of action do not excuse him in any way for the slur which he has cast upon me and other former ministers of the Conservative government, and it is this matter which is before the house at the present time. Irrespective of what inquiry may be set up, or anything along that line, I think the minister has placed himself in a position that he must either substantiate the statements he has made or resign, as called for in the motion I have made.

Mr. Erik Nielsen (Yukon): The minister said a moment ago that on Friday he did not make any allegation against any one of the former cabinet ministers now sitting on this side of the house. That is not in accordance with the facts. At page 2211 of *Hansard* for last Friday, hon. members will find this recorded:

I repeat he is the very last person in the house who can afford to give advice on the handling of security cases in Canada.

The reference is to the Leader of the Opposition. Later on, in the same column, the Minister of Justice used these words:

I want the right hon. gentleman to tell the house about his participation in the Monseignor case—

An hon. Member: That's right.

Mr. Nielsen: I hear an hon. member saying "That's right". That is precisely the substance of the motion that is being made. I read on:

—to tell the house about his participation in the Monseignor case when he was Prime Minister of this country.

If that is not an accusation of participation involving a member of the former government—

Mr. McIlraith: Give us the page reference.

Mr. Nielsen: Page 2211, the left hand column, two thirds down the page. Here are the words:

I want the right hon. gentleman to tell the house about his participation in the Monseignor case—

Mr. Pearson: In the handling of it.

Mr. Starr: Read *Hansard.*

Mr. Nielsen: To the press, sir, the minister has charged that former Conservative ministers were involved with a former east German spy. He has said he would ask the cabinet to re-open the case. He has said there was an R.C.M.P. file—that he had not seen it, but was briefed on it. He has said that the Leader of the Opposition, the former prime minister, did not handle the case properly and should explain. He has said that the former prime minister never referred the matter to the law officers of the Crown. He has said that he learned about the case in another department. He has said the Liberals were tired of hearing the Leader of the Opposition insinuate that the government was plunged in scandals, and that the Liberals were going to fight back hard, using the same tactics.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Nielsen: He has said "We know she had been engaged in espionage prior to coming to Canada". He has said that more than one minister was involved. Indeed, some press releases are carrying reports that more than two ministers of the former government were involved. He has said that government action at the time was justified, but it is too late now, the girl being dead.

He has said he was not in a position to comment on whether there was a security leak. Nothwithstanding the fact that he has not seen the file, he has said his objective was to press the Leader of the Opposition to explain his conduct in not turning the case over to the law officers. He has said it was a bona fide security case, again notwithstanding the fact that he has not seen the file.

On the basis of these statements, and in order that we on this side of the house may be able to present arguments, and make the minister account for his irresponsible and despicable statements outside this house—

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Nielsen: —we urge that the motion be allowed, on the basis of the chronology which I have laid before Your Honour, which constitutes certainly one of the most serious and important cases of privilege ever to have come before this house.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. David Lewis (York South): With regret as to what is being done to this parliament—

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh.

Mr. Lewis: —I want to say that we in this party cannot blame the hon. gentleman on this side of the house who moved the motion which is now before us.

It seems to us to be a clear point of personal privilege affecting every member of the cabinet to which the statement of the Minister of Justice had reference. It would have been to expect more of them than one should expect—that they should sit still and fail to raise this matter which concerns their individual personal integrity and standing in the country as spokesmen for a political party.

An hon. Member: Why not?

Mr. Lewis: I do not care how many catcalls are made from the other side or from this side of the house. I say to you, sir, that it is a great and deep matter, and one for great and

deep regret, that when certain unpleasantnesses in this house have at last come to a conclusion a member of the government should find it necessary to rake them all up again and start another unpleasantness over again and make this parliament, which has so terrible a responsibility at the present time in the world's history, a matter for laughter and sorrow on the part of the Canadian people.

I am not going to make a lengthy speech, because I want to make a suggestion to Your Honour and to members of this house that this matter is unpleasant and undignified enough without lengthy speeches or any elaboration of the unpleasantness and the indignities. I suggest we vote on this motion and after we have voted—I hope, in its favour—that we take the necessary steps to implement it in the proper way—and I hope this will be before some committee rather than on the floor of this house.

Mr. Eldon M. Woolliams (Bow River): I wish to support what has been said by the two hon. members who have just spoken, particularly by my hon. friend from Yukon, who outlined certain statements which the minister has made. The minister today made certain statements which seemed to contradict quotations which have appeared in the leading newspapers of our country. This is significant and it goes to the heart of this question of personal privilege.

• (3:30 p.m.)

He has seen fit to hold two press conferences and when you analyse the headlines in the Ottawa *Journal*—no doubt similar headlines will appear in other newspapers—you will see he has made far worse and far more grave statements outside the house than he made inside the house. In addition, the fact that he was speaking outside the house makes the matter far worse than if he had made the statements in the house.

He has, according to the quoted statement in the press, implicated at least two Privy Councillors or more. He has said in the house once or twice—whether he has contradicted it I do not know—that there was no question of security in his mind. Yet outside the house he said, as quoted—and I suggest this is the most cowardly statement of all those he has made:

> In some ways it was worse.

When asked if there had been an actual security leak he replied:

> I don't know—but there definitely was a security risk.

[Mr. Lewis.]

Therefore he has by innuendo, using the former minister of justice's words, offended so far as the Privy Councillors of this house are concerned. He has dragged the House of Commons and parliament into the gutter. The other day he had a letter of resignation placed on the Prime Minister's desk—

Mr. Speaker: Order.

Mr. Woolliams: —and the Prime Minister should have opened it because there is a great schism between the minister and the Prime Minister. I think the minister should get up and resign.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

Mr. R. N. Thompson (Red Deer): Mr. Speaker, you have asked for comments and advice with regard to a decision on whether or not there is a legitimate question of privilege before the house. I personally regret very much that this matter has been brought up in this way. Certainly it is not going to do anyone any good, let alone this house. Nevertheless the question of privilege raised by the hon. member for Calgary North is in my opinion a legitimate question of privilege because it has to do with the integrity, yes, even the morality of men who are members of the Privy Council.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, without entering into any debate I wish to say it is our opinion that there is a question of privilege and that it must be allowed on that basis. I would only hope that this matter can be referred to a committee of the house. In that way we will be able to go on with the work that is before us and avoid taking a further part in dragging this house into the mud and mire, something that obviously is going to be involved in the situation we have before us now.

Mr. Churchill: Settle it right here.

Mr. Thompson: Mr. Speaker, I think the question of privilege is a legitimate one.

Mr. Cardin: Mr. Speaker, I do not write the headlines in the newspapers. The reason for my calling a conference was the numerous telephone calls I had from the press in order to explain the difference there was between my resigning and the decision I took not to resign.

During the course of the interview questions were asked about the Munsinger case and I did not say anything that had not already appeared in the press at that time. I should like to remind hon. members that during the course of the debate on the

Spencer case there were insinuations from all parts of the house to the effect that I was trying to hide something, that the government was trying to hide matters that were scandalous, that we did not want to prosecute Spencer because he would perhaps come out with the names of people whose heads would swim.

There were insinuations right and left. No one on this side of the house asked that there be charges made but we did, under the conditions that were asked for by members of the N.D.P., agree to a judicial inquiry into that matter.

In this particular instance I did not make any insinuations of any kind against anyone that had not already been in the newspapers. In the interests of the individuals concerned, in the interests of people who might be involved in this particular case, I suggest that the best, the most honourable and the most equitable way of solving this problem is as we did in the Spencer case, by having a judicial inquiry and having a judge report on the decision and the conduct of the Leader of the Opposition.

Mr. Starr: You tell us now. This is the minister of mud.

Mr. Speaker: Order.

Mr. Terence Nugent (Edmonton-Strathcona): Mr. Speaker, I have never heard a more remarkable speech than that just made by the Minister of Justice. If I understand his argument correctly, what he says is that all he did was answer questions that the press raised. I think that the complete picture is that he threw out this suggestion on Friday, that the press took the hook and came to him and that he got the sort of headlines he was looking for. If this is not weaseling, I do not know what is.

The minister is getting now in this motion exactly what he wanted when he first raised the matter. The matter is getting nationwide publicity. If he is in charge of the ministry of justice he should have some concept of justice and should know that the reputation of men cannot be put under a shadow in this manner without the person who makes the allegations and raises them being prepared to back up those accusations. The suggestion of the Minister of Justice now is that this was accidental—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. I appreciate the views expressed by the hon. member.

[*Translation*]

Does the hon. member for Lapointe (Mr. Grégoire) wish to add something?

Mr. Gilles Grégoire (Lapointe): Mr. Speaker, for our part we are not ready to add anything to the debate at this moment. We would have liked to know the views of the right hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Pearson) on the problem which is now being discussed.

[*English*]

Right Hon. L. B. Pearson (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, I think I am as aware as any other member of the house that this is a very serious and grave situation. I can understand the feeling of the hon. member who raised the matter in the way he has done and the motion he has submitted, and I can understand the feeling of the Minister of Justice after what he has been through in recent weeks in connection with a case in which there were many accusations and suspicions levelled at him.

But I should like, Mr. Speaker, if I might deal with the matter as a parliamentary one, and as the leader of the house because of my position as Prime Minister, to suggest to you, sir, in view of the seriousness of the matter I might be permitted to consult, which I would do without delay, with the mover of the motion and yourself to see how best the matter can be resolved immediately so that justice may be done.

Mr. Starr: I should like to ask the Prime Minister a question at this point, and I think it is a serious one. Does he think that the reflections cast on a large group of Privy Councillors in the previous government should remain unanswered for any time at all? Should they not be dealt with at once in order to remove the stigma from these people?

Mr. Pearson: I appreciate the earnestness of the hon. member when he talks about reflections cast upon Privy Councillors because I know something about that myself. I have been told that crime entered into my office, and that kind of thing, and I know how he feels because I felt the same way in reverse.

I do not want to delay this matter. It must be dealt with, and dealt with immediately. I am asking for the privilege as leader of the house to consult with the hon. member who moved the motion and Your Honour, to see how it can be dealt with quickly and effectively.

Mr. Bell (Carleton): Then vote for the motion.

Mr. Starr: May I appeal to the Prime Minister again? Will he not prevail upon the Minister of Justice to reveal the facts now at this time in respect of this case? If not, we have no alternative but to ask that the motion be put.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. This is not an enviable position which the Chair is being placed in at the moment. I have been given an opportunity during the last hour or so to reflect on the very serious matter raised by the hon. member for Calgary North. I must point out that I regret very much his original motion could not be accepted because of a technical difficulty, and he gave written notice subsequently, at 2.40 or 2.45, which was about the time the motion would have been discussed in any event.

• (3:40 p.m.)

I am satisfied and pleased with the way the matter has come to a head. As hon. members know, the Chair is guided by citation 104(5) which says:

> As a motion taken at the time for matters of privilege is thereby given precedence over the prearranged program of public business, the Speaker requires to be satisfied, both that there is a prima facie case that a breach of privilege has been committed, and also that the matter is being raised at the earliest opportunity.

I expect it might have been argued, inasmuch as the statements were made on Friday last, that the matter was not raised at the first opportunity, but we are dealing now specifically with allegations as reported in a newspaper outside the house and the allegations repeated by the hon. member in the house. I am inclined to believe there is a prima facie case of privilege in this instance but I might point out to hon. members—and I am sorry I have to use the word "but"—that it does not necessarily follow that if there is a question of privilege the motion made necessarily is acceptable according to the rules, practice and procedure of the house.

What we are dealing with now is an accusation made by some hon. members against another hon. member. The subject matter which gave rise to the statements made by the Minister of Justice, which is in the background of what we are dealing with now, is an accusation made against the Minister of Justice—

Some hon. Members: No, no.

[Mr. Pearson.]

Mr. Speaker: —and there is a suggestion that the Minister of Justice has in some way conducted himself in an improper manner. This is the only interpretation which can be placed on the motion put forward by the hon. member.

There are any number of precedents indicating what has to be done in such instances. I would refer hon. members in particular to the *Journals* of the House of Commons, Volume 105, 1959, at page 584, where the Speaker, who was faced with a somewhat similar case, was given notice and after lengthy consideration delivered a judgment which covered some four or five pages in the *Journals*. I might say that that Speaker had a considerable advantage at that time over the present Speaker. However, fortunately I can take advantage of his ruling and quote from it:

> In my view, simple justice requires that no honourable member should have to submit to investigation of his conduct by the house or a committee until he has been charged with an offence.

Then, further on:

> In the case before us no honourable member has taken the responsibility of making a specific charge against the honourable member—

The motion I have before me says:

> That the Minister of Justice be required forthwith to substantiate the charges made inside and outside this Chamber which have reflected unfortunately and improperly upon members of Her Majesty's Privy Council.

It is obvious that what we are doing in this motion is impugning the conduct of the Minister of Justice who himself perhaps impugned the conduct of other members but, as I have said, this is not what we are faced with at present. I am impressed by the suggestion made by the hon. members for York South (Mr. Lewis) and Red Deer (Mr. Thompson) who say that the proper course to take in respect of this type of matter is to refer the subject matter of the motion to a committee.

I should like to bring to the attention of hon. members Bourinot's fourth edition, page 162, where it says:

> A reference to a committee is no doubt the proper procedure in all cases in which there are reasonable doubts as to the facts or the course that should be pursued, especially when it is necessary to examine precedents or witnesses.

I have given the matter very serious thought and have looked at it as objectively as I can. I can come to no other conclusion than that the motion as drafted now cannot be accepted by the Chair because it is too

general in terms and, according to precedents, does not specify the charge levelled against the minister. For this reason, while I agree with the hon. member for Calgary North that there is a prima facie case of privilege, the motion in its present form cannot be accepted by the Chair.

Hon. Gordon Churchill (Winnipeg South Centre): Mr. Speaker, you have allowed the question of privilege and it can be further discussed even though you suggest that the motion was not put in the proper form. Am I right in that conclusion?

Mr. Speaker: No. There is nothing before the house. I know the hon. member realizes this. There was a question of privilege which was not followed by a proper motion. There is nothing before the house and we cannot debate a motion which has not been accepted.

Mr. Stanley Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Mr. Speaker, may I draw your attention to the fact that before Your Honour's ruling the Prime Minister asked for permission of the house to discuss the matter with the member for Calgary North and Your Honour. I understood that what he wished to discuss was the question of privilege. Since Your Honour has agreed that there is a question of privilege, is there not some way in which there can be that discussion within the next half hour or so, reserving to the member for Calgary North the right to bring in at that point, if he wishes to do so, a motion worded in some other way?

Mr. Speaker: No. There still is no motion before the house. There may be arrangements made by hon. members to have informal discussion as to how this matter could be proceeded with by way of another motion but certainly there is no motion before this house now. The decision I have reached is justified, I believe, by precedents and procedures followed in previous years.

Mr. Harkness: Mr. Speaker, I have never pretended to be an expert on the rules of the house. Probably what you have said may be correct on the basis of a literal interpretation of former rulings but I would submit, Mr. Speaker, that this is a matter—

Mr. Speaker: Well, the only attitude or position I can take now is that any further discussion is a comment on the ruling of the Chair. There are other avenues open to hon. members. I am sure they can give the matter serious thought. I would suggest that further consideration be given the matter in another light.

Mr. Nielsen: Mr. Speaker, I should like to move, seconded by the member for Calgary North (Mr. Harkness), that the Minister of Justice do resign.

Mr. Speaker: I cannot accept this motion. I suggest to the hon. member that this is a substantive motion and would require notice. It is not necessarily one which follows logically from the question of privilege, though I have some doubts now.

The Chair is being placed in a very difficult position at this point. If hon. members are going to bring in a series of motions until such time as they may be in a position to find one which will be acceptable under the rules, it is, I suggest, placing the Chair in an impossible position. If the hon. member now makes this motion I will ask, as I have the right, to have the opportunity to consider the motion before ruling on it.

Mr. Thompson: Mr. Speaker, in the name of reason, for the good of the house and likewise in the national interest I would suggest it is only right at this time, Your Honour having indicated that there are other ways this matter can be dealt with, that the suggestion be followed that Your Honour, the Prime Minister and the hon. member for Calgary North get together to discuss the matter.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. This is not a matter which is for the consideration of the Chair.

Mr. Churchill: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a question of personal privilege. We have been considering a matter of personal privilege raised by the hon. member for Calgary North with which you have dealt. I, sir, have a question of privilege which to a certain extent resembles that raised by the hon. member for Calgary North. I base my question of privilege on the statements made by the Minister of Justice in this house on Friday, outside the house yesterday and today and in this house today. If you take all his statements and examine them separately you cannot help but find that they cast a reflection on the members of Her Majesty's Privy Council, and I take objection to that.

• (3:50 p.m.)

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. The hon. member says he has a question of privilege which is somewhat like the one raised by the hon.

member for Calgary North. I cannot find any difference at all between the hon. member's question of privilege and the one raised by the hon. member for Calgary North. I can see no point in every member of the Privy Council getting up at this time to raise exactly the same question of privilege. A ruling has been made by the Chair and I would invite the hon. member for Winnipeg South Centre to take into account that ruling and what has been said by the Chair.

Mr. Churchill: Mr. Speaker, you are suggesting that members of the Privy Council should not raise this point. You acknowledged that the hon. member for Calgary North had a question of privilege and that question was settled, but I have a question of privilege too. The Minister of Justice implicated all members of the privy council who served in the cabinet of the present Leader of the Opposition. I happen to be one of those members of the Privy Council. You may have settled in your mind the question raised by the hon. member for Calgary North, but I have a case to put forward regarding the statements of the Minister of Justice which affect me as a Privy Councillor and affect every other member of the Privy Council. That is the question of personal privilege I wish to raise at this time.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. I cannot agree with the logic of the hon. member for Winnipeg South Centre. The motion which was made did not refer to the hon. member for Calgary North, it referred to the fact that there were allegations made affecting members of Her Majesty's Privy Council. The hon. member for Calgary North in his presentation never suggested that the allegations applied only to him. His motion and the arguments submitted in its favour during its presentation referred to a matter of privilege which affected all Privy Councillors, not just one.

It is obvious in my mind that the ruling which has been made in connection with the question of privilege and the motion of the hon. member for Calgary North applies in the same way to the question of privilege which the hon. member for Winnipeg South Centre may have. That earlier privilege and motion have been put to the Chair, considered and ruled upon.

Mr. Churchill: Mr. Speaker, I am not speaking to the motion which you ruled out of order. Unless I did not hear correctly, the hon. member for Calgary North raised a personal question of privilege. In speaking to that question he said it affected all members of the Privy Council who had served under the former Conservative government. He then moved a motion with which you were not in agreement. I am not speaking to that motion, sir. I am raising a question of personal privilege which, as I have stated, is based upon statements made by the Minister of Justice and I demand my right to be heard. Freedom of speech is at stake in this house.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Speaker: My suggestion to the hon. member is that there is no question of freedom of speech involved. We have spent over an hour now on a very important question of privilege.

An hon. Member: Is there a limit to the freedom of speech?

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Calgary North was given every freedom to express his question of privilege and the hon. member for Winnipeg South Centre had an opportunity to take part in that discussion. He was not denied the right to speak on that question of privilege. Certainly if the question of privilege raised by the hon. member for Calgary North meant anything, it was meant to apply to all Privy Councillors. It applies to Privy Councillors on both sides of this house. I cannot agree with the hon. member for Winnipeg South Centre that there is a separate and distinct question of privilege in that he would be affected personally and distinctly from the hon. member for Calgary North. For that reason I cannot allow him to re-open the whole question at this time.

Mr. Churchill: Mr. Speaker, I suggest that you cannot deny an hon. member the right to raise a personal question of privilege. There is a question of privilege in respect of the statement made by the Minister of Justice to the effect that one or more ministers were involved. He said there were two or more ministers involved, as reported in some press accounts, and he has not denied that he has made that statement. Once he used the word "more" he made it all-inclusive, and there is a question of personal privilege in respect of every member of the Privy Council who wishes to raise it today. It does not matter how many other questions of privilege may have been raised. The fact that the hon. member for Calgary North said that these statements affected every member of the Privy Council does not prevent every member of the Privy Council from raising a

question of privilege if he so desires. The purpose of my rising today is to raise such a question of privilege.

You asked me why I did not participate in the earlier discussion. The earlier discussion was on the question whether or not there was a question of personal privilege and some hon. members ranged over a wide field regarding this issue. That is why I did not participate. I knew you would rule that there was a prima facie question of privilege. This was obvious to everyone in the chamber. The matter of the motion is a different question. I suggest I do have a question of personal privilege. It may be very similar to that raised by the hon. member for Calgary North but it is equally important to me and to every member of the Privy Council. I am surprised that the members of the Privy Council sitting on the other side of the house are so disinterested in an issue of this kind they would not disavow the aspersions that have been made about members of the Privy Council in the statements of the Minister of Justice.

Mr. Starr: Unless they are part and parcel of the whole situation.

Mr. Churchill: I am astonished that the Prime Minister of this country wants to withdraw this issue from the house and present it to some sort of committee. It might not be debated again in this chamber. Let us settle it right here and now. Let the Minister of Justice name names and cases.

Mr. Nielsen: Put up or stop fooling around.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh.

Mr. Churchill: Put up or stop fooling around.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Churchill: The Minister of Justice has pursued his normal course of attacking the Leader of the Official Opposition when he is not in this chamber. He did the same thing several years ago. That is the normal course he follows. The minister has cast aspersions on members of the Privy Council outside of this chamber and in this chamber and it is up to them to settle this matter right away. As was suggested earlier, he should disclose his facts here and now or withdraw the statements he has made.

Mr. Nielsen: Or he should resign.

Mr. Churchill: If this matter is referred to a committee it will go on for weeks and months, and smears, innuendos and McCarthyism will be spread right across this country.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh.

Mr. Churchill: Mark you, sir, this will be used by various people for political purposes to destroy—

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh.

Mr. Churchill: The Liberals are laughing at this.

Mr. Nielsen: That is typical.

Mr. Churchill: That is typical of them; it is typical of their attitude toward parliament.

Mr. Ricard: That is their way of working.

Mr. Churchill: They would like to have this serious matter brushed aside as carelessly as they have suggested, by sending it to a committee. The Prime Minister knows how serious this matter is.

An hon. Member: He will not give any leadership.

Mr. Churchill: I do not agree with the Prime Minister on many things but he has given long service to this country. He is the head of his party and the head of this government.

Mr. Starr: He is a member of the Privy Council.

Mr. Churchill: The Prime Minister was sworn in as a member of the Privy Council in England and he is a right hon. member. He knows that a slur cast on a member of the Privy Council should be resisted by the leaders of the Privy Council. In this House of Commons we have only two members who are right hon. members of the Privy Council, the Prime Minister and the Leader of the Opposition. They were both sworn in by the Queen and they have the title of right honourable. They know we look to them for leadership. When the advisers to Her Majesty the Queen are affected by a slur I should think that the Prime Minister would be the first person to resist.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

• (4:00 p.m.)

Mr. Churchill: As the hon. member for Calgary North said, members of the Privy Council sitting on this side of the house are not under any obligation to rise and say "I

was not implicated." I am not doing it for that purpose at all. I do not care what these Liberals do or say about me. They have said everything in the past anyway so it does not matter. I do not care what accusations the Minister of Justice may make right at this very moment. But I challenge him to make his statements here in the house, not outside the house. He tried to persuade us that he made his statements on Friday and that he was not challenged. He did not implicate one or two or more of the Privy Council on Friday. He did not say in the house what he said outside or he would have been challenged immediately, and he knows it. That is the value of this debating chamber; this is where people are challenged immediately. How do you catch up with these outside stories? Is he going to rush to another press conference later today and give out a little more information, more innuendo, more scandal, more involvement? This is what he will be up to, this Minister of Justice who is supposed to sustain the law of this land and set an example.

Mr. Nielsen: A fine example.

Mr. Churchill: This is my question of personal privilege, Mr. Speaker. I have been accused along with others by this Minister of Justice of having been involved somehow or other and I ask him—

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh.

Mr. Churchill: The Liberals laugh again. They think this is just nonsense. They will destroy parliament if we give them the opportunity. I hope we are here to prevent them doing so.

An hon. Member: The minister laughs too.

Mr. Churchill: I ask the Minister of Justice to get up in this house as a member of Her Majesty's Privy Council, make his apology to the House of Commons—

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh.

Mr. Churchill: —and withdraw the statements that he made outside this house. Alternatively, let him get up and make his accusations clearly and plainly right here and then let us see what happens.

I present this motion in conclusion, Mr. Speaker, based on my question of privilege. I think it must come to a decision of this house. It must come to a vote and not be shoved aside, shunted into some corner or some committee. I move, seconded by the hon. member for Ontario (Mr. Starr):

That the Prime Minister immediately call for the resignation of the Minister of Justice on the basis of the improper conduct of the minister in the making of improper accusations against the right hon. Leader of the Opposition and all Privy Councillors in the former government.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Speaker: The motion which has just been submitted to the Chair by the hon. member for Winnipeg South Centre is substantially the same as the one already before the Chair moved by the hon. member for Yukon. At that time I asked hon. members to give the Chair an opportunity to look into the situation further, because certainly I think it is not entirely correct to submit a series of motions to the Chair in such a very important matter, such a very delicate matter, and ask that a ruling be made, except when there is a very clear case.

It is my opinion that the first motion put before the house constituted a very clear case and by reason of precedents it was clear that the motion should not be accepted. May I suggest to hon. members now that I be given an opportunity to look at the motions made by the hon. member for Winnipeg South Centre and the hon. member for Yukon. This is a request that is very reasonable and which the Chair is entitled to make according to practice. I trust hon. members will agree to give the Chair this opportunity.

Mr. Nielsen: Mr. Speaker, while you are looking at the motion might I be allowed to say a word on the necessity of dealing with this matter today, immediately, now. The charges and allegations that have been made—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. The hon. member has had an opportunity to speak. I wonder whether there is anything he can now say that will add to what he has said on the previous motion. I am not being unreasonable at all or unfair, I think, to hon. members when I ask them to co-operate with the Chair. I believe that hon. members have a responsibility in this matter to co-operate with the Chair and I ask hon. members to co-operate with me in this regard. This is all I am asking at this time.

Mr. Nielsen: With deference, Mr. Speaker, I have not had any opportunity at all to speak on the merits of the motions that have been made. I have only had the opportunity to speak on whether there exists a prima facie case of privilege. In the meantime the urgency of this matter, because these allegations of

the Minister of Justice are being spread all over the country, demands immediate discussion in this chamber. It is this matter about which I wish to speak.

Mr. Speaker: I understand that there is urgency in this matter and I can assure the hon. member that I am quite convinced it is a matter of substantial and serious urgency. But, with respect, I do not think it should necessarily be settled within 30 minutes, within an hour, or immediately. As the hon. member says, the matter has been publicly referred to and has gained some prominence. I doubt whether it will gain additional prominence if the motion of the hon. member is allowed to stand for a while. Again I would suggest that this be done.

Mr. Starr: Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact that Your Honour has said that this is a matter of importance and should be dealt with within a reasonable time, I wonder whether Your Honour would indicate to us how long it will be before Your Honour brings in a decision on the merits of the motions?

Mr. Turner: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact that all hon. members agree on just how important the matter before the house is and how urgent it is, I wonder whether the Chair should be pressed into making an immediate decision—

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh.

Mr. Turner: —because it is very important for the rules of this house that the right decision is made by the Chair. I would therefore urge hon. members to give the Chair a chance to make the right decision.

Mr. Lewis: Mr. Speaker, you have asked members of the house to give you some time to consider the two motions before Your Honour. May I respectfully suggest to you, sir, and to the members of this house that the proper thing to do now is to adjourn the house for an hour or so—

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Lewis: —so that you may give this matter the consideration you think necessary and so this most unpleasant spectacle may come to an end. I would urge you, sir, and all members of the house to agree to an adjournment until six o'clock so that Your Honour may have the time, and everybody else may have the time, to go into this matter and to do it properly.

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Mr. Lewis: If there are problems about moving such a motion, Mr. Speaker, I should like to hear what the house leader has to say.

Mr. Pearson: Surely it is only reasonable and right that in a matter of this importance, so difficult and complicated for the Speaker, he be given some time to decide what is the right course to follow. The hon. member opposite has said that this must be decided today, immediately, now. I recall the insinuations and the charges of arson, murder and bankruptcy and everything over the years, and the remedy for these charges was to set up a royal commission.

Mr. Nielsen: Absolutely.

Mr. Pearson: This is a matter that should be decided and decided quickly but surely, Mr. Speaker, you ought to be given some opportunity to look into this matter and surely, also, while that is being done the house can go on with the business before it.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Lewis: Mr. Speaker, I ask leave to move, seconded by the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Knowles):

That this house now stand adjourned until 6 p.m. this day.

• (4:10 p.m.)

Mr. McIlraith: Mr. Speaker—

Mr. Churchill: Order. It is not debatable.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

Mr. McIlraith: May I ask—

Some hon. Members: Sit down.

Mr. McIlraith: Mr. Speaker, before the hon. member makes his motion may I ask him a question?

Mr. Churchill: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, this motion is not debatable.

Mr. Speaker: Order. I suggest that the motion is not debatable. It is also not receivable at this time. The hon. member is now proposing a motion which is in the form of a superseding motion. There has to be something before the house before a motion to adjourn the house can be moved and at the moment there is nothing before the house.

The hon. member cannot, under the guise of a point of order, rise to ask the adjournment of the house. There has to be business before the house and a motion under consideration, followed by a superseding motion

asking for the adjournment of the house. My understanding of the expert advice I have received, advice which is always very useful in such instances, is to the effect that this motion cannot be moved now.

Mr. Nugent: Mr. Speaker, I thought the business before the house was a question of privilege raised by the hon. member for Winnipeg South Centre. I submit that whether or not the motion is in order the question is still there.

Mr. Speaker: It is not. I have to add that not only can it not be done under the guise of a point of order but it cannot be done under a question of privilege.

Mr. Bell (Carleton): Surely Your Honour has looked at standing order 25 which reads:

A motion to adjourn (except when made for the purpose of discussing a definite matter of urgent public importance), shall always be in order—

I repeat, Mr. Speaker, "shall always be in order". The universal custom of this House of Commons is that a motion to adjourn can be received at any time, I submit with the greatest respect.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member should have read the rest of the standing order. It continues:

—but no second motion to the same effect shall be made until after some intermediate proceeding has been had.

I really do not want to argue with the hon. member. The Chair should not be placed in the position where it has to argue on a matter such as this. I suggest that whenever there is a substantive motion before the house at a later hour during the day that motion can be moved. My understanding is that it cannot be moved now. I hope I have been well advised on this.

Mr. Nugent: Mr. Speaker, if the motion to adjourn is not in order, I should like to speak to the question of privilege raised by the hon. member for Winnipeg South Centre and I should like to move a motion in connection therewith.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. The hon. member has heard the hon. member for Winnipeg South Centre make a motion. He has moved a motion and the Chair has asked for the assistance and for the concurrence of the house to allow the Chair some time to consider the motion, as well as the motion moved by the hon. member for Yukon. Surely the hon. member does not want to move a third motion on the same question of privilege.

[Mr. Speaker.]

Mr. Nugent: Mr. Speaker, surely the question whether the motion is proper does not end the debate. The disposition of one motion does not end the question of privilege. I would put that suggestion before the house.

Mr. Speaker: I cannot agree with the hon. member. A question of privilege has been raised. The Chair rendered the decision that there was a prima facie case of privilege before the house, after which a motion was moved consequent upon the question of privilege. The only matter we can discuss now is the motion, if it is accepted by the house. The Chair has asked that the matter be held in abeyance. This is such a reasonable request that I would invite hon. members to grant it.

Mr. Nugent: Mr. Speaker, my point is that if the motion had been disposed of that would have disposed of the question of privilege. But since the motion was found to be not acceptable it does not dispose of the question of privilege. Therefore the question of privilege is still before the house, as is the action to be taken on it. We have two questions of privilege which in my submission are still before the house, one raised by the hon. member for Calgary North and the other by the hon. member for Winnipeg South Centre. The motion moved by the hon. member for Calgary North was found to be out of order but—

Mr. Speaker: Order. I cannot agree with the hon. member's contention. My contention is that two very logical questions of privilege have been raised followed by motions, one of which is under consideration. We cannot completely forget the fact that these motions exist and are now before the house. They were regular motions. Whether or not they are acceptable or should be ignored is the question which the Chair would like the opportunity to decide. But certainly motions have been moved and seconded in both instances. I do not think we can make an abstraction of them and return to the question of privilege and discuss it further.

Mr. Nugent: Mr. Speaker, may I repeat that by finding the motion out of order you are killing off debate on the main subject? That practice could happen in the house at any time. A member could make a motion which is out of order so as to kill off debate. Certainly this does not dispose of the substantive question before us, and I wish to speak to that substantive question.

Mr. Knowles: With respect, Mr. Speaker, I would invite Your Honour to reconsider the position which you have taken in respect of Standing Order 25. Standing Order 25 is quite clear when it says that a second motion to adjourn cannot be made until some intermediate proceeding has been had.

Most of us here in this house are aware of the position. In 1956 this sort of thing was tried and we found out what were the rules. I submit that a motion to adjourn is in order at any time provided it follows some intermediate proceeding between the motion and the last time there was a motion to adjourn.

I submit, Mr. Speaker, that an intermediate proceeding as defined in the authorities is something that is entered in the *Journals*. There will be an entry in the *Journals* for today that the house met at 2.30. Motions which have been made will appear in the *Journals*. I submit that the motion to adjourn the house till six o'clock comes after intermediate proceedings since the last time there was a motion to adjourn.

Mr. Speaker: I might say I am rather impressed by the argument of the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre, but there is another difficulty. By using the words "that this house stand adjourned till six o'clock this day" the hon. member has placed a condition on the normal motion so it cannot be moved in this way. It becomes a substantive motion and we would require notice of a substantive motion. If the motion were simply that this house do now adjourn I would agree with the hon. Member for Winnipeg North Centre that probably it could be moved.

Mr. Knowles: Mr. Speaker, in the interests—

Mr. McIlraith: Mr. Speaker—

Mr. Knowles: Mr. Speaker—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. Is the hon. member continuing to speak on the point of order?

Mr. Knowles: Mr. Speaker, in the interests of parliament I move, seconded by the hon. member for Skeena:

That this house do now adjourn.

Mr. McIlraith: The hon. member rose on a point of order, and cannot, therefore put a motion. Mr. Speaker—

Mr. Fairweather: It is not debatable.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. The hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre has moved a motion while speaking on a point of order.

Some hon. Members: No.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member had the floor on a point of order, which was the only way he could get the floor at the time. I am sure he will recognize that. I think the Chair has the right to recognize the Minister of Public Works on the point of order.

• (4:20 p.m.)

Mr. McIlraith: Mr. Speaker, I think all hon. members will agree that there is a grave and serious matter concerning members of the house at the moment. That being so, I would point out that the Prime Minister, who has the senior responsibility in the house as leader, did make a suggestion a few minutes ago that was not accepted. In the last few minutes we have been in danger of getting away from the issue into procedural discussions and wranglings that really serve no useful purpose. I have a suggestion that I would ask hon. members to listen to and consider.

The business indicated for the house this afternoon was, I think I can properly say, three rather routine motions to set up committees—

Some hon. Members: Order, order.

Mr. McIlraith:—and a small bill.

An hon. Member: Order. There is a motion.

Mr. McIlraith: I would suggest that the house give the Speaker an opportunity to consider the grave matter that is before him relating to a motion on a matter of real substance and concern to the house, which I feel is the best way of doing it.

Mr. Churchill: Just a moment, Mr. Speaker. On a point of order—

Mr. McIlraith: In the meantime, Mr. Speaker, we could go along in the usual way—

Mr. Nielsen: No. This is far too important.

Mr. Churchill: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, this is a question of procedure.

Mr. McIlraith:—and consider the matters I have indicated—

Some hon. Members: Order.

Mr. McIlraith: —which are not of a very major nature.

Some hon. Members: Order.

Mr. McIlraith: I believe that that course of action would permit the house to consider the very important matter before it in a calmer and more careful way, and not prejudice it by means of an immediate consideration of—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please; order, please. The position of the Chair has now been reinforced by a citation from Bourinot's fourth edition, page 353, which the Chair did not have available before and which I now cite:

> No member who rises to a question of order or privilege will be permitted to move an adjournment of the house or of the debate under the cover of such question.

The hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre, in the same way as the hon. member for York South, rose on a point of order—

Mr. Knowles: Oh, no.

Mr. Speaker: —rose on a point of order. That was the only way that the hon. member could get the floor.

Mr. Knowles: No, no.

Mr. Speaker: There is no other way that he can be recognized unless it is on a question of privilege. That is the only matter that we have before us now.

This motion would be made or could be made if there was an item of business before the house and it would then become a superseding motion. Whenever the house reaches the normal business of the house and there is an item of business or a motion before the house, a superseding motion can be made by the hon. member who has the floor discussing the substantive motion, but not on a point of order. This, as I said, is the citation which unfortunately I did not have before but it is clearly before us now.

Mr. Churchill: You should have been here in 1956.

Mr. Knowles: Mr. Speaker, I accept your ruling. I will move my motion when we get to the second reading of the Bank Act bill.

BANK ACT AND QUEBEC SAVINGS BANKS ACT

EXTENSION OF CHARTERS TO DECEMBER 1, 1966

Hon. Mitchell Sharp (Minister of Finance) moved the second reading of Bill No. C-3, to amend the Bank Act and the Quebec Savings Bank Act.

He said: Mr. Speaker—

Mr. Knowles: Would the minister like my motion?

Mr. Sharp: I have a very short speech to make.

[Mr. McIlraith.]

Mr. Churchill: Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the hon. member for Grey-Bruce (Mr. Winkler), that the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre be now heard.

Mr. Muir (Cape Breton North and Victoria): You are not so sharp.

Mr. Sharp: Mr. Speaker—

Some hon. Members: No, no. Order.

An hon. Member: There is a motion.

Mr. Sharp: Mr. Speaker, may I proceed?

Some hon. Members: No, he has not been recognized.

Mr. Starr: Yes, he has. This is just manoeuvring around.

Mr. Sharp: Mr. Speaker, the bill before you—

Some hon. Members: No, no.

Mr. Sharp: —proposes to extend the charter of the bank—

Some hon. Members: Order, order.

An hon. Member: Sit down, C. D. Howe.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. To be legal and to be right I think the Chair would have to rule that, the minister having the floor, the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre cannot take the floor away from him for the purpose of moving—

An hon. Member: You did not recognize him.

Mr. Speaker: If the Chair recognized the hon. Minister of Finance he had the floor. I wonder whether hon. members heard me. As I said, if we are going to face this motion after the minister has finished his statement I am quite prepared to put it from the Chair now, that is, if the minister will relinquish the floor in favour of the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre. That would be my suggestion. We will have the motion, I assume, whenever the minister has completed his statement.

So if the hon. minister agrees I will read the motion.

Mr. Sharp: I agree, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Winnipeg South Centre (Mr. Churchill), seconded by the hon. member for Grey-Bruce (Mr. Winkler), moves that the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre be now heard. Is it the wish of the house to adopt the said motion? All those in favour please say yea.

Some hon. Members: Yea.

Mr. Speaker: All those opposed please say nay.

Some hon. Members: Nay.

Mr. Speaker: In my opinion the nays have it.

And more than five members having risen:

Mr. Speaker: Call in the members.

Order. The question is as follows. Mr. Churchill, seconded by Mr. Winkler, moves:

That the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre be now heard.

[*Translation*]

The hon. member for Mount Royal (Mr. Trudeau) cannot take his seat once the question is put.

[*English*]

. The house divided on the motion (Mr. Churchill) which was negatived on the following division:

Division

YEAS

Messrs:

Aiken
Alkenbrack
Allard
Asselin (Charlevoix)
Barnett
Beaulieu
Bell (Carleton)
Bell (Saint John-Albert)
Bigg
Bower
Brand
Brewin
Cadieu (Meadow Lake)
Cameron (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands)
Cantelon
Chatterton
Churchill
Clancy
Coates
Code
Crouse
Dinsdale
Enns
Fairweather
Fane
Fawcett
Flemming
Forbes
Forrestall
Gilbert
Grafftey
Grills
Gundlock
Hales
Hamilton
Harkness
Herridge
Horner (Acadia)
Howard
Howe (Hamilton South)
Howe (Wellington-Huron)
Johnston
Keays
Kennedy
Kindt
Knowles
Korchinski
Lambert
Lewis
Loney
MacDonald (Prince)
MacEwan
MacInnis (Cape Breton South)
MacInnis (Mrs.) (Vancouver-Kingsway)
Macquarrie
MacRae
McCleave
McCutcheon
McIntosh
McKinley
McLelland
Madill
Martin (Timmins)
Mather
More
Muir (Cape Breton North and Victoria)
Nasserden
Nesbitt
Nielsen
Nowlan
Nugent
Orlikow
Pascoe
Patterson
Peters
Prittie
Pugh
Rapp
Régimbal
Ricard
Rynard
Saltsman
Schreyer
Scott (Danforth)
Scott (Victoria (Ont.))
Sherman
Simpson
Southam
Starr
Thomas (Middlesex West)
Thompson
Vincent
Wadds (Mrs.)
Watson (Assiniboia)
Webb
Winch
Winkler
Woolliams—98.

NAYS

Messrs:

Allmand
Andras
Asselin (Richmond-Wolfe)
Badanai
Basford
Batten
Béchard
Beer
Benson
Berger
Boulanger
Brown
Byrne
Cadieux (Terrebonne)
Cantin
Caouette
Cardin
Caron
Carter
Cashin
Choquette
Chrétien
Clermont
Comtois
Côté (Dorchester)
Côté (Longueuil)
Cowan
Crossman
Davis
Deachman
Dionne
Drury
Dubé
Duquet
Émard
Éthier
Faulkner
Favreau
Forest
Foy
Gauthier
Gendron
Godin
Goyer
Granger
Greene
Grégoire
Groos
Habel
Haidasz
Harley
Hellyer
Honey
Hopkins
Hymmen
Isabelle
Klein
Lachance
Laflamme
Laing
LaMarsh (Miss)
Lamontagne
Langlois (Chicoutimi)
Langlois (Mégantic)
Laniel
Laprise
Latulippe
Laverdière
Leblanc (Laurier)
LeBlanc (Rimouski)
Lefebvre
Legault
Lessard
Lind
Loiselle
Macaluso
Macdonald (Rosedale)
MacEachen
Mackasey
McIlraith
McLean (Charlotte)
McNulty
McWilliam
Martin (Essex East)
Matheson
Matte
Mitchell
Mongrain
Morison
Neveu
O'Keefe
Orange
Otto
Pearson
Pelletier
Pennell
Pepin
Pickersgill
Pilon
Prud'homme
Reid
Richard
Rideout (Mrs.)
Robichaud
Rock
Roxburgh
Ryan
Sharp
Simard
Stafford
Stanbury
Stewart
Tardif
Teillet

Thomas (Maisonneuve-Rosemont)	Wahn
Tolmie	Walker
Tremblay	Watson (Châteauguay-Huntingdon-Laprairie)
Tucker	Whelan
Turner	Winters—124.

• (5:20 p.m.)

Mr. Speaker: I declare the motion lost.

Mr. Nicholson: Mr. Speaker, I was paired. Had I voted I would have voted against the motion.

Mr. Cameron (High Park): Mr. Speaker, I was paired. Had I voted I would have voted against the motion.

Mr. Sharp: Mr. Speaker, the bill before the house proposes to extend the charters of the Canadian chartered banks and of the Quebec savings banks until December 1, 1966, or 60 days thereafter if parliament does not sit for at least 20 days during the month of November, 1966.

As the house is no doubt aware, there were two extensions during past sessions of parliament to permit study of the recommendations of the Royal Commission on Banking and Finance, popularly known as the Porter Commission. Under present legislation the charters and powers expire after the sixtieth sitting day of parliament subsequent to January 17, 1966. I have had some calculations made to determine on what date the 60 days would expire and I have been informed that they would probably expire around Easter time. Therefore it is of considerable importance to the business and financial communities of this country that there should be a further extension at the present time, and that is what this bill proposes.

Hon. members will notice that it is intended that the charters of the banks should be extended until December 1, 1966 unless, of course, there is not an opportunity to get the other amendments through, or in the event of parliament not sitting for at least 20 days during the month of November, in which case there would be an automatic extension.

It is my hope and my intention, Mr. Speaker, that the house would pass the present bill forthwith. In due course, and I hope fairly soon, I will be able to bring before the house the substantive amendments to the Bank Act, to the Bank of Canada Act, to the Quebec Savings Banks Act and to some other financial legislation, so that before December 1, when the charters of the banks would expire according to the legislation which I am now proposing, there would be time for ample and careful consideration of the substantive amendments to the Bank Act.

• (5:30 p.m.)

I think the house will want to know about this because I imagine that there will be some questions during the discussion of this short bill and there will be some desire to know what progress the government is making on this very important legislation, namely, the substantive amendments that I hope to bring forward in due course in the next few weeks.

Hon. members will recall that my predecessor in office, the present member for Davenport (Mr. Gordon), placed a bill before the house which died on the order paper containing certain substantive amendments to the Bank Act itself. The government is reconsidering the proposals that were put forward last year. May I at this juncture refer to a speech that I made to the Canadian Club of Toronto on January 3 when I was speaking about some of the responsibilities of the Minister of Finance during this present year. I said at that time:

> Quite apart from the budget, there will be a substantial amount of financial legislation this year. The centrepiece, of course, will be the banking legislation, which includes both the revision of the Bank Act and the amendments to the Bank of Canada Act as well as other statutes.

I went on to say:

> I am reviewing now, in the light of events and developments of the past year, what was put before the house last spring.

I said then:

> I do not propose to make any comment on the substance of this legislation before presenting it to the house except to say—

I felt the house would be interested in this if hon. members have not already seen it.

> —that there will be some changes.

Then I added:

> My own opinion is that our legislation should go as far as is practicable to strengthen public confidence in our financial institutions and to promote competition among them for the benefit of the public at large.

I should like to enlarge a bit upon these general comments that I made to the Canadian Club in January of this year and say that it is still my intention to place before the government, and I hope that the government will approve, changes to the Bank Act and to other related legislation that will accomplish the two purposes that I set forth in the speech to which I have referred, which I delivered to the Canadian Club at the

beginning of January of this year. The first, and I think an extremely important purpose in the light of recent events in this country is to strengthen public confidence in our financial institutions.

I know that all members of the house are aware of some of the events that have taken place in the last few weeks and months which have shaken public confidence in some of our financial institutions. I need not at this time recall the names. They are so well known as to require nothing but reference to the fact that there have been some institutions that have failed or that have had to be absorbed. Indeed, the governor of the bank has said that because of some of these events he had to take very special measures in the administration of monetary policy to maintain general confidence in the stability of our financial institutions. I want to say, Mr. Speaker, that when we do get into the substance of these matters the purpose of the legislation that will be brought forward will be to assure as far as is practicable strengthened public confidence in our financial institutions.

The second purpose that I set forth at the beginning of January this year in my speech to the Canadian Club was that I thought our legislation should promote competition among our financial institutions for the benefit of the public at large. It has seemed to me that this, in general, was one of the main conclusions of the Porter Commission on Banking and Finance that was conducted in order to prepare for these decennial revisions of the banking legislation. I do think that we should, in considering legislation that is to be in effect for the next ten years, do as much as we can to promote competition among those institutions.

The Porter Commission went to some pains to point out that some of our existing legislation does have the effect of limiting this competition to the detriment of the public. Therefore I feel that we should, in our legislation, be striving to put forward legislation that will promote healthy competition for the benefit of the public at large. The financial legislation that will be coming forward, and this bill that is now before us for second reading is the first of a series of bills, will be of the utmost importance not only to the business and to the financial community but also to the little man in this country.

It will be the purpose of this legislation to promote the welfare of everyone. The purpose of this legislation will not be to protect the financial institutions. It will be to see that these financial institutions operate in such a way as to be of benefit to the population at large. I say that, Mr. Speaker, because sometimes I have seen suggestions that certain changes that are being proposed by various people they are sometimes attributed to the government although the government has not yet made up its mind on the substance of these matters—are somehow directed toward benefiting financial institutions. I should like to say as the Minister of Finance that my chief concern is the welfare of the population at large. I should like to see financial institutions operating in such a way as to be of the maximum benefit to the public at large.

Mr. Starr: I beg your pardon?

Mr. Sharp: The financial institutions can look after themselves very well, and I would hope that our legislation will be of such a character as to promote the general welfare of the public. That will certainly be our purpose.

Mr. Lewis: You are spinning it out admirably.

Mr. Starr: You have 20 minutes to go.

Mr. Sharp: I am sure when I say this that I speak for all sides of the house and for all members.

Mr. Churchill: Would the minister permit a question?

Mr. Sharp: Certainly.

Mr. Cameron (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands): On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, I wonder whether the hon. minister could relate his remarks to the principle of the bill before us?

Mr. Churchill: I withdraw my question because it is the same as the one that has just been asked.

Mr. Sharp: Mr. Speaker, I was saying that this is the first of a series of bills that will be coming before the house, and I thought it would be reassuring to the house when it is considering this first measure, which is for the purpose of extending the charters of our banks for a limited period—

Mr. Nielsen: We know that. You have already said that once.

Mr. Starr: Twenty minutes to go.

Mr. Sharp:—to know that we are seriously considering the nature of the amendments that will be coming forward and that will have to be dealt with by December 31.

Mr. Starr: Would you say that over again? I did not get that.

• (5:40 p.m.)

Mr. Sharp: I know that if I had simply risen and said that this is a bill which is intended to extend the charters of the banks for a period up to December 1st hon. gentleman opposite would have said: He did not tell us anything else, he did not tell us whether it was the purpose of the government to bring forward anything further. Indeed, one of my colleagues told me he did not know whether the house would be prepared to consider the bill unless there were some assurance that we were intending to proceed with substantive amendments to the Bank Act and that these would be before the house in plenty of time to be considered before December 1, 1966. At one time I had the idea that it would be sufficient merely to say what is contained in the explanatory note in the bill. However, I have been persuaded otherwise.

Mr. Starr: You mean you were persuaded at the cabinet meeting half an hour ago.

Mr. Chatterton: Would the minister permit a question? May I ask whether the minister has enough verbiage available to carry him through to six o'clock and take the government off the hook?

Mr. Sharp: I am sure the hon. member knows that this is a subject of importance, and he would expect the Minister of Finance to deal with it thoroughly.

Mr. Chatterton: Would the minister permit another question? While he is dealing with it thoroughly, will he also deal with it well?

An hon. Member: And intelligently.

Mr. Sharp: I am trying to deal with it thoroughly, well and intelligently.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh.

Mr. Speaker: Order. There are so many interruptions that it is difficult for the Chair to follow the minister's very interesting remarks.

Mr. Starr: If the minister would speak to the subject they would be better.

Mr. Speaker: The Chair wishes to remind the minister who has the floor that he should refer his remarks to the bill before us.

Mr. Sharp: It is important, I think, that the house should have some idea of what the government is proposing to do by way of substantial amendments to the Bank Act before this extension of the charters is approved. In particular the house should know that we are seriously concerned—

[Mr. Sharp.]

Mr. Starr: Surely, Mr. Speaker, the minister does not think he can get away with this "malarkey" he is giving us now. This bill deals only with an extension of the charters of present banks for a time. It has nothing to do with what amendments may be made in the future. The minister should address his remarks particularly to the point at issue. We are prepared to pass this measure if he would keep his mouth shut and sit down.

Mr. Pickersgill: Perhaps I might say a word on the point of order raised by the hon. member for Ontario. I assume that in the consideration of this matter the same interpretation of the principles of the bill would be made in relation to every speaker.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Caouette: Mr. Speaker, on the point of order raised by the Minister of Transport, I suggest that Bill No. C-3 is quite clear. Let the minister restrict his comments to the principle of the bill and we shall listen to him.

Now, in my opinion, he is out of order when he refers to other bills or when he is dealing with provisions of other bills still to be brought before the house. We shall discuss those bills in due course, when they come before the house.

At the present time, the minister should limit his remarks to the principle of Bill No. C-3, the purpose of which is to extend banking powers until November, 1966, or until December 1, 1966.

Mr. Lachance: Still on the same point of order, Mr. Speaker, I am surprised that the hon. member for Villeneuve (Mr. Caouette), who has always been particularly interested in the problems created by the Bank Act, should be satisfied with the brief comments made today by the Minister of Finance (Mr. Sharp) about this bill.

Personally, since the bill has to do with the Quebec Savings Bank Act, I would be greatly interested to hear the Minister of Finance give us more detailed explanations.

Mr. Caouette: Mr. Speaker, the hon. member for Lafontaine is showing that, for a lawyer, he is not too well versed in law.

Mr. Lachance: Surely as well as the hon. member for Villeneuve, Mr. Speaker.

[*English*]

Mr. Speaker: I am sure the minister knows the rules and can address his remarks to the principle of the bill before us. However, I might mention to hon. members that I well recall being in the Chair when a similar bill was introduced in a previous session and at that time a number of hon. members who are objecting at this moment to anything beyond discussion of the strict principles of the bill had no qualms about ranging far beyond those principles. At that time I tried, though without very much success, to restrict hon. members' comments to the principles of the bill. I am trying to do the same today.

Mr. Sharp: This bill is before the house, as hon. members know, because last year we were not able to deal with substantial amendments to the act before the session was over. What we have before us now is a bill to extend the existing measure for a further period of time.

As I say, I have been talking to some of my colleagues and one of them suggested to me some time ago that if I did not deal with the general intentions of the government in the field of financial legislation while I was introducing the present measure hon. members would complain that I had not dealt adequately with the subject and was hoping to get the legislation through without any discussion of the principles underlying banking legislation as a whole.

Mr. Chatterton: Which other cabinet minister suggested the hon. gentleman should give so much explanation of this bill?

Mr. Cameron (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands): Would the minister permit a question? As the only principle involved in this bill is the question of time, I wonder whether the minister would be prepared to discuss this principle?

Mr. Sharp: I will be very happy to do so. The purpose of extending the act until December 1, 1966, was very carefully considered in the light of the time available. We considered carefully whether this would give sufficient time for the house and the committees of the house to deal with the financial legislation which is coming subsequently and which will amount to substantial amendments—

Mr. Grégoire: May I ask another question? Does the minister think there will be an election before December 1, 1966?

Mr. Pickersgill: It is a question of timing.

Mr. Sharp: While my remarks have been quite relevant, Mr. Speaker, I do not think that remark is relevant. Indeed, it has been found from experience that it is extremely difficult to forecast the dates of elections.

An hon. Member: And the outcome.

Mr. Sharp: At any rate, one of the reasons for suggesting that the charters be extended to December 1—

• (5:50 p.m.)

Mr. Cashin: Would the minister permit a question? First, would he not agree with me that the hon. member for Royal, while otherwise intelligent, is lacking in a sense of humour? The real question I want to ask arises out of the remarks of the hon. member for Lapointe and concerns the date of December 1, 1966. An interesting question has been presented to the house by the hon. member for Lapointe. It is a purely hypothetical question, but in the event that the country was in the midst of an election at that time when the bank—

Mr. Nielsen: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. Will Your Honour intervene to prevent the hon. member and others like him among the government and its supporters from making a mockery of the rules of the house?

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. The hon. member is, of course, impugning motives, which he knows he has no right to do under the rules.

Some hon. Members: Withdraw.

Mr. Speaker: When a legitimate question is put to the minister and an hon. member has the floor it is not for the Chair to find out or guess why the question is being asked, and the hon. member for Yukon cannot suggest a question is being asked for any other motive than to obtain information.

Mr. Cameron (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands): On a point of order, Mr. Speaker—

Mr. Cashin: On a question of privilege, Mr. Speaker—

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. May we have order? There is an hon. member rising on a point of order and another on a question of privilege. Perhaps the hon. member for St. John's West might be given the opportunity to put his point first.

Mr. Cashin: Mr. Speaker, my question of privilege arises out of the remarks just made by the hon. member for Yukon who cast reflections upon my judgment and ability and, moreover, on my right. The other two may well be in question but my right to ask a question, which I believe is a serious one even though it may be hypothetical, is very much in order. It is right to the point of the particular legislation before the house. I might say I regret I do not have the experience that the hon. member for Yukon has and therefore I am unable to use the rules as skillfully as he—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. May I suggest that the point be ignored—perhaps forgotten is a better word—at the moment. The hon. member for Yukon made a statement and the hon. member for St. John's West objects to it. It might be better for the proper conduct of business if we returned to the minister's statement.

Mr. Cameron (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands): Mr. Speaker, I was rising on a point of order when you recognized the hon. member for St. John's West. My point of order is that the hon. member for St. John's West was not asking a question. He was intervening in the debate. Consequently, the minister has lost the floor and since the hon. member for St. John's West has now taken his seat it is your duty to recognize someone else.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. I cannot agree with the hon. member. The minister has the floor. He allowed a question, as is very frequently done, and if there were a suggestion that when hon. members allow a question they lose their right to speak I am afraid very few questions would be allowed. It seems to me we have followed the usual practice. I should like hon. members to cooperate with the Chair and allow the minister to continue with his statement.

Mr. Sharp: Mr. Speaker, the question asked by the hon. member for St. John's West is indeed very pertinent to this legislation because the reason the legislation is drawn in this way is to provide that if parliament is not sitting in the month prior to December 1 then these charters are automatically extended. It is important to the house to understand this and recognize the principle that lies behind this bill. As I was saying—

Mr. Ryan: Would the minister permit another question? With regard to the proposed section 6(b)—

[Mr. Speaker.]

Mr. Speaker: Order. I take the liberty of bringing to the attention of the hon. member that in the course of debate on second reading no reference should be made to specific clauses of the bill and he cannot ask such questions.

Mr. Ryan: I bow to your ruling, Mr. Speaker, but I should like to put this question. I understand that under the B.N.A. Act parliament must be called within a year less a day. I should like to ask the minister whether under the proposed section 6(b) it could possibly be as late as January or February of 1967 that a bank could carry on the business of banking without anything further being done?

Mr. Sharp: Mr. Speaker, I think it would be more appropriate if I were to answer that question when I wind up the debate on second reading because I am not quite certain I have understood the full import of the question. It may be an important question and I would not like to pass over it lightly.

The purpose in extending the period until December 1 is to enable the house and its committees to deal in as much detail as they wish with subsequent legislation when it comes before us. We had thought that perhaps we could make the date earlier than December 1, but because of the press of parliamentary business and the need on the part of the house and the community at large to have an opportunity of discussing the legislation in committee, we felt we should give the maximum amount of time possible by having this date of December 1. We thought about December 31, but it seemed to us it would be difficult under the circumstances to deal with the question raised by the hon. member for St. John's West about some emergency intervening. Therefore we felt the best possible compromise upon a date would be December 1, which is several months from now. I do not think this is any too much time and I do hope that the house will agree with the government that a date of December 1 is the appropriate date. It is as late as we can practically make it.

It gives enough time for the house and its committee to consider fully the financial legislation dealing with the Bank Act, the Bank of Canada Act, the Quebec Savings Banks Act and perhaps other financial legislation, because all of this must be considered as a package for the purpose, as I said at the beginning of my remarks, of strengthening confidence in our financial institutions and

second, promoting competition among them for the benefit of the common man. May I call it six o'clock, Mr. Speaker?

Mr. Starr: A disgraceful performance by the Minister of Finance.

PROCEEDINGS ON ADJOURNMENT MOTION

SUBJECT MATTER OF QUESTIONS TO BE DEBATED UNDER ADJOURNMENT MOTION

Mr. Speaker: It is my duty, pursuant to provisional standing order 39A, to inform the house that the questions to be raised at the time of adjournment tonight are as follows: The hon. member for Brome-Missisquoi (Mr. Grafftey), Health and Welfare—request for increased assistance for medical schools; the hon. member for Vancouver-Kingsway (Mrs. MacInnis), Canadian Economy—steps to meet increase in cost of living; the hon. member for Kootenay East (Mr. Byrne), Administration of Justice—Steven Truscott—request for investigation.

It being six o'clock the house will now proceed to consideration of private members' business as listed on today's order paper, namely, private bills, notices of motions (papers) and public bills.

PRIVATE BILLS

INTERPROVINCIAL PIPE LINE COMPANY

The house resumed, from Tuesday, February 22, consideration of the motion of Mr. Wahn for the second reading of Bill No. S-10, respecting Interprovincial Pipe Line Company.

Some hon. Members: Stand.

Mr. Stanley Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Mr. Speaker, I rise on the second reading of Bill No. S-10 for a purpose that will not take the house by surprise. I had thought that the hon. gentleman who had the floor just before six o'clock was making a speech that would end at 5.30 or 5.40 and that I would get the floor at that time. But since he kept going I have to rise on this bill for the purpose that the house expects me to fulfil.

It is our feeling that time, something about which the Minister of Finance (Mr. Sharp) was speaking, is needed by the government to consider this day's events, and time is needed by Your Honour to consider the important matters that Your Honour must consider. We think it would be better for parliament to hope for a better day tomorrow than we have had today. We recognize, Mr. Speaker, that a motion such as the one I now wish to make—

• (6:00 p.m.)

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member, I am sure, will recognize that he has the floor for the purpose of speaking about this bill and he should speak about it unless he wishes to make another motion. For the moment he has to limit his remarks to the bill before the house.

Mr. Knowles: Yes, Mr. Speaker. I think, rather than our spending time on this bill, it is more important that we give consideration to the points I just made. I therefore move, seconded by the hon. member for Greenwood (Mr. Brewin), that the house do now adjourn.

Mr. Macdonald (Rosedale): Mr. Speaker—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. It has been moved by the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre seconded by the hon. member for Greenwood, that the house do now adjourn. According to the terms of Provisional Standing Order 6(3), if any member objects to the taking of a vote at any time between 1.00 o'clock p.m. and 2.30 o'clock p.m. or between 6.00 o'clock p.m. and 8.00 o'clock p.m., Mr. Speaker shall request those members who object to rise in their places and if five or more members rise the taking of the vote shall be postponed.

And more than five members having risen:

Mr. Speaker: The vote is therefore suspended until eight o'clock p.m.

Mr. Knowles: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, do we understand that Your Honour will call for the vote automatically at eight o'clock in view of the objection from the government side?

Mr. Speaker: This is my understanding of the rule, that the vote will be called at eight o'clock.

An hon. Member: What are you going to do?

Mr. Hellyer: We are going to vote this down and get on with the country's business.

An hon. Member: You are still in a mess.

Mr. Bell (Saint John-Albert): You will have to make a lot of telephone calls during supper.

Mr. Frank Howard (Skeena): Mr. Speaker, I rise to make a few comments about the bill regarding the Interprovincial Pipe Line

Company. My purpose is akin to that achieved by the Minister of Finance who succeeded in preventing a particular motion from coming to a vote. My purpose is that the Interprovincial Pipe Line Company bill likewise will not come to a vote because I do not think parliament should endorse the principle contained in the bill.

One of the contentions of the sponsor of the bill is that the legislation would be of assistance to the investing public, the reason being that if the stock split is permitted to go through the presumed price of the stock on the open market would be approximately one fifth of what it is at the present time and because it would be a lower priced stock it would therefore be more attractive to the investing public. How is this supposed to take place? Some years ago we had another bill which parliament dealt with regarding a stock splitting arrangement involving Trans Mountain Pipe Line Company. The information which we were given at that time by persons knowledgeable in the field of stock market activities was that when a stock split of this nature took place they could expect about a ten per cent increase in the number of shareholders and that after this 10 per cent increase in the number of shareholders took place—the 10 per cent increase, incidentally, would be an increase because of speculation based on an expected rise in the price of the stock itself—the total number of shareholders, following an indeterminate period, would settle back to somewhat the same number as before the stock split took place. The assistance to the investing public is only to approximately 10 per cent of the investing public, which I submit is a relatively insignificant part of the Canadian population.

Mr. Johnston, president of Interprovincial Pipe Line Company, told us a long time ago that from watching the movement of these shares and their sale on the stockmarket he knew that sales were between 700 to 1,000 shares a day. He went on then to say, and I quote from his statement in the proceedings and evidence of the standing committee: "I think that is probably a reasonably good average". So far as Mr. Johnston, the president of the company, was concerned sales of the stock on the market were at a reasonably good average. It seemed all right to him. It seemed that the investing public was exhibiting sufficient interest in the stock at a price of around $90, as it was then, and that sales achieved a reasonably good average.

How is this proposal going to be of help, as the sponsor puts it, to the investigating public?

[Mr. Howard.]

Is it going to be of help to the shareholders now such as Imperial Oil, Shell and B.A. Oil? If what we are told is the usual thing happens and the stock split goes through, the price of the stock on the market will be cut by five and there will be an almost automatic advance in the new price which will add to the advantage of those who are now stockholders and allow them, if they so desire, to divest themselves of the stock they now hold in anticipation of the 10 per cent increase in shareholders that may result from the stock split.

I suppose one can argue that this is a reasonable course to follow, but what prevented those who want to divest themselves of the stock now from selling it in the last two years when it was almost $100 a share? There was a reasonably good profit available for those who had bought it at a lower price. I do not know what it is down to but it is down now. When the hon. member introduced the bill the other day it was about $86. There has been some decline from what the price was a year or two ago when a similar bill was before us. Why is it that parliament at this juncture, as it was, before, should be asked to endorse a principle which will assist to bail out investors who may have bought the stock at a high price? We do not do this in respect of other companies.

• (6:10 p.m.)

The normal course, as I understand it, is that if you buy stock on the market and it goes up and you sell and make a profit that is good for you but if you buy stock at a certain price and it goes down and you lose money then it is too bad. That is the way the ball bounces, as the common expression goes.

The small investor will not be in a different position after the stock split takes place from what he is in now. The whole question is related to investors having a certain amount of money to invest. If with that money they buy ten shares of stock at one price or 100 shares of stock at another price it does not make any difference to them because they still have a certain amount of money involved in an investment.

Mr. Johnston said when he appeared before the committee that at that time average sales ran between 700 and 1,000 shares and he considered that reasonable taking into account the price of the stock and the number of shares on the market. One would assume from that statement that there was reasonable activity in the buying and selling of

Interprovincial Pipe Line shares on the open market.

Mr. Johnston said that the investing public was participating reasonably which leads me to believe that perhaps there is something more behind this proposed stock split than a beneficent desire on the part of Interprovincial Pipe Line Company, Imperial Oil, Shell Oil and British American, all of whom are noted for their desire to help the investing public, to do just that. There must be something more behind this particular proposal than just that desire.

When the hon. member who sponsored the bill spoke on the day of its introduction he spoke in terms of the value of the stock on the market and said the present market price of Interprovincial stock at that time was $86. He quoted from a study of stock splits in postwar years published in the *Analysts Journal*. He also referred to some characteristics of procedures of common stock splits which appeared in the *Harvard Business Review*.

Mr. Johnston suggested that the New York Stock Exchange was officially committed to a policy of keeping individual common stocks at what it considered desirable price levels, and in this case "desirable" means low or medium priced. The object was to make for better trading and to attract small investors. He suggested that the exchange regards as the most desirable price level a range between $18 and $25. I assume the analogy is that the Toronto Stock Exchange should or does have the same principle and that it is just as desirable to do it there as it is on the New York stock exchange.

On the day Mr. Johnston made that statement I looked at the Ottawa *Citizen* of February 15 to see how many stocks there were in this desirable price range and how many there were above the $25 level. Apart from penny stocks, which probably do not enter the picture because they are in a different class and of a different sort altogether, there were many stocks on the Toronto exchange at the undesirable level.

The stock of Imperial Oil, one of the owners of the Interprovincial Pipe Line Company, was at the undesirable level of $53¾ which I presume is $53.75. That is a most undesirable situation. This company is imbuing one of its subsidiaries, if that is what Interprovincial Pipe Line Company is, with the concept that its shares are at an undesirable level while at the same time its own stock is at an undesirable level, more than twice as much. General Motors Corporation is another undesirable company in so far as its stock is concerned. They were selling their shares on that day at the fantastic price of $113. That is an even more undesirable level than the shares of Interprovincial Pipe Line Company.

I could refer to a number of other companies whose stocks were in the undesirable range on that day but perhaps I should not take time to do so. To mention a few, there were several banks, Bell Telephone, B.C. Sugar, C.P.R. and a variety of other.

An hon. Member: Put them on the record.

Mr. Howard: My hon. friend asks me to put them on the record. If members wish me to do so I will but I do not think there is sufficient time at my disposal. This request comes from a responsible source so perhaps I should comply by referring to a few of them. Some of them I do not recognize but there is one referred to as Alta. G.P.C. with its stock listed at $97½. That is a little bit more undesirable than Interprovincial Pipe Line. The stock of B.C. Sugar was listed at $42, Bell Telephone stock was listed at $58, Bank of Nova Scotia stock was listed at $73 and Bank of Montreal stock was listed at $64. Perhaps that will suffice for the moment.

The point I want to get at is this. It does not seem to be a reasonable argument for the sponsor of this bill to say on the one hand that the price level of its stock, $86 as it was on that day, is an undesirable level when one of the owners of the company, Imperial Oil, also had its stock at an undesirable level. There must be something more behind this proposal than was stated by the then president of the company. I do not know whether Mr. T. S. Johnston is still the president of the company but at that time he made a number of extremely interesting and revealing statements that I feel should give us some concern and cause us to wonder. He talked about philosophy, if there is any such thing in the stock market, in respect of small investors and their preferences as to what they would like to buy, in what lots and at what prices. Mr. Johnston in his laudatory remarks about the Interprovincial Pipe Line Company said that there was still a particular trend on the stock market which would indicate that companies do not wish to sell their stocks at a price too low or too high. He makes that statement as though the company had something to do with the setting of the price. I thought the price was set on the marketplace

by the investors or speculators rather than by any desire on the part of the company itself.

• (6:20 p.m.)

He talks about surveys being made on the New York, Toronto and Montreal stock exchanges and others. He talks about popularly priced stock and says its range is $20 to $25. I might say that on the Toronto stock exchange on that day, February 15, there were not too many stocks in the popular price range of $20 to $25 compared with the total number of stocks listed.

Mr. Johnston went on to make a most revealing statement which I think deserves intense examination. In talking about stock in the popular price range he said:

> This encourages wide participation by the Canadian stockholder and the Canadian public which, I think, is a most desirable feature. I think the public should participate to the greatest extent possible in any company which has been successful and has contributed something to the Canadian economy.

I have forgotten how many shares of this stock are on the market. I believe about 5 million shares have been issued out of a total number in the treasury of some 40 million. This leaves in the treasury of the company at the present time 35 million shares. If it is correct, as Mr. Johnston says, that the public should participate to the greatest extent possible in any company which has been successful and has contributed something to the Canadian economy, why does this company not take steps to issue some of the shares out of its treasury and broaden the participation? Why does it not draw many more people into the picture?

The financial survey of oils for 1965 gives the number of issued shares as 5,087,282 as at December 31, 1964. I gather nothing has been taken out of the treasury since then although there may have been. Do the directors of the company, do the boys who control and own it have any options to buy treasury stock at a set price? The usual course with regard to an option given to any official or director is that they have the option to buy the stock at a low price, which means that they put up very little money, become involved in no risk, sell the stock at the inflated price on the stock market and keep the change.

This is what happened with Trans Canada Pipe Lines. This is how a couple of people became millionaires overnight from an investment of $8. We should like to know whether there is any activity of this sort taking place in the company or contemplated by it.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order. I must advise the hon. member that the time allotted to him has expired.

Some hon. Members: Continue.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: The hon. member for New Westminster.

Some hon. Members: Go ahead.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order, please. If it is the wish of the hon. member to continue I am sure he will make a request to the house.

Mr. Howard: Mr. Speaker, the house has requested that I continue beyond my time and I shall be glad to comply with that request.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order. If the hon. member wishes to continue he will make the request.

Mr. Howard: If I shall have the unanimous consent of the house, which is required, I shall be happy to continue.

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Does the house give unanimous consent to the hon. member continuing?

Some hon. Members: Yes.

Some hon. Members: No.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: There is not unanimous consent. The hon. member for New Westminster.

Mr. Scott (Danforth): Let the record show that it was the Liberals who refused consent.

Mr. Barry Mather (New Westminster): Mr. Speaker, I should like to say a few words in relation to the proposition that is before us in Bill No. S-10 respecting the Interprovincial Pipe Line Company. I believe the purpose of the bill is to secure from parliament approval to split the stock of the company five times, or to five shares of the value of $1 each. Those of us in the New Democratic Party object to this and have several grounds for so doing. In the first place, and in direct relation to the application before us, we have looked over the history of the company and its stock and find that the company secured consent by an act of parliament 17 years ago to transport oil in Canada. At this time I believe the company has some 3,500 miles of line in its operations.

The original capitalization of the company in 1949 was on the basis of $50 per share but even by 1952, if my figures are correct, the shareholders had approved a stock split to a par value of $5 a share. This company has a capitalization of 40 million shares and only 5 million of those shares are on the market at the present time. If the new, further split which is now sought is approved it will mean the company will have a capitalization, if my figures are correct, of 200 million shares.

The question that arises in our mind is: Why does the company want this many shares? Its stock, as was pointed out before, has been and continues to be an excellent, well supported investment. As a matter of fact, somebody has worked out that if you had bought one $50 share in this company back in 1949 and had stayed with it through the stock split that took place in 1952, the 10 for 1 split, and had reaped the $3.40 dividend paid per share last year, you would have received in dividends $30 a year up to this time for the original capital investment of $50. The stock is a very good one, so why change it or dilute it, especially when, if what is sought in the way of an additional stock split is granted, the company will have some 175 million undistributed shares in its treasury?

I would want to know a great deal more about the proposition before I would agree to it. That is in the first place, Mr. Speaker. In the second place I very much doubt the claim that is made as a basis for proposing this stock split and the proposition we are faced with in the explanation of the bill. This proposition is that the stock split is being sought in order to encourage Canadian investors to invest in a Canadian corporation. I think nobody would dispute the fact that the companies in Canada which actually own a great number of the shares of this company are in the main non-Canadian companies and are rather, United States controlled or owned companies. My understanding is that Imperial Oil, B.A. Oil and Shell Oil are not truly and completely Canadian concerns. I believe many hon. members would agree that what is owned is controlled. For example, what the Americans own in this country, which according to the latest figures I have is something more than 60 per cent of all Canadian natural resource industries, is certainly controlled and circumscribed by non-Canadian minds and hands.

• (6:30 p.m.)

The situation in this respect is something like the old adage of the iceberg. That part of it which is above the surface seems very massive and people think it is a tremendous size. Of course, Mr. Speaker, so it is; but actually it is only one-seventh of the great bulk of that structure which runs below the surface and actually determines the flow and the course of the iceberg which looks so large above the surface. I think that is the case also in the matter of Canadian industry, particularly in the matter of this application. Therefore, under these circumstances and believing as we do we just cannot be so naive as to take this prospectus at face value, and we in this group insist on continuing to examine the fine print.

I have another reason for objecting to the passage of this bill, at least till my grave misgivings about it are set at rest. The reason is that basically this is a transportation company, a private monopoly concern dealing in a business which affects several provinces and at least several thousands of Canadians. Actually it is not a business, any more than the post office or the streets or sewers are, which can be regarded as a competitive one. You cannot logically have several giant pipe line transportation companies running across the country competing with and duplicating each other. This just does not make sense.

Our feeling, Mr. Speaker, under these circumstances is that this company should be regarded as having something in the nature of a private monopoly function in what should be the public service or public monopoly field. I think that the parliament which originally granted this organization its rights was unwise in doing so. It seems to me, in the first place, that it was wrong for it to do so. Surely it should have been a publicly owned and operated concern serving the public interest, operated by and for consumers at the lowest possible cost to them.

So, Mr. Speaker, as far as I am concerned I oppose the passage of this legislation and I would invite other hon. members also to take a very hard look at it or at least to ask for further clarification and explanation.

Mr. M. W. Martin (Timmins): Mr. Speaker, I should like to say a few words on this bill and for very good reason. I know we may be accused by certain hon. members of taking perhaps an overzealous interest in these pipe line bills but I think I can demonstrate to yourself and to the house that bitter experience is possibly the reason we seem to be so

extremely interested. I should like to relate some experiences that make me feel that if closer attention had been paid to previous bills appearing before the house certain difficulties which confront us today would not now exist. Furthermore, if we provide this close scrutiny we may be able to avoid similar action in the future.

I have been receiving recently a tremendous number of complaints by consumers of natural gas. I grant you, Mr. Speaker, they are not in connection with this particular company or this particular pipe line, but I think there is great similarity between the two. What I want to demonstrate today are matters for which we should watch out while we have the responsibility of passing of bills of this sort in the house.

In the region from which I come there has been a tremendous and very unwarranted increase lately in gas bills. Therefore I proceeded to look into the matter to see what was causing it and I found that while everything was perfectly legal and aboveboard a very shady deal was being pulled off.

The information I got was that when this company received their original contract they contracted to supply a certain quality of gas to the consumers. I believe the figure was something like 1,000 b.t.u.'s per cubic foot of gas. During the period they were selling this gas and getting people to convert to gas they were shooting through something like 1,100 b.t.u.'s per cubic foot. After everybody had gone to the expense of converting to gas stoves, gas furnaces and so on the company then cut the gas back to the amount they originally contracted and guaranteed to carry. This may be quite legal so far as the supply of gas is concerned but so far as the sale of it is concerned it has been done under false pretenses. This is something that the members of this house should watch for when we consider such matters.

I am told, for example, that the profits of this particular gas company in the first six months of last year jumped 50 per cent. What is happening, of course, is that while the consumers are still paying the same price they were paying before they are not getting the same quality of gas and it does not perform the same function or serve the same purpose.

What happened after all this conversion had taken place and everybody had gone to the expense of installing gas furnaces, gas stoves, and so on, was that a plant was built to extract butane and propane gas from the natural gas as it came through. This gas was sold at a handsome profit by the company which charged the same price for the gas they had previously charged. I am referring to Northern Ontario Gas which supplies the district from which I come. This is the sort of thing we have to examine very carefully, and it is the sort of thing we should try to prevent occurring in the future. I am wondering, Mr. Speaker, whether we have a quorum at the present time.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order. Under the Standing Orders of this house, if any member brings to the attention of the Speaker that there is not a quorum present the members in the house are to be counted. I shall therefore ask the Second Clerk Assistant to count the house.

And on the count being made, more than 20 members were declared to be present.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order. I declare the house properly formed. The hon. member for Timmins.

Some hon. Members: Shame.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order. I should point out to the house that the remarks just made are out of order. Members of this chamber may leave or enter the chamber when the count is being made.

• (6:40 p.m.)

Mr. Martin (Timmins): Mr. Speaker, my opinion, which I have certainly expressed many times, is that it is a shame to take away the supper hour and to inconvenience the staff. I think that is one matter which should be looked into at the present time.

An hon. Member: Work harder.

Mr. Martin (Timmins): I think it is the privilege of any hon. member to call the attention of the house to the fact that if we can muster only 21 hon. members out of 265 we need to take another look at the idea of keeping the staff working during the supper hour.

An hon. Member: It is quality that counts.

Mr. Martin (Timmins): I did not hear the interjections. If hon. members have any questions to ask, I will be glad to answer them if I can.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order, please. I think it might be well for the house to get back to consideration of the business before it, which is the bill.

Mr. Martin (Timmins): Mr. Speaker, I have not very much more to say. Possibly these interjections may have made my mind wander from the subject. I do think that we should bring these matters to the attention of hon. members so that they can realize the importance of giving a bill such as this the very closest scrutiny.

Mr. Reid Scott (Danforth): Mr. Speaker, I want to say a few words on the bill and to introduce a motion which I think will give the house an opportunity to discuss what I think is a matter of great importance involving a very basic principle in matters of this kind. Before doing so I want to say a couple of words about the bill itself. I want to ask the sponsor, when he is winding up the debate and before we vote on the bill, which I presume will not be too long from now, to deal with some of the questions in the minds of some of the members of the house.

I hope that the sponsor of the bill will explain to us the necessity of a stock split when there are 40 million shares in the treasury unissued. The only reason we have heard from him is that the value of the shares is rising dramatically and therefore it is desirable to split them again. However, as has been pointed out by the hon. member for Skeena (Mr. Howard), the shares of a great many responsible companies stand at a much higher value than do those of the company now under consideration. The explanation for the split does not seem to be reasonable or not sufficiently reasonable to convince us of the merits of the split.

We do not really want to hold the bill up in any way. We want to pass it and let it go on to the committee so that all the details that are in our minds can be examined and all the questions can be answered. We want to expedite the passage of this measure.

One of the first speakers this afternoon raised what I think is the key issue in the bill, that is, that companies of this nature should not be privately owned. That is our judgment and perhaps we may be wrong. It seems to me, however, that this is a type of company which should be publicly owned and should not be left to ownership by oil companies as at present. We are not in favour of public ownership in all circumstances but certainly any company that is dealing with a natural resource of this type ought to be, in our opinion, under public ownership. We have had good experience of public ownership in Canada with operations such as the Sarnia plant, Canadian National Railways, and particularly with Ontario Hydro, a publicly owned corporation which produces electricity at the lowest cost I believe in North America, the next lowest cost producer being the publicly owned Tennessee Valley Authority.

It seems to me that at some stage in our history we shall have to take a serious look at the whole business of pipe lines. All the experts say that before many years pass pipe lines will be an important method of transporting goods. We shall not only be transporting oil through the pipe lines but we shall be transporting wheat and a great many commodities, even consumer goods. Many things will be transported through pipe lines. It seems to me that pipe lines are of such vital importance to the coming Canadian economy that the interests of the public would be served much better if they were placed under public ownership.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, rather than dealing with the particular bill under consideration I should like to move a motion, with your consent. I move, seconded by the hon. member for Springfield (Mr. Schreyer):

> That Bill S-10 be not now read a second time but that it be resolved that in the opinion of this house the said Interprovincial Pipe Line Company be brought under public ownership.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order, please. I point out to the hon. member for Danforth who has moved this motion that I can immediately see two objections to it. The first objection to it is that the words "in the opinion of this House the said Interprovincial Pipe Line Company be brought under public ownership" are quite outside the principle of the bill now before the house. Again, in the second part I would think there are financial implications. For those two reasons I believe that the motion moved by the hon. member for Danforth is out of order.

Mr. Howard: Mr. Speaker, I believe that there is a provision within the standing orders for a so-called reasoned amendment which permits the placing before the house of a proposition different from that which is contained within a bill itself. I cannot immediately find the provision in Beauchesne that deals with this. I looked for it and I could not find it. I must say that the motion by the hon. member for Danforth came to me as a surprise; otherwise I would have had more time to check. As I say, Mr. Speaker, there is a provision to the effect I have mentioned. I am sure that the Clerks at the

table would be able to provide us with the particular reference in Beauchesne. The effect of it is that it permits parliament to enunciate a principle or policy that differs from the one contained within a bill. I submit that the motion of the member for Danforth does precisely that. The motion offers the suggestion that the house should not proceed to pass the bill but should declare a policy or principle by way of a reasoned amendment that the company be put under public ownership. That is the motion. I regret that I am not able to give the reference in Beauchesne. However, I know that procedure similar to that has been followed on other occasions in the house and has been accepted by the house.

My colleague, the hon. member for Comox-Alberni, during the last session moved such a reasoned amendment with respect to a bill to establish an Indian claims commission, in which he said the house should not proceed to pass the bill but should develop a policy which differed from that set out in the bill. That particular so-called reasoned amendment was accepted by the Speaker at that time.

• (6:50 p.m.)

Mr. T. S. Barnett (Comox-Alberni): I very well recall during the last session of parliament moving an amendment to a motion for second reading. As far as my understanding of the rules goes, that amendment was on all fours with the one now proposed by my hon. friend from Danforth (Mr. Scott). There was some discussion at the time whether my motion was in order. I cannot recall the exact date. I do know that a member on the government side of the house raised the question whether it was in order and after some consideration of the matter it was ruled by the Chair to be in order.

Mr. Scott: I just want to make a representation on one aspect of your ruling, Mr. Speaker. I refer to the inference that this motion would in some way involve the expenditure of public funds. I hope you will reconsider this ruling because it is a common practice for members on this side of the house to move expressions of opinion which may or may not involve the expenditure of public funds.

We have often moved motions which, if carried, would involve a course of action necessitating the expenditure of public moneys, but it has always been my understanding that this is a proper procedure.

[Mr. Howard.]

Before we moved this amendment we carefully considered the question of whether or not it would be in order. It was only after a careful search of precedents and a comparison between this motion and various others which the Chair has found acceptable that we drafted it in its present terms. I believe that if Your Honour would take this motion again under advisement and compare it with others which have been accepted in the past Your Honour would agree that it is a proper one, not one which should be ruled out of order.

Mr. Arnold Peters (Témiskaming): Mr. Speaker, I should like to say a word on this matter. There is no question that if we were recommending that the government purchase this company there would be an expenditure of money involved. However, the amendment is carefully worded so that the government ownership could be established in other ways. This company is an efficient and wealthy company. There are many ways in which the government could assume control without making any financial investment in it.

In the present case this could be done by taking over the undistributed shares which are available at the present time. As my hon. friend from Skeena has pointed out, only some 5 million out of 40 million are outstanding at the present time. The rest are treasury stock. If the government were to decide to take it over by taking over these 35 million shares, it would exercise control and no expenditure would have been incurred.

I suggest there are a number of ways in which the intention of this amendment could be carried out without the government incurring expenditure. The amendment merely says:

> —that in the opinion of this house Interprovincial Pipe Line Company be brought under public ownership.

This could be done if the government were to take control of the undistributed stock which the company holds. The argument that the exercise of control would involve the expenditure of public money is not necessarily sound. Moreover, as a result of action taken following other measures in the past the government has been able to obtain control over a company, or control during its operation of a short range program, without the expenditure of money. I would remind hon. members of the circumstances in which control was obtained in the case of the Canadian National Railway by issuing government stock and bonds to the Grand Trunk

Railway at the time of the formation of the C.N.R. No large outlay of money was made, though it is true fairly large contributions were made later over a period of time.

Much of the government's contribution when the Grand Trunk Railway was taken over took the form of an assumption of responsibility for stock. In addition, large grants of land were made. Thus the government of the day was able to take over and finance the Canadian National Railway without spending large sums of money. I suggest that this amendment in its present form does not really call for the spending of money since it does not suggest how money should be spent, if it is to be spent.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: It is the considered opinion of the Chair that if the second part of this amendment were carried out there would be a financial obligation on the Crown. I would point out to the hon. member that in the explanatory notes to the bill the following statement appears in the first sentences:

> The purpose of this bill is to divide each of the 40,000,000 authorized shares of the par value of $5.00 each of the capital stock of the company into five shares of the par value of $1.00 each.

In other words, the principle of the bill is a division of shares. May I quote from citation 203 (1), page 171 of Beauchesne, fourth edition.

> It is an imperative rule that every amendment must be relevant to the question on which the amendment is proposed.

I would also draw attention to what is said on page 527 of May, seventeenth edition.

> The principle of relevancy in an amendment governs every such motion. The amendment must "strictly relate to the bill which the House, by its order, has resolved upon considering"—

In the case now before us the house is resolved upon considering the dividing of the shares of this particular company. The second part of the hon. member's amendment is not relevant to that principle. I therefore rule the amendment out of order.

Mr. Scott: May I call it seven o'clock?

• (7:00 p.m.)

Mr. Deputy Speaker: It being seven o'clock, the hour for private members' business has expired and the house will resume the business that was interrupted at six o'clock.

BANK ACT AND QUEBEC SAVINGS BANKS ACT

EXTENSION OF CHARTERS TO DECEMBER 1, 1966

The house resumed consideration of the motion of Mr. Sharp for the second reading of Bill No. C-3, to amend the Bank Act and the Quebec Savings Banks Act.

Mr. Erik Nielsen (Yukon): Mr. Speaker, I am rising again on the question of privilege that was raised before the house went on to consider private members' business, and before discussion began on the Bank Act.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order. Before the proceedings were interrupted at six o'clock did not the Minister of Finance have the floor?

Hon. Mitchell Sharp (Minister of Finance): No, Mr. Speaker. I had concluded my remarks.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: The hon. member for Yukon.

Mr. Nielsen: I hope someone will inform the Minister of Justice (Mr. Cardin) and the Prime Minister (Mr. Pearson) that this matter is being discussed, since neither of them are in their seats at the moment. I am doing this because of the fact that the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Diefenbaker), was absent from the city and absent from the house when comments were made outside the house reflecting on his conduct as prime minister and because of the comments made this afternoon in the house.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order, please. The Chair is in some doubt as to what is the point of privilege being raised by the hon. member for Yukon. Does it deal with the bill before the house at the moment?

Mr. Nielsen: Mr. Speaker, I am availing myself of the first opportunity to raise a point of privilege which has not been raised specifically this afternoon, or this day, with respect to the Leader of the Opposition. He being absent I intend to raise this question of privilege not only on his behalf but because it affects the privileges of all members of the house. This being the first available opportunity to raise it, I propose to put it to you now, sir.

The Minister of Justice this afternoon made a statement not only—

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order. Before the hon. gentleman goes too far perhaps he would state what his point of personal privilege is.

Question of Privilege

Mr. Nielsen: If Your Honour will permit me, that is what I was proceeding to do. Beauchesne, citation 108(3) at page 98 indicates the importance of libels on members of the house. Beauchesne says that they have been "constantly punished," and further he says:

—the libel must be based on matters arising in the actual transaction of the business of the house.

The Minister of Justice made charges, both in and out of parliament, which, if allowed to stand constitute a libel on the former prime minister of this country and every member of his government. He stated that the Leader of the Opposition had acted improperly in a security matter of which, because of his position as Minister of Justice, he is assumed by all members of the house to have particular knowledge.

Now, sir, I believe that this is a grave and serious libel, and that truth is the only defence to it. I say the minister, and this is the nub of the question of privilege, is called upon now to prove the truth of these statements in the house. It cannot be done by a committee. The charges were not made in a committee. They were made by the minister on his own responsibility, both in the house and outside it, in the enjoyment of all of his privilege as a minister of the crown and as a member of the Privy Council. He, and he alone, must accept the responsibility for the insinuations which he has raised and the charges which he has made.

All of these matters, as the minister pointed out, arose out of the consideration of his estimates and thus, "in the actual transaction of the business of the house." Some arose immediately and others were compounded by the minister's statements outside the house as well as by his further statements here today when he said, and he repeated, sir, that the conduct of the Leader of the Opposition should be the subject of a royal commission inquiry.

Having gone that far, and he took it upon his own responsibility to proceed that far, he is now, I submit, under an obligation, under a ministerial duty as a member of the government and as possessor of the portfolio which he holds, to go farther and to say upon what these basest of charges are founded. I say, sir, if he does not do this, which he has an obligation to do, then he must resign.

In further support of the question of privilege I raise, the responsibility of a member for his words is a basic principle of parliament. This principle must be enforced by parliament; and it must be enforced I submit, sir, with or without a motion. The minister must answer for the words which he has used.

I hope, sir, that as a man of honour, as a man of integrity, he would not continue to hide behind the rules of the house, but that he would rise and detail his charges against a former prime minister of this country, charges which he made this afternoon and charges to which I refer this day at the first opportunity.

Now, sir, the despicable charges and the allegations which have been made by the minister outside the house, reflecting on the former Conservative government and upon the former prime minister today, carried by all of the nation's news media, are a matter of such importance, of such urgency that they demand immediate attention by the house.

We have witnessed today the Minister of Finance (Mr. Sharp)—

Mr. Sharp: Mr. Speaker, I am not an expert on the rules, but on a point of order I would just like to know whether it is in order for the hon. member to interrupt the normal business of the house in this way.

Mr. Nielsen: I submit to Your Honour that a point of privilege always takes precedence over any point of order. This afternoon the Minister of Finance, and others, attempted to use the rules to delay the bringing of this very important and urgent matter before the house.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please; I have already taken the liberty of bringing to the attention of the hon. member for Yukon that he should not impute motives, and again I bring this to his attention. The Minister of Finance (Mr. Sharp), during discussion and consideration of an item of business before the house, made a speech and no hon. member, I suggest, can impute that the speech was made for any other purpose than to enlighten the house. The hon. member should not impute motives.

Mr. Nielsen: Well, Mr. Speaker, anyone who was in the house this afternoon can draw his own conclusions on that matter.

That this matter is a matter of urgent public importance, and that it constitutes a dastardly reflection on every member of the former government, on members of the house who are privy councillors, and upon the Leader of the Opposition, there can be no doubt. It cannot be dealt with in any other way because the minister himself carefully

waited until his estimates went through before saying at a press conference what he did not dare say in this parliament.

The minister's action constitutes a breach of national security, and as such is a matter of urgent public importance and must be dealt with, I submit, sir, here and now. No other house business, no other matter of debate can take priority over the wholesale slandering, for that is what I submit it is, of a former government and a former prime minister by one holding the responsibility of a minister of justice. The minister has an obligation—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please; I heard the hon. member this afternoon when he made his first contribution to this debate and, raised the matter which he considered a question of privilege, which was followed by a motion. I find it very difficult to see any difference between the question of privilege he is raising at this time and the one he raised this afternoon.

• (7:10 p.m.)

I know he might argue now that we are dealing with a different privy councillor and that every single privy councillor has a separate question of privilege. This is probably the only argument on which he can justify his entering into a debate a second time; but I should like him to take account of the fact that he has already participated in this question of privilege. I suggest the motion very properly was allowed to stand for a short while. I think the hon. member would want to consider the possibility that the motion the hon. member has already moved should be considered by the Chair. If I may say so, he is trying to duplicate his personality in the house and say that he made a motion before on behalf of one privy councillor and that he could again make a motion on behalf of not this one but another one. I have some doubt whether the hon. member can make six speeches, each time on behalf of a different privy councillor. This is beyond my comprehension; certainly, it does not appear to be very logical. Therefore, unles the hon. member is making a different contribution from that which he made this afternoon, I doubt whether he has a real question of privilege.

Mr. Nielsen: Mr. Speaker, since you raised the matter, and since Your Honour was not in the chair when I initially raised the matter this evening, I point out to you, with deference, that I am rising this evening on behalf of the Leader of the Opposition, who is not present in the house.

Mr. Speaker: I do not want to complicate things for the hon. gentleman, but I realize he is rising on behalf of another member of the house; this is the point I am making. He is rising on behalf of another privy councillor who may feel aggrieved by the remarks which have been made by the Minister of Justice. This was my point. I wonder whether the hon. member, after he has completed his presentation now on behalf of the Leader of the Opposition, then might get up a third time and say that this time he is speaking on behalf of a third privy councillor. I doubt whether this can be done.

Mr. Nielsen: I do not have to rise on behalf of any particular member of the privy council in this house. The only submission I have made to you this evening is on the basis that a prima facie case of privilege exists, and there has been no debate whatsoever in respect of the merits of the fundamental question of privilege raised which has to be decided by the house and, with great deference, sir, only by the house.

I am rising this evening at the first opportunity because the matter has not been placed before Your Honour previously. On this question of privilege, I should like to draw Your Honour's attention to the words used by the Minister of Justice this afternoon when he suggested to you, sir, and this house that the conduct of the former prime minister of this country should be made the subject of a royal commission inquiry.

I submit, sir, that that is an entirely distinct and separate question of privilege which has arisen as a result of the proceedings this afternoon, and not as a result of any proceedings during the minister's estimates or anything he may have said outside the house; indeed, it is additional. The minister has simply dug himself in deeper by his remarks this afternoon. I say, sir, that he cannot hide behind such wholesale smears, slanders, and allegations without fulfilling the obligation he has to make known the full facts. He has that duty and that responsibility. He must make his charges, having gone as far as he was allowed to go this afternoon in this house and outside it. He is assumed, sir, by the public as well as by the members of this house, to be in possession of the facts and to be making charges based on substance. He must, therefore, state to the members of the house what

those charges are. If he does not do that, sir, then he is under an obligation by our procedures to resign. That is the position in which he is.

Public life would be impossible, if a minister in full possession of his ministerial authority were able to make this kind of a charge about members of this house past and present, about privy councillors and about a former Prime Minister of this country without being required to substantiate and prove them. He must name names, and he must reveal the full circumstances. No more serious charges have been made by a minister in this country.

According to the press and the radio, the minister has involved, without naming them, members of the previous government, the Leader of the Opposition, privy councillors, and I think a woman whom he says was formerly involved in espionage in East Germany. He has stated there was a report on the matter on the files of the R.C.M.P., although he has not seen that report. He has stated that the case was a bona fide security case, although he has not said it very well. He has made the charge that the former Prime Minister did not deal in a proper manner with that case. How does he know, if he has not seen the file?

He has made these charges after his estimates were passed and at a time when he knew the former Prime Minister was absent from this city. The minister's conduct constitutes a deplorable dereliction of his high office and a dastardly attack on the former Prime Minister, a member of Her Majesty's Privy Council, and every member of the former Conservative government, some of whom are still sitting in this house and who are Privy Councillors.

I submit, to you, sir, and to the house, that this must be dealt with by parliament and must be dealt with by parliament immediately, because the shabby, sordid and underhanded action which it constitutes is one which must not be allowed to be interrupted by any other order of business. The minister now must back up in this house what he said to the press outside this house, and back up in this house the charges he made against the Leader of the Opposition this afternoon.

The Prime Minister of this country is not free from responsibility. A public action of this kind by a member of the cabinet must represent the considered determination of the government. The Prime Minister and the government must accept the minister's action or repudiate it. The minister acted following a meeting of the cabinet.

The whole government is involved in a course which has been reprehensible. It is a course of action which has been cowardly, and it is a course of action which has been lacking in the most elementary sense of justice or responsibility. I hear members over there make remarks concerning past proceedings of this house with regard to myself when I brought certain charges.

Hon. G. J. McIlraith (Minister of Public Works): Mr. Speaker, on a point of order—

Mr. Nielsen: This is a question of privilege and surely it supersedes—

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member may raise his point of order.

Mr. McIlraith: Mr. Speaker, no remarks whatever were being made from this side of the house.

An hon. Member: You just came in.

Mr. McIlraith: The hon. member is stating something about the proceedings in the house at the moment which is not true. There was no sound of interruption whatever.

An hon. Member: You were only coming in.

Mr. Nielsen: If an ordinary member of parliament had made such charges as were made by the minister this afternoon, and outside of this house, he would be required to substantiate them, and I am one who has particular knowledge. I see the Parliamentary Secretary laughing. He would be required to substantiate them. A minister's responsibility certainly is that much greater, and that responsibility does not cease once he leaves this chamber and holds a press conference. He has been meeting with the press and he has been giving out information in dribs and drabs, even prior to the allegations he made this morning.

The *Globe and Mail* this morning carries an interview with the minister in which he says "the Munsinger case is worse than the Profumo case". This statement is in the papers this evening in Ottawa.

• (7:20 p.m.)

In what way is it worse? Profumo lied to parliament. Does the minister say that someone here lied to parliament? Does he say the former prime minister lied to parliament or that any Privy Councillor lied to parliament?

According to the press, officials of the minister's department a day or two ago were making available, to certain reporters, information directly from the file on this case. The minister says he has not seen the file. On what basis can he blacken the reputation of a whole government and a former prime minister? This, sir, is outright slander and it ill behooves the minister who holds the portfolio of justice to engage in such tactics.

In so far as the public is concerned, and in so far as parliament is concerned, the presumption is that when a minister of justice speaks he has access to full information. The whole weight of his office is placed behind the charges he has made. He must now substantiate them. It is his obligation as a minister, as a member of the government and as a man of honour and integrity, to substantiate the charges he made outside and inside the house against the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Diefenbaker) and other Privy Councillors, and remove the cloud that is hanging over the heads of some of the members of the previous government.

Mr. Speaker, if the minister is not prepared to do this he must resign. The minister's action in this case, his leaking of information to the press, his calling a press conference to place in the public domain suggestions, insinuations and allegations which he dare not make in this house, demonstrates his unfitness for the position he holds and his total failure to grasp even a glimmering of the responsibility of that position.

The minister cannot be allowed to get away with this kind of action. This parliament must not allow him to get away with this kind of action. To countenance the method he has used would mean that none in political life would be free from insidious and cowardly attacks, without substantiation, at any time. Parliament cannot, I submit, be reduced to that state.

This is not a question of supporting accusations, with respect to the comments of the Chair this afternoon, against a minister. This is a question of dealing with the fact that the minister both in this House and outside has made charges, insinuations and allegations affecting members of this House, namely, the Leader of the Opposition and the members of the former cabinet, some of whom are sitting here this evening.

The request before us raises an issue as to the responsibility of a member of this House to substantiate charges.

Mr. Duquet: Did you, in respect of bankruptcies?

Mr. Nielsen: My hon. friend is new in this house. The charges which I brought were made the subject of a commission, and I had the distinct honour of being in the presence of Mr. Justice Dorion prior to his findings.

Mr. Duquet: I hope you keep that honour.

Mr. Nielsen: The question before us is one dealing with the fact that a minister, both inside this house and outside, made insinuations and allegations against the Leader of the Opposition and members of his former cabinet. He must substantiate the charges he made, just as those members on the other side obliged me to do with respect to matters raised in 1964. I submit that responsibility falls more heavily upon a minister, and heaviest of all on the Minister of Justice, since this is claimed to be a matter involving national security. Those are my submissions, sir. You have two motions before you and I am prepared to move a third with respect to this specific question of privilege that has been raised by me in the absence of the Leader of the Opposition regarding statements made when he was not in this house, nay even in this city to defend himself against despicable and insidious charges on the part of the Minister of Justice.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. I must say again that the essence of the question of privilege raised by the hon. member for Yukon does not differ greatly from those raised this afternoon, inasmuch as we are dealing again with the same statements made by the Minister of Justice (Mr. Cardin).

Mr. Nielsen: It is a new one.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Yukon says it is a new one. There were certain statements made by the Minister of Justice in the house this afternoon. There may have been more made since then, but I have not heard of them. My understanding is that we are dealing with the statements made in the house this afternoon and that those statements were the subject of the discussion in the house this afternoon.

As the hon. member states, there are two motions now before the Chair. According to our procedures there really should be only one. However, as a result of the way things were taking place during the course of the afternoon, the Chair found itself in the position of having two motions. It would be highly irregular to entertain a third.

I think the suggestion was agreed to by hon. members this afternoon that the Chair be given an opportunity, as is always given to a Speaker, to consider this serious matter and to look into the motions to see whether they should be received, whether they are in order and to render a decision to the house.

We must also take into account the fact that the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Knowles) has put a motion to adjourn the house at eight o'clock for the precise purpose of giving the Chair an opportunity to look into these matters.

Mr. Knowles: Hear, hear.

Mr. Speaker: In my view we should wait until the motion is put to the house. If the house is adjourned the Chair will then have an opportunity to think about all these things. I might say, to be very candid, that is what I would like to do. That is what I tried to do to the best of my ability during the dinner hour. I thought I would have an opportunity then to study these matters, but it was brought to my attention in the Speaker's chambers that a new question of privilege had been raised and it was suggested that I come back to the chamber. I apologize to the hon. member for Yukon if I was a few minutes late, but I did not expect this turn of events.

I think the situation is clear. There are two motions before the Chair. There was general agreement this afternoon that the Chair should be given an opportunity to look into them. The motion put by the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre was put for that very purpose. It will be voted on at eight o'clock and if it is carried I will have the opportunity of looking into the matter so that I may render a decision tomorrow. If it is not carried, I hope I will still have a chance to return to my chambers to consider the very serious suggestions that were made this afternoon and this evening by the hon. member for Yukon. I believe hon. members have an obligation to the Speaker to allow him to study matters of this kind. I am not a learned member of this House of Commons. I have been here just a few years and I am guided by the older members and other experienced people who have been here for some time. They assure me that it is normal for hon. members to give their Speaker, the man they have elected to this job, an opportunity to look into this type of matter. If hon. members refuse to give me an opportunity to return to my chambers I will remain here but, as I have suggested, they have an obligation to give me an opportunity to study the matter.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Terence Nugent (Edmonton-Strathcona): Mr. Speaker, the questions before Your Honour deal with whether or not the two motions are in order and, as I had the occasion to say this afternoon,—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. I will just say one thing more. If the hon. member for Edmonton-Strathcona (Mr. Nugent) feels the Chair should not have the opportunity of returning to the Speaker's chambers to consider this matter, I will stay and listen to the hon. member.

Mr. Nugent: Mr. Speaker, I feel that you should have an opportunity, but I wish to say something about that opportunity. It is my view that the question of whether the motion is or is not in order does not dispose of the main question of privilege which was raised this afternoon, or the question of privilege which was raised this evening.

• (7:30 p.m.)

There are several methods by which the house might deal with this question of privilege. Two motions are before Your Honour, either one or both of which may be found to be out of order, or Your Honour may decide that they are in order. With all due respect, sir, that does not solve the problem. That is only part of the problem with which the house is now dealing. I submit that had Your Honour ruled immediately and found one or other motion in order, it would not have finished the debate on the question of privilege; it would just have made sure that we knew exactly the procedure we were following in order to deal with the questions of privilege which have been raised.

I submit, with all due respect, that the decision the house arrived at this afternoon was that there was a prima facie case of privilege. The next step, since there is a question of privilege raised by an hon. member, is this: What is the best way for the house to deal with the question of privilege? I suggest, sir, that it is a transgression of the privileges of members of this house that we are now attempting to solve. The hon. member for Yukon (Mr. Nielsen) found it necessary to raise a new one in order to revive the debate. I presume that in accordance with a strict application of the rules, I should speak only on the question of privilege raised by

that hon. member. However, since the question involves the privileges of many members it is certainly the most orderly and business-like procedure to discuss the whole question, without undue regard for the niceties of the rules.

Mr. Speaker: I point out to the hon. member that the rules are more than niceties.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Speaker: The rules have to be respected by every hon. member, including the hon. member for Edmonton-Strathcona. There is one question before the house. The hon. member feels that he has a right to discuss it. I am not going to deprive him of this right, but I hope he will discuss this matter within the rules.

Mr. Nugent: I assure Your Honour that I shall try and stick strictly to the rules. I was perhaps a little careless in what I said. What I meant to say was this. Since the various questions of privilege are so intertwined, it is difficult to restrict one's remarks and make sure that they apply only to the question of privilege just raised, rather than including the remarks made this afternoon.

The matter before the house as a question of privilege deals fundamentally, I think, with the responsibility of one member of this house toward another in the sort of remarks he can make and the sort of attacks he can make on another member either in his capacity as a private member, as a member of the cabinet or as the Prime Minister, depending upon the member's status at the particular time.

Hon. J. R. Nicholson (Minister of Labour): Mr. Speaker, will the hon. member permit a question?

Mr. Nugent: Yes, sir.

Mr. Nicholson: The hon. member referred to the fact that these statements were made in the house. Great attention has been drawn earlier today to the fact that certain statements were made outside the house today. Is it not a fact that any member who has cause to complain about statements made outside the house can resort to the courts?

Mr. Nielsen: The question I raised involved statements made inside the house.

Mr. Nugent: I thought I said "statements made inside and outside the house" because sometimes a statement made outside the house could only have meaning if it were made inside the house. You have to consider it as a course of conduct followed between members of the house. I submit that the most serious question that we in this house have to consider is the responsibility—

Mr. Nicholson: Mr. Speaker—

Mr. Nugent: I would prefer not to hear another argument from the minister at this time.

Mr. Nicholson: Would the hon. member answer the question?

Mr. Nugent: I would prefer not to hear another argument from the minister at this time. I thought that he wished to put a question, but he made an argument. I trust that if he wants to take part in the debate he will grant me the courtesy of finishing my remarks about what I consider to be the responsibility here, and then we may hear from him. The responsibility of the Minister of Justice is, I submit, the business of everyone in this house and statements made by him concern the responsibility of all members.

I know Your Honour had considerable difficulty this afternoon and said that it was possible you might have question of privilege after question of privilege and we would not get very much farther. I submit the matter is so serious that it is the business of this house and is worth the time of this house, if necessary, to consider every question of privilege involved in the minister's action and deal with them one after another until the minister learns his responsibility to this house.

I submit that there are many questions of privilege that have not yet been raised by individual Privy Councillors. In addition, there are questions of privilege that can be raised by every member of this house if we take our duties seriously and take the words "responsible government" seriously. "Responsible government" implies that the government is responsible to this house. It is our duty as members of this house to make sure that the government acts in a responsible manner to this house.

The hon. member for Yukon pointed out very clearly the entire cabinet responsibility for the statements and actions of the Minister of Justice. The government now in power in this country is entitled to run the country only so long as it has the confidence of this house, and we have the right to support them and give them our confidence only so long as the government carries out its duties in a

responsible manner. Let us consider just one statement made by the Minister of Justice today. I ask any serious-minded member of this house to try and tell me this is the statement of a responsible minister. The Minister of Justice makes the sort of allegations which leave many former cabinet members under a cloud. He places a serious smear on the reputation of the right hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Diefenbaker) by saying that he improperly used his office when Prime Minister. He tells this house that he learned something about this conduct, but has the effrontery while making these grave charges, and making sure that he hits the headlines both inside and outside the house by reason of his statements, to say there is an R.C.M.P. report that he has not even seen.

Would this not offend the sensibilities of any member who wishes to go back to his constituency and say that he has conscientiously carried out his duty as a member of parliament to make sure there is a responsible government in this country? Here is a Minister of Justice who takes that sort of action and blandly tells this house, to the applause of the Liberal backbenchers, that he has not even bothered to read a report which may clear up all those misgivings in his mind or may substantiate them. The Minister of Justice was invited by the right hon. Leader of the Opposition to bring this report forward. He mentioned this last Friday. He has called press conferences. He has made these statements again today and tells us there is a report. Then he says he has not even seen it.

• (7:40 p.m.)

I ask all hon. members of this house who believe in responsible government if they are going to abandon their duty to make sure the government acts responsibly. What hon. member on either side of the house would call this a responsible government? What hon. member would suggest there is more serious business for this house to consider right now than the conduct of this government? It is not just the Minister of Justice but also the Prime Minister and his cabinet members who are concerned. I submit, Mr. Speaker, that the most serious questions affecting this house are those matters which go to the root of our system of government. Democratic government can only survive if you and I, the elected members of this house, are conscious of and conscientious about our duty to keep the government responsible to this house. We have a responsibility to those who elected us. We have to answer. What did we let the government get away with?

I am submitting that when the government officially allows a minister to act in this manner, it is our duty to make sure that all else ceases till the position is made clear. I would move a motion now that we go into committee of the whole house if the Minister of Justice (Mr. Cardin) would like to bring the facts forward and explain them. In committee of the whole, witnesses could be brought before the bar of the house and examined. If the facts are such as alleged by the Minister of Justice—that the former Prime Minister mishandled his office—then obviously the Minister of Justice should take this course, and I want to give him the opportunity of so doing. When he makes such allegations he has a duty to this house to prove them.

Mr. Nielsen: It is an accusation.

Mr. Nugent: I would move the motion now if I thought there was any hope of the Minister of Justice complying.

As I understand the position on the other side of the house, it is that it is perfectly all right for Privy Councillors to live under the suspicion that perhaps they are the ones who behaved so very badly, while all the time the Minister of Justice has a file, which he has not bothered to look at, which would clear the matter up. It is perfectly in agreement with Liberal principles that those Privy Councillors should be stained in that way, shall I say. This is what hon. members opposite are saying.

I could raise a question of privilege of my own very simply. I come to this house as a member with a duty I want to uphold. I do not believe that my position in this house should subject me to the witnessing of the sword of insinuation or accusation being directed toward these Privy Councillors by the Minister of Justice. I could raise a question of personal privilege as to whether I, as an elected member of parliament, must sit in this house at the same time as another member of the house who acts in this way. I believe that would be a very proper question of privilege for the house to consider.

The Prime Minister (Mr. Pearson) seems rather amused at my statement. I suppose the question of responsible government is a laughing matter with the Prime Minister because we have certainly seen very little of it under his tenure of office. I hope that the Prime Minister, who speaks for a government

which seems to make accusations so easily and withhold the evidence, will tell us whether or not he is proud of that party of his which is going to back up this kind of action.

Individual hon. members on the other side who jeered so loudly this afternoon might rise in their places one by one and tell the house whether they really believe they are doing their duty to their constituents by backing a government which says it will smear people and not even bother to look at the evidence. The Minister of Justice says he has the files, yet he has not looked at them. Can you imagine, Mr. Speaker, making serious slanders in view of that statement? Can you imagine any responsible person asking a whole group of people to live under that sort of cloud of insinuation, while at the same time the admission is made that there is a file in existence which may clear up the whole matter, a file at which the Minister of Justice has not even bothered to look.

The question of privilege, Mr. Speaker, concerns responsibility to this house. The government is responsible to the house, and we as members are also responsible.

An hon. Member: You mean irresponsible.

Mr. Nugent: I heard someone say "irresponsible". Since the hon. member sits on the other side of the house I gather he is speaking for the Liberals. It is true that when you talk of yourselves you do talk of irresponsibility.

I am not satisfied with the action taken by the minister. I am not satisfied that in this case the action of the government constitutes responsible government. My duty, as I see it, as a member is to insist on responsibility from the government. If we do not get it I am going to do my darndest to get rid of the government. I will continue to fight because this is the No. 1 priority item.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh.

Mr. Nugent: I realize a bunch of trained seals are not very interested in democracy. They are willing to sit back, take orders, jump up and down, and so on.

An hon. Member: You are one yourself.

Mr. Nugent: I never was, nor will I be. I ask any one of those who have interjected to stand up and say they believe this a proper course of conduct for the minister to follow.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Langlois (Chicoutimi): Mr. Speaker, I rise on a question of privilege.

[*English*]

Mr. Nugent: The hon. member can have the floor as soon as I have finished.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Langlois (Chicoutimi): Mr. Speaker, I rise on a question of privilege.

[*English*]

Mr. Speaker: I believe there is a question of privilege being raised. We have many questions of privilege before us at the moment, but we are dealing at the present time with the one on which the hon. member for Edmonton-Strathcona (Mr. Nugent) is speaking.

[*Translation*]

The hon. member cannot rise at this time when we are considering a question of privilege. If he is raising a point of order, I could recognize him. But we must try to dispose of questions of privilege seriatim.

Mr. Langlois (Chicoutimi): I raise a point of order, Mr. Speaker.

[*English*]

Mr. Nugent: Mr. Speaker, I am pointing out to hon. members—

Mr. Speaker: Order; the hon. member is rising on a point of order.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Langlois (Chicoutimi): Mr. Speaker, the previous speaker, the member for Edmonton-Strathcona (Mr. Nugent), has been inviting us in the last few minutes, especially those whom he calls the backbenchers, to express our views about the government's conduct.

Mr. Speaker: Order. I presume the invitation of the hon. member for Edmonton-Strathcona is mainly rhetorical. For the moment, I would suggest that we allow him to proceed with his remarks.

[*English*]

Mr. Nugent: Mr. Speaker, it is encouraging that at least one of the backbenchers is apparently concerned with the responsibility of government, and we might look forward to his participation in the debate, instead of this wild desk pounding each time a scurrilous remark is made.

I will close with this observation. If this is responsible government I ask any member who can do so to explain to me how the conduct of the Minister of Justice can be called responsible. I would dearly love to

hear that explanation. I would especially like to hear him explain how so many members of this house, Privy Council members, can be put under a cloud. The minister tells us he has a file on the matter which he has not even seen. How can that be responsible government? I certainly hope some hon. members will take this opportunity.

Hon. R. A. Bell (Carleton): Mr. Speaker, a long time ago I learned never to speak at any length when I was full of indignation. Therefore, my words here tonight are going to be very few in speaking to this question of privilege.

There has been an unholy slander against a group of men who have served Her Majesty well in this country. The matter can be settled and it can be settled at once if the Prime Minister of Canada (Mr. Pearson) will act as a Prime Minister. I ask the right hon. gentleman for Algoma East to act as a Prime Minister.

Right Hon. L. B. Pearson (Prime Minister): Might I ask the hon. gentleman a question? What does he mean by "acting"? Does he mean recommending the establishment of a judicial inquiry into this matter?

Mr. Bell (Carleton): The right hon. gentleman knows perfectly well what I mean. I want him to bring his Minister of Justice (Mr. Cardin) into the house and make him prove the charges which he has made against a number of people, or else resign his seat. Let the right hon. gentleman act as a Prime Minister.

Mr. Pearson: Would my hon. friend be satisfied with having the Minister of Justice appear before a judicial inquiry, together with the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Diefenbaker) and all those concerned with this matter? Is that what he means by action?

• (7:50 p.m.)

Mr. Nielsen: The rules require the minister to make his choice.

Mr. Bell (Carleton): Mr. Speaker—

Mr. Pearson: No, no—

Mr. Bell (Carleton): I have the floor. I say that this has gone beyond a judicial inquiry. This is something the high court of parliament must settle, and I say that right here. Let us go into committee of the whole and let us allow the Minister of Justice to present his evidence now.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

[Mr. Nugent.]

Mr. Bell (Carleton): Let him present the evidence in this house, and let us be the judges. We are the people who have been elected to be the judges of the situation.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh.

Mr. Bell (Carleton): I would, sir, move such a motion. Mr. Speaker, you have enough motions before you, but I will present to you what I think is the correct motion in this house, a motion that will show the moral indignation in this house, which should be felt by 265 hon. members. My motion is that the house do now resolve itself into committee of the whole in order that hon. members may have an opportunity to examine the Minister of Justice, so that he may advise the committee what evidence he has to substantiate the charges made inside and outside this chamber which have reflected unfortunately and improperly upon members of Her Majesty's Privy Council. In the event he fails to substantiate such charges then the hon. minister should be called upon to submit his resignation and to atone by the forfeiture of his seat.

An hon. Member: Right.

Mr. Bell (Carleton): That, sir, is the motion I am prepared to make in this house. I say to you, and I say to the right hon. gentleman from Algoma East, he has an obligation to do something to settle what has happened today.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh.

Mr. Bell (Carleton): He has an obligation. Let him live up to the tradition of his office. He is the fourteenth man to hold that office, and he is about to be the first man to disgrace the office if he does not do anything.

Mr. Pearson: Mr. Chairman, may I ask my hon. friend a question. If there is a recommendation made in this house for the establishment of a judicial committee, to inquire into all these matters which have been talked about, will he support it?

Mr. Bell (Carleton): I will support an investigation in this parliament tonight.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh.

Mr. Bell (Carleton): Bring the Minister of Justice in here. Bring in the man who has not even reviewed the file. Bring him in, and let him swear to it. Let him tell his story. He has so cowardly fled from the chamber. And what has he been ready to do? He has been ready to smear men of honour, men who have served the crown well.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh.

An hon. Member: Sir, may I ask the Prime Minister a question?

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. We will allow the hon. member for Ontario to speak.

Mr. Starr: I wish to direct a question to the Prime Minister, Mr. Speaker. In view of what he has intimated the government might be prepared to do, and would get support on, which is the establishment of a judicial inquiry, does the Prime Minister intend that the aspersions that have been cast should remain until the judicial inquiry meets, hears witnesses and brings in findings? Is this what he means?

Mr. Churchill: That is what he wants; to postpone everything.

Mr. Pearson: I believe that there have been all sorts of statements made in the house this afternoon, and allegations made inside and outside the house. I ask the hon. member who was so very indignant a few moments ago because we would not do anything about it, if the government moved a motion in this parliament for the establishment of a judicial inquiry, which is what they wanted in the Spencer case and this is a matter which concerns security—would the opposition support it?

Mr. Starr: May I ask this question of the Prime Minister, and I ask the Prime Minister if he would answer it for me? Does he intend then under this procedure to allow this stigma to hang over the heads of all those who were at that time in the government, until the findings are made? Does he agree that that should be the case?

Mr. Pearson: I wonder if my hon. friend would consider some of the stigma that he and his friends have imposed on us in recent months, as a government, and whether he thought at that time there should be a parliamentary inquiry into the statement, for instance, of the Leader of the Opposition who said not very long ago, "A vote for the Liberal government will mean an open season for organized crime in Canada".

Did he ask for a parliamentary inquiry then?

Mr. Bell (Carleton): Why does not the right hon. gentleman just act like an ordinary Prime Minister?

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh.

Hon. Alvin Hamilton (Qu'Appelle): Mr. Speaker, I think possibly we have had a clear indication in these last two or three minutes of what the real sickness of this parliament is.

Some hon. Members: You. You.

Mr. Hamilton: You have a man who has the title of Prime Minister treating this house in a smart alec way on a very serious—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. I suggest to the hon. member that there are institutions which have to be respected in this house, and I ask him to limit his remarks, as I have asked the hon. member for Edmonton-Strathcona (Mr. Nugent), to the question of privilege which was raised by the hon. member for Yukon (Mr. Nielsen).

There is a very special piece of business to be considered at the moment, and the rules of relevance insist that we should limit our comments to the matter now before the house.

Mr. Hamilton: Mr. Speaker, I think you are aware that the statement we are objecting to on this question of privilege was made by the Minister of Justice today who said in this house that the conduct of the Leader of the Opposition should be the subject of a royal commission. He stated that when he was minister in another department, which we have to assume was the Department of National Defence, he heard rumours or stories which he repeated today in his press conference outside the house.

My question is why, if the Minister of Justice has held these views for several months now, has kept this knowledge to himself for all this time, did he not do his duty when he was Associate Minister of the Department of National Defence and lay these serious charges then?

How can a man stand up and be credible in this house when he claims he has had this knowledge for many months, but has waited until today to use it.

I now charge this Minister of Justice with taking part—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. Pursuant to section (3) of Standing Order 6 it is my duty to interrupt these proceedings.

At 6.05 p.m. this day, the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Knowles), seconded by the hon. member for Greenwood (Mr. Brewin), moved:

That the house do now adjourn.

And the Chair having proposed to put the question thereon, more than five hon. members rose to object to the taking of a vote.

Division

Accordingly pursuant to Section (3), Standing Order 6, the vote on the said motion was postponed until 8.00 o'clock p.m.

The house is therefore deemed to have reverted to "private members' business" for such time as is necessary for the taking of the vote.

Mr. Speaker: Is it the wish of the house to adopt the motion?

Some hon. Members: No, no.

Mr. Speaker: All those in favour?

Some hon. Members: Yea.

Mr. Speaker: All those opposed?

Some hon. Members: Nay.

Mr. Speaker: In my opinion the nays have it.

And more than five members having risen.

Mr. Speaker: Call in the members.

The house divided on the motion (Mr. Knowles) which was negatived on the following division.

• (8:00 p.m.)

YEAS

Messrs:

Aiken
Alkenbrack
Asselin (Charlevoix)
Barnett
Beaulieu
Bell (Saint John-Albert)
Bell (Carleton)
Bigg
Bower
Brand
Brewin
Cadieu (Meadow Lake)
Cameron (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands)
Cantelon
Chatterton
Churchill
Coates
Code
Crouse
Dinsdale
Enns
Fairweather
Fane
Fawcett
Flemming
Forbes
Forrestall
Gilbert
Grafftey
Grills
Gundlock
Hales
Hamilton
Harkness
Herridge
Horner (Acadia)
Howard
Howe (Hamilton South)
Howe (Wellington-Huron
Johnston
Keays
Kennedy
Kindt
Knowles
Korchinski
Lambert
Lewis
Loney
MacDonald (Prince)
MacEwan
MacInnis (Cape Breton South)
MacInnis (Mrs.) (Vancouver-Kingsway)
MacLean (Queens)
Macquarrie
MacRae
McCleave
McCutcheon
McIntosh
McKinley
McLelland
Madill
Martin (Timmins)
Mather
More
Muir (Cape Breton North and Victoria)
Muir (Lisgar)
Nasserden
Nesbitt
Nielsen
Nowlan
Nugent
Orlikow
Pascoe
Patterson
Peters
Prittie
Pugh
Rapp
Régimbal
Ricard
Rynard
Saltsman
Schreyer
Scott (Danforth)
Scott (Victoria (Ont.))
Sherman
Simpson
Southam
Starr
Thomas (Middlesex West)
Thompson
Vincent
Wadds (Mrs.)
Watson (Assiniboia)
Webb
Winch
Winkler
Woolliams—98.

NAYS

Messrs:

Allard
Allmand
Andras
Asselin (Richmond-Wolfe)
Badanai
Basford
Batten
Béchard
Beer
Benson
Berger
Boulanger
Brown
Byrne
Cadieux (Terrebonne)
Cantin
Caouette
Cardin
Caron
Carter
Cashin
Choquette
Chrétien
Clermont
Comtois
Côté (Dorchester)
Côté (Longueuil)
Cowan
Crossman
Davis
Deachman
Dionne
Drury
Dubé
Duquet
Émard
Éthier
Faulkner
Favreau
Forest
Foy
Gauthier
Gendron
Godin
Goyer
Granger
Greene
Grégoire
Groos
Habel
Haidasz
Harley
Hellyer
Honey
Hopkins
Hymmen
Isabelle
Klein
Lachance
Laflamme
Laing
LaMarsh (Miss)
Lamontagne
Langlois (Chicoutimi)
Laniel
Laprise
Latulippe
Laverdière
Leblanc (Laurier)
LeBlanc (Rimouski)
Lefebvre
Legault
Lessard
Lind
Loiselle
Macaluso
Macdonald (Rosedale)
MacEachen
Mackasey
McIlraith
McLean (Charlotte)
McNulty
McWilliam
Martin (Essex East)
Matheson
Matte
Mitchell
Mongrain
Morison
O'Keefe
Orange
Otto
Pearson
Pelletier
Pennell
Pepin
Pickersgill
Pilon
Prud'homme
Reid
Richard
Rideout (Mrs.)
Robichaud
Rock
Roxburgh
Ryan
Sharp
Simard
Stafford
Stanbury
Stewart
Tardif
Teillet
Thomas (Maisonneuve-Rosemont)
Tolmie
Tremblay

[Mr. Speaker.]

Trudeau
Tucker
Turner
Wahn
Walker
Watson (Châteauguay-Huntingdon-Laprairie)
Whelan
Winters—124.

• (8:40 p.m.)

Mr. Speaker: I declare the motion lost.

Mr. Nicholson: I was paired, Mr. Speaker. Had I voted, I would have voted against the motion.

Mr. Cameron (High Park): Mr. Speaker, I was paired. Had I voted, I would have voted against the motion.

Hon. Alvin Hamilton (Qu'Appelle): Mr. Speaker, before we voted on the motion to adjourn, I was trying to make one or two points. I should like to repeat them in simple form. The first is that we have had a statement by the Minister of Justice that, by its very nature, puts all of us on the front bench of the Conservative party in a situation where we are guilty by association. This is pure, undiluted, plain and simple McCarthyism.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh.

Mr. Hamilton: The technique of McCarthy was to call for an investigation before his committee and name a whole series of suspects. Until those persons had given their evidence, until the report was received, they were guilty in the minds of many people. This government and the Prime Minister, by condoning the action of the Minister of Justice have laid themselves open to the charge of McCarthyism by every freedom loving person across Canada.

The second point I want to make on this question of privilege is that the minister, by his own confession, has stated that he obtained this information when he was in another department. He has only been in three departments. He was Associate Minister of National Defence, he was Minister of Public Works and now he is Minister of Justice.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Hamilton: If he found out anything that in his opinion was close to treason when he was Associate Minister of National Defence, why did he not speak up then? If he had this information for all those months that he was Minister of Public Works and sat along with these others in the cabinet, why did he not speak up then? He has been Minister of Justice now for several months and he has not spoken. Instead he waited until the man he wanted to attack was out of his place in this house and out of the city.

Some hon. Members: Shame.

Mr. Hamilton: The Minister of Justice is like a sick animal in the forest.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh.

Mr. Speaker: Order.

Some hon. Members: Withdraw.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please; I would ask the hon. member to keep in mind the proprieties of this house and to consider the expressions that he uses. There are some expressions that are not accepted as good, parliamentary expressions. I urge the hon. member to keep this in mind.

Some hon. Members: Withdraw.

Mr. Hamilton: Mr. Speaker, there is an expression to the effect that when the bulls come into the pasture, the calves and the cows go to the corner. If the Minister of Justice takes offence at any of my remarks, he knows his recourse. This man, it is evident to all of us, feels hurt that he has been attacked in this house.

An hon. Member: Persecuted.

Mr. Hamilton: He feels hurt because things that have been said to him have hurt his sensitivities, and the only thing he can think of is to bite back.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh.

Mr. Hamilton: He forgets, in the rough and tumble of this house, who the man is who started this.

Some hon. Members: Nielsen.

Mr. Hamilton: The Minister of Justice sat on this side of the house and without provocation made certain statements. Now, when he is in the government and is paying the penalty for his rashness, he cannot stand up like a man and take it; he must bite back like a forest animal that has rabies.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh.

Mr. Hamilton: But if an animal in the forest has rabies—

Mr. Nielsen: You put him out of his misery.

Mr. Hamilton: —and bites everything in sight, that animal, if it comes close to human habitation, is put out of his misery. The man who can put the Minister of Justice out of his misery is the Prime Minister. Just because the sensitivities of one small man in this house—

Some hon. Members: You.

An hon. Member: And Nielsen.

Mr. Hamilton: —are hurt and his ego has been deflated, he does this awful thing. He charges many people with something he knows is not true. The minute the minister says "two or more cabinet members" he knows there must be some in that cabinet who are not guilty of the charge that he lays. All we ask him to do is name names and get us out of this position; suffer the consequences, be a man and resign his seat in the house.

Mr. Nielsen: That is the position in which he is.

• (8:50 p.m.)

Mr. Hamilton: When this period of our history is written the Minister of Justice will not suffer; he will just be forgotten for his smallness of mind. But the man who has dragged down his party, his government and his country is the Prime Minister. Rather than face the fact which the country knows to be true, namely that his cabinet is divided, and get rid of those who will not behave as the custom of this house dictates, he will abide anything. From the action of the Prime Minister today, Mr. Speaker, it cannot be denied that he is the one who will pay the price. All he is doing now is trying to extend by a few hours, a week or maybe a few months his tenure of office. He does not dare take the long walk to the Governor General's residence.

Mr. Lewis: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. May I respectfully ask Your Honour whether a motion is before the house; and, if there is not, what are we now discussing?

Mr. Speaker: If the hon. member was in the house earlier this afternoon or this evening he will remember that the Chair expressed the opinion there were already two motions before the house, that there should not be a third one and that we should not be considering the matter any further. I asked for the assistance and co-operation of hon. members, but that co-operation has not been extended.

At the moment the house is considering a question of privilege which was raised by the hon. member for Yukon (Mr. Nielsen). The hon. member for Yukon made the point—and I respect the point that he made—that this was a separate question of privilege. He has spoken on the question and I had assumed that hon. members who have taken part in the debate since then have been referring themselves to that question of privilege raised by the hon. member for Yukon this afternoon.

Mr. Lewis: May I raise a further point of order, Mr. Speaker. Is there any way in which you or we can avoid spending any more time this evening in personal attack and personal dirt?

Mr. Hamilton: I know how you feel, Mr. Speaker, but the hon. gentleman who has just sat down is not under the charge that some of us here are. Let him go home to his wife and family and endure what we have to endure.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh.

Mr. Ricard: All they are interested in is ruining the reputation of others.

Mr. Speaker: Order. The hon. member for Qu'Appelle (Mr. Hamilton) has the floor.

Mr. Hamilton: I was rising in reply to the statement by the hon. member for York South (Mr. Lewis), who does not seem to appreciate that there is a matter of more serious portent here than the question of a few minutes of time. This is a matter concerning the rights of the members of this house, and the only place this matter can be settled is here in the House of Commons. It cannot be dragged out over many months in any long investigation.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. The Chair would appreciate the co-operation of all hon. members to give an opportunity to the hon. member for Qu'Appelle to make his point. The hon. member for Bow River.

Mr. Woolliams: Mr. Speaker, you asked—

Mr. Turner: May I raise a point of order, Mr. Speaker?

Mr. Speaker: The Minister without Portfolio (Mr. Turner) on a point of order.

Mr. Turner: I should like to put a point of order to Your Honour. I thought the hon. member for York South (Mr. Lewis) quite properly asked what question was before the house. It was my understanding that you had reserved consideration of the two motions in order to decide whether or not there was a prima facie case. How is it that hon. members are now addressing the house on these motions at the moment?

Mr. Nugent: Mr. Speaker, on the point of order, must we explain to every member who was not present before what has been happening here? Is everyone who comes into the

house going to ask what is happening so that they can be put in the picture? I suggest that the minister could have been here had he wanted.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Gilles Grégoire (Lapointe): Mr. Speaker, I realize that the house is dealing with a question of privilege concerning the events of these past few days.

This afternoon I heard a former minister refer to the situation in which former Conservative ministers find themselves, with all the insinuations and implications made recently.

Perhaps they could be asked if what they have been doing for the last two years was not constant insinuations and implications.

I heard the hon. member for Calgary North (Mr. Harkness) say that he had never heard about the Munsinger case. It proves one thing: that the Leader of the Opposition did not keep his ministers informed when he was Prime Minister.

It also proves that the case was not investigated as it should have been and that it has not been completely cleared up, since the ministers were not even aware of it, except, as pointed out by the hon. member for Villeneuve (Mr. Caouette), the ministers involved at the time.

In my opinion, this matter should certainly be cleared up and the motion as moved this afternoon will not satisfy anyone. While you are going to consider whether the motion is in order, I should like to move an amendment so that you may consider it at the same time as the motion. You will then have all evening to decide if the amendment is just as regular as the motion. With your permission, I move the following amendment.

Mr. Speaker: Order. The hon. member moves an amendment to the motion before the house, but it is clear that until that motion has been accepted, no member will be able to move an amendment.

An amendment to a motion cannot be moved as long as a motion is still before the house.

• (9:00 p.m.)

Mr. Grégoire: In that case, Mr. Speaker, I shall simply outline the amendment to the Conservative motion I should like to move later, so that we may all be enlightened.

The amendment would be along these lines: That every word after the word "immediately" in the motion of the hon. member for Winnipeg South Centre (Mr. Churchill) be deleted and replaced by the following: That the right hon. Prime Minister take such steps as are necessary to establish a judicial inquiry into the security case referred to by the Minister of Justice (Mr. Cardin) and by the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Diefenbaker) on March 4, 1966 at page 2211 of *Hansard*, and which was also raised by the Minister of Justice in a press conference on March 10, 1966 and which was also referred to by the hon. member from Calgary North (Mr. Harkness) on orders of the day on March 10, 1966, in a question of privilege.

I submit that only a judicial inquiry into the whole Munsinger affair, can inform public opinion and show whether the Minister of Justice was right or wrong in raising a question of security which had to be in force at the time, and only a judicial inquiry will enlighten us on the role and the conduct of the Leader of the Opposition in the Munsinger case.

If the Minister of Justice is asked only to give all his evidence, everything cannot be aired. On the other hand, if a judicial inquiry is held, we will know precisely what was the role of the Leader of the Opposition at the time, whether he acted properly and whether he conducted himself as befits a Prime Minister.

If we were to ask only for a simple statement in the house, we would never have the whole story.

Mr. Speaker, I would also like to have you take under advisement the advisability of the amendment I have moved, so that if this amendment is in order, we will have a judicial inquiry on everything that happened on that subject. I feel that a statement would satisfy no one.

In the last two years, the Conservatives have asked for a royal commission or a judicial inquiry at every turn. If it was a good thing each time they did the asking, so why would it not be as good a thing in this case? Would there be a double standard? If it was good in the Spencer case, why would it be bad in the Munsinger case?

I see that some Conservative members are in favour of holding a judicial inquiry in the Munsinger case.

Well, Mr. Speaker, then it would throw light on everything we want to know.

Mr. Speaker, I think that such an inquiry is needed. In view of the fact that a motion and an amendment thereto are before you,

even though the latter is not official yet, I think that we could go on to something else.

Everything that will be said from now on will not be very useful. We might as well wait for the findings of an inquiry to know exactly what to think of all that.

That is why I feel that we should now go on to another item—

Mr. Speaker: Order.

Mr. Grégoire: —and really discuss the business before the house, because the people of Canada—

Mr. Speaker: Order.

Mr. Grégoire: —have had enough of that; they want a legislative program, they want to see some work done.

Mr. Speaker: Order. I think that the hon. member is getting farther and farther away from the question of privilege raised by the hon. member for Yukon (Mr. Nielsen) tonight. If he wants to keep on talking, he should limit his remarks to that motion or to the question of privilege raised by the hon. member for Yukon.

Mr. Grégoire: Mr. Speaker, I will conclude by inviting all hon. members to behave a little more intelligently and come back to what interests the Canadian people; a legislative program for the people, and put a stop to all that dirty and sickening business.

[*English*]

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Bow River.

Mr. Knowles: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, and I think perhaps I should put it before my hon. friend for Bow River takes the floor. I would hate to get into the middle of his speech.

Mr. Speaker, like my colleague from York South I am still concerned with what it is we are debating. Your Honour said a moment ago that at seven o'clock the hon. member for Yukon raised what he described as a new question of privilege.

An hon. Member: That is right.

Mr. Knowles: Ever since then, except for the time that was taken on the vote, apparently we have been discussing that question of privilege.

I ask Your Honour this question. Is not our practice with respect to a question of privilege this: that an hon. member raises a question of privilege; he might get a bit of support here and there, but at some point early in the proceedings the Chair decides whether or not there is a prima facie case of privilege. If there is, a motion is put and then debate may take place on the motion. It seems to me, and I think this is what bothered my colleague from York South, that we are now having what sounds like a debate on the motion, but the motion has not been put. Do I take it that Your Honour has, by implication, suggested that there is another prima facie case of privilege? It seems to me, Mr. Speaker, that we should have some ruling before we go on with the debate, which seems to be a debate on a motion which has not yet been put.

Mr. Nielsen: On the point of order raised, I refrained from moving the motion because of the two that are already before Your Honour. The motion that I had in mind moving was that this house call upon the Minister of Justice to substantiate the charges and allegations he has made against the Leader of the Official Opposition and members of the former Conservative government, now hon. members in this house.

It is quite a different motion than proposed by Your Honour.

Mr. Speaker: I think I would perhaps agree that the particular point raised by the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Knowles) is well taken. I have brought it to the attention of hon. members before. From a procedural standpoint, we certainly do not appear to be operating according to the standard practice of the house. We have already had two questions of privilege which have been raised, and two motions which have been placed before the house. The hon. member took the floor on the third question of privilege, and we have had a debate since then on that, or I assume on the same question of privilege.

Now to answer the point raised by the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre, there is not so much difference between this particular question of privilege and others raised earlier today that I can reach a different conclusion than that which I reached before, to the effect that there appears to be a prima facie case of privilege. This having been said, recognized and agreed, I wonder whether we can allow the debate to continue on something which we do not have before us: a motion. If the hon. member submits his motion we are in a position where we have three motions before us, and then perhaps we could discuss that.

This is the embarrassing position in which I think we have placed ourselves in the chamber. And this is why I suggested it would have been so much easier to have delayed the matter for a short while. I am not faulting any hon. member for this. I am saying that is the factual position at present.

I agree with the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre, and I should like to suggest to hon. members, in view of the fact that we are in the same position as before, that we have these three potential motions, it would be so much easier to allow the matter to stand, to leave it in abeyance until we have a chance to look at the other two motions. This is what I hoped we would do and what I am proposing still hopefully to hon. members. I am hopeful that hon. members will agree with me that that is the best way to handle the matter.

Mr. Nielsen: On the question of order, I wish to make one point, and it is this: my question of privilege raised this evening was confined to the statement made by the minister this afternoon in this house. It is my understanding, and it certainly was the situation in connection with the motion of 1964, that when a minister or an hon. member makes a charge against another hon. member of the house, he must substantiate that. That was the narrow basis in the privilege question and the narrow basis of my motion. If it will assist, I am prepared to put that motion now. I think Your Honour could also take that one under advisement.

Mr. Speaker: I feel that the situation would not be any worse than it is now if we received a third motion. I would be glad to hear it, but the hon. member cannot expect that I will give him a decision on it right now.

Mr. Nielsen: I have already read it to Your Honour. It is moved by myself and seconded by the hon. member for Carleton (Mr. Bell).

Mr. Speaker: As I said a moment ago if hon. members want me to put the motion I would consider it along with the other two motions. I recognize that the motion by the hon. member for Yukon has already been placed on the record. I suggest to hon. members that unless somebody has a completely new question of privilege to raise at this time, that we go on with other business.

Mr. Bell (Carleton): Mr. Speaker, may I ask with the calmness which I actually do not feel if it is not possible to persuade the right hon. gentleman from Algoma East to act like a Prime Minister in the settling of this matter.

Some hon. Members: Order.

Mr. McIlraith: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker. Just for the sake of clarification, the hon. member for Yukon has been permitted to place his motion before the house without a decision being taken by yourself as to whether it is acceptable. That being so, what is the status of the proposed amendment that was indicated a few moments ago? Is it also to be placed before the house? I suggest it would have to be.

Mr. Speaker: It is still lower on the totem pole. I would think that we should first consider whether any of these motions can be accepted, and if the motion is accepted, whether any member has the right to move an amendment.

Mr. Nugent: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker. The point of order raised was not just from the hon. member for Yukon, who had a motion. As I indicated to the Chair, I also have a motion that I shall be prepared to move. The hon. member for Carleton (Mr. Bell) has a motion. However, I think the nub of the question, sir, lies in the suggestion by the Chair that a motion, if it be not in order would stop the debate.

• (9:10 p.m.)

I suggest to Your Honour that there are many questions of privilege which might be raised and many motions which might be put. It is my contention that though a particular motion by one hon. member has been found out of order, this does not dispose of the main point, that is, the question of privilege which has been raised. The Chair has already ruled that this is a question of privilege. The motion is only one solution, intended to show how we should handle this matter. Since there are so many possible motions it is my contention that even if one, two or even three motions were out of order, the ruling on the question itself does not prevent this discussion of the means by which the house should handle the question of privilege. It is, therefore, my contention that it was not necessary to move any motion. Indeed, it might be improper to add any motion to the order paper.

I did suggest to Your Honour that I really believed I was co-operating. There was no suggestion that Your Honour had to give a ruling on the first question before the debate could continue. But since the motion is a method of disposing of the question at the

end of debate, Your Honour has time to rule on various motions and adopt any suggestions, and when the questions or privilege which have been raised are disposed of, I should like to have an opportunity to put my motion as well. I hope Your Honour will not feel that I was not trying to co-operate with the Chair when I spoke on this matter; I had that impression.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Grégoire: Mr. Speaker, since there are now three motions under consideration, I would like to move another one under standing order 24.

I move, seconded by the hon. member for Villeneuve (Mr. Caouette):

That the orders of the day be now read.

Let us proceed.

[*English*]

Mr. Speaker: We are already on the orders of the day. The hon. gentleman's motion might be a good motion for tomorrow, but not for tonight.

Does the hon. member for Rosthern wish to speak on a point of order?

Mr. Nasserden: No, Mr. Speaker, on the question of privilege itself.

Mr. Speaker: I am asking the question because there are two hon. members seeking the floor, and if they wish to speak on a point of order I would recognize them first. However, I will call on the hon. member for Rosthern.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Alexis Caron (Hull): Mr. Speaker, on a point of order about the same point of order raised a little earlier by the hon. member for Winnipeg South Centre (Mr. Churchill). The discussion is allowed to go on. The hon. member for Yukon (Mr. Nielsen) moved a motion which you took under consideration. You said that tomorrow you would probably give your ruling on it and since then the debate has been going on. If we are allowed to keep on discussing it, I think that the hon. member for Lapointe (Mr. Grégoire) also had the right to move an amendment. If you allowed the debate to continue on the motion, the hon. member for Lapointe had the right to move his amendment, so that it could be studied at the same time, and you could give your ruling tomorrow.

[Mr. Nugent.]

I think that the hon. member was perfectly right to move his motion, while the others had the right to discuss a point of order which you had taken under consideration.

[*English*]

Mr. E. Nasserden (Rosthern): In rising to say a few words on this matter before us today I think we should remember what is before us at this time. The question of the privileges of the House of Commons is not something to be taken lightly, not only because of the rights of hon. members but because of the dignity of the Chair, as well. I wish to refer to Beauchesne citation 105 on page 96 where it is stated:

—if a member should rise to complain of a breach of privileges of the house they have always instantly heard him. It seems that the first duty of parliament is to keep its privileges and no rule or standing order should restrain its conduct when it must vindicate its authority.

This refers not only to members of the House of Commons but to the Chair as well. Then on the following page we find in citation 106(2):

The dignity and independence of the two Houses are in great measure preserved by keeping their privileges indefinite. If all the privileges of Parliament were set down and ascertained, and no privilege to be allowed but what was so defined and determined, it were easy for the executive power to devise some new case, not within the line of privilege, and under pretence thereof, to harass any refractory member and violate the freedom of Parliament.

Today we have witnessed the spectacle of the Prime Minister and other members opposite pointing to the fact that the hon. member for Yukon has made charges in this house. This is one of the reasons they are raising their charges at this time. In other words, this citation is very applicable to what is taking place in the House of Commons today.

If we go on to consider citation 159(2) on page 134, we will find that it states:

A Minister of the Crown is not at liberty to read or quote from a despatch or other state paper not before the House—

An hon. Member: Read on.

Mr. Nasserden:

—unless he be prepared to lay it upon the table. This restraint is similar to the rules of evidence in courts of law, which prevent counsel from citing documents which have not been produced in evidence. The principle is so reasonable that it has not been contested, and when the objection has been made in time, it has been generally acquiesced in.

We have two questions before us. One concerns what is alleged to have taken place four or five years ago. The other relates to what has taken place during the last few hours, the statements made by the Minister of Justice. The most important question before us at this time concerns the statements made by the Minister of Justice during the last few moments and in the last few hours. The minister has made charges against the cabinet of another day en bloc, with no regard at all for those who were innocent.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. I have some difficulty in following the hon. member. I gathered, when he got to his feet, that he wanted to refer to a question of privilege. I may say in passing that I am in full agreement with everything he has said and with the citations to which he has referred. I might add that it is in keeping with those citations that the Chair has tried, even gone out of its way, to give every hon. member an opportunity to take part in the debate today.

This having been said, we must recognize that we have to go back to something. Before the hon. member took the floor I believe we had agreed that the hon. member for Yukon would be allowed to present his motion to the Chair although it was not placed before the house. I assume the hon. member will now wish to address himself, perhaps, to a new question of privilege; but not, I suggest, to the one we have already disposed of to some extent.

I should put it this way: really we have nothing at this time before us, the question of privilege raised at seven o'clock by the hon. member for Yukon having been received by the Chair for the purpose of taking it into consideration. The hon. member has raised a question of privilege with which I am in full agreement.

• (9:20 p.m.)

If he wants to raise another question of privilege he is free to do so, but for the guidance of the Chair he should state what it is he wants to speak about.

Mr. Nasserden: I had very little more to say, Mr. Speaker, but I was trying to draw on the statement the Chair made a little while ago, in which you indicated you had not quite made up your mind this matter was of such urgency that the minister should make a statement to the house substantiating the allegations he has made. It is that point which I am trying to draw to Your Honour's attention. I do not think in Your Honour's experience, or in that of any member of the house, we have ever had anything come before us that could be considered more urgent, especially when we think of the implications of the allegations made by the Minister of Justice, unsupported allegations, that touch on the morality and integrity of so many members of the house, and indeed touch on all members of the house.

Mr. Speaker: I have said many things today but one thing I hope I did not say is what the hon. member says I said. May I suggest at this point, since we have another 40 minutes to go this evening that we return to the order of business we had proposed to consider at seven o'clock.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Heward Grafftey (Brome-Missisquoi): Mr. Speaker, under the circumstances, I move, seconded by the hon. member for Bow River (Mr. Woolliams), that the house now adjourn.

[*English*]

Some hon. Members: Ten o'clock.

Mr. Speaker: Well, there is a motion which has just been moved by the hon. member for Brome-Missisquoi (Mr. Grafftey). I am leary about going back to Standing Order 25 which gave me some difficulty this afternoon, but perhaps this time my interpretation will be accepted. I understand the Standing Order requires that there be an intermediate proceeding and, to the best of my knowledge, since the last motion was made there has been no intervening procedure. We have been on the question of privilege, and I would like to hear hon. members on this point.

Some hon. Members: Ten o'clock.

Mr. Speaker: I see some hon. members looking at me with learned looks, and they might like to advise the Chair on this point. My view, and my interpretation would be that there has not been an intermediate proceeding. In view of this I do not think that the motion moved by the hon. member can be received at this time.

Mr. Howard: May I call it ten o'clock, Mr. Speaker, because obviously we are not going to get any business done anyway.

Mr. Speaker: We can call it ten o'clock if there is unanimous agreement.

Some hon. members: No.

Mr. Speaker: There is no unanimity.

Mr. Turner: On a point of order, may I suggest to Your Honour that since you have taken under reservation three or four separate motions, and since there is nothing properly before the house at this particular moment, we revert to the ordinary business and that you make such a ruling.

Hon. D. S. Harkness (Calgary North): Mr. Speaker, when I raised this question of privilege this afternoon I thought it was a matter which could be resolved very early and in a straightforward manner. Since that time the whole thing has been completely confused by a large number of questions of order and by procedural matters of various kinds.

I suggest that the only way in which the situation we are in could be resolved at the present time is by the leader of the government, the Prime Minister of Canada, standing up and saying what action he is prepared to take in order to bring this situation to a conclusion.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Cameron (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands): I presume, Mr. Speaker, we are now back on the regular business of the house, second reading of the bill moved by the Minister of Finance (Mr. Sharp)?

Mr. Lambert: Mr. Speaker, what I am concerned about is just what business are we on? If we are on the Bank Act I would like the Chair to indicate that.

Mr. Speaker: That was the business called at seven o'clock when the question of privilege was raised by the hon. member for Yukon. That is the business before the house, and if we agree that these several questions of privilege might be held in abeyance and reserved, we would return to that particular order of business, namely, the Bank Act.

Mr. Starr: Well, Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order, which is that this matter was brought before the house as a very serious matter to be considered by parliament and by the government. The Prime Minister has not seen fit to resolve this situation. He is letting the aspersions that have been made lie where they are, without any action on his part at all.

A motion was moved earlier by members of the N.D.P. that the house adjourn. It was defeated. Now, because this matter has not been resolved I see no point in continuing for the balance of the half hour that remains before ten o'clock. I suggest that for the sake of the orderly business of the house we call it ten o'clock in order to give Your Honour an opportunity to resolve the motions which you have under reserve, and an opportunity for the government to make some definite decision.

Mr. Speaker: I am sure the hon. member realizes there was a division in the house just a short while ago on a motion to adjourn the house and the majority of the house decided that we should not adjourn. It certainly is not for the Chair to go against that decision of the house. If there is unanimous agreement by hon. members, we could adjourn.

Some hon. Members: No.

Mr. Speaker: There is not. This has already been considered. There is no unanimous agreement, and so we have before us at this moment a particular item of business, the Bank Act.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Grégoire: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker.

You have ruled that the motion for the adjournment of the house put forward by the hon. member for Brome-Missisquoi (Mr. Grafftey) was out of order because we had not gone on to another matter.

Now, if I am not mistaken, the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre put his motion for the house to adjourn at six o'clock while we were discussing Bill No. S-10, introduced at the beginning of the private members' hour, that is at six o'clock.

Since then, the private members' hour has expired and at seven we returned to the orders of the day, that is to the motion for second reading of Bill No. C-3, an Act to amend the Bank Act.

A moment ago I asked that we return to the orders of the day and you told me that we already were on the orders of the day, therefore on Bill No. C-3. Since the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre put his motion while the motion for second reading of Bill No. S-10 was before us and since the other motion concerning Bill No. C-3 was introduced, I should like to draw to your attention standing order 25, which says:

A motion to adjourn (except when made for the purpose of discussing a definite matter of urgent public importance) shall always be in order, but

no second motion to the same effect shall be made until after some intermediate proceeding has been had.

Well, we have been having an intermediate proceeding. We were examining Bill No. S-10 when the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre introduced his first motion. We are now discussing Bill No. C-3, brought forward by the Minister of Finance (Mr. Sharp). So when the hon. member for Brome-Missisquoi moved his motion, it was another proceeding of the house.

Therefore, in the circumstances, inasmuch as everybody wants to end this sitting tonight and as this will lead nowhere, I think I should point out to you that the motion of the hon. member for Brome-Missisquoi was moved on another proceeding, for the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre moved his motion at the time of the motion on Bill No. S-10, and the hon. member for Brome-Missisquoi moved his on Bill No. C-3.

Therefore, in the circumstances, I suggest you cannot help but declare the motion of the hon. member for Brome-Missisquoi in order and proper; it should be put to a vote immediately without debate, pursuant to the Standing Orders of the house that we all have at hand.

• (9:30 p.m.)

[*English*]

Hon. J. W. Pickersgill (Minister of Transport): Mr. Speaker, I had understood that Your Honour had made a ruling that these remarks were not debatable. If that is the case, then I will take my seat at once, but if the argument put forward by the hon. member for Lapointe is to be heard, I would like to point out to Your Honour in respect of that argument that we were not permitted at seven o'clock to proceed to another matter. Therefore, there has been no intervening procedure because the time has been taken up with discussion about something that was not before the house at all.

Mr. Grégoire: We were back on the orders of the day at seven o'clock, Mr. Speaker.

Hon. W. G. Dinsdale (Brandon-Souris): Mr. Speaker, I should like to speak briefly to the question of privilege which is before the house tonight or which I understand—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. We have a point of order at the moment. As has been indicated to the hon. member, I have considered the circumstances and have considered the Standing Order.

Mr. Nugent: Mr. Speaker, I would like to be heard on a point of order.

Mr. Speaker: Is it the same one affecting Standing Order 25?

Mr. Nugent: It has to do with the business of the house.

Mr. Speaker: This is not a point of order which is being considered now. We are considering the point of order raised by the hon. member for Lapointe who, I appreciate, wanted to be helpful; but I wonder whether we have achieved this result. The only thing the Chair can say is, viewing the situation at this time and considering what was before the house, the Chair reached the decision that the motion could not be received.

I suggest to the hon. member that I could not change this decision at the moment and, unfortunately for him, according to the new rules, this cannot be appealed. I am sorry if a mistake was made, and I hope no mistake was made; but so many things have been going on that it was not clear to the Chair whether we were on a new order or whether there was an intermediate proceeding. I believe there was not, and this is the basis on which the ruling was made by the chair.

Mr. Grégoire: Mr. Speaker—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. The Right Hon. the Prime Minister.

Right Hon. L. B. Pearson (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, I understand that while I was out of the house for a few moments I was asked by the hon. member who raised this matter first this afternoon whether I would state my position and that of the government in respect of the matter as it has developed, and as it has developed during the day.

The house will recall, Mr. Speaker, that this afternoon I did make a proposal which I thought would enable the house to get on with the business of the house while this matter was discussed outside. This afternoon I suggested that Your Honour, the hon. member and I might discuss, and settle as best we could this very serious—and I believe I called it a very grave—matter while the house went on with the business on the order paper. That suggestion was not acceptable to the house, because the debate continued.

Since that time various suggestions have been made as to how this matter can be dealt with. So far as the government is concerned,

I think the sooner we can agree on a procedure to deal with it, the sooner we will get back to the business before us in the House of Commons.

This evening, Mr. Speaker, the hon. member for Lapointe made a proposal in the form of an amendment to a motion, which amendment I think was not officially before the house, because you had not ruled on it; but it was an amendment to a motion which has been before us. That amendment, the details of which I do not have with me, would provide for the submission of this question to a judicial committee for examination.

Now, Mr. Speaker, perhaps I might be permitted to read the amendment. It is that we should:

—take such steps as are necessary to establish a judicial inquiry into the security case referred to by the Minister of Justice and by the Leader of the Opposition on March 4, 1966, at *Hansard* page 2211—

At which time, I might interpolate, Mr. Speaker, the Leader of the Opposition said—and I hope I am paraphrasing correctly—that he would be glad to have a commission of inquiry into this matter.

An hon. Member: That is not what he said.

Mr. Pearson: Then the amendment goes on:

—referred to by the Minister of Justice in a press conference on March 10, 1966—

At this conference the Minister of Justice—and I hope I am correctly paraphrasing his remarks—said he would have no objection to such an inquiry into this matter. Then the amendment goes on:

—and referred to in a question of privilege raised by the hon. member for Calgary North at the commencement of proceedings this March 10, 1966.

Mr. Speaker, it seems to me that this amendment covers the situation very well. So far as the government is concerned, not only would we accept an amendment of this nature, if it were properly put before the house, for a judicial inquiry, we would welcome it.

Mr. Harkness: Mr. Speaker, I am glad that the Prime Minister has accepted the proposition I made a little while ago that he should make a statement in respect of what the government was prepared to do in connection with this matter. I should like to point out to him and to the house, however, that in this matter I think time is of the essence. If there is going to be a judicial committee which will take two or three weeks to set up and which will then drag on for several weeks before there is any clearing of the names and reputations of myself and the other members of the government of 1960-62, then I say it is not good enough. I think perhaps this might be the best way to deal with this matter, but I would like to be assured that this inquiry will be started immediately and that a report will be brought forward without a great many delays, so that the present situation will not continue to exist.

Mr. Pearson: My hon. friend has asked me for certain assurances in this matter, and I can understand his anxiety to have these assurances from the government. I can tell him this, that last Friday, I think it was, we agreed in respect of a judicial commission of inquiry which was pressed for strongly by the opposition, and within four hours, Mr. Speaker, we had that commission set up with a judge appointed and with terms of reference. I assure my hon. friend I will try to be equally quick in respect of this commission.

Mr. Nielsen: Mr. Speaker, the reference which the Prime Minister had to the recommendation of the Leader of the Opposition in respect of an inquiry is to be found at page 2211 of *Hansard* of last Friday, where his words are set out in the left hand column:

I am not worried. Have your commission look into it. Put it on the agenda.

We all know what he meant by those words; we were discussing a particular inquiry at that time into security matters involving the Spencer case. The other barrel that was fired by the Prime Minister and his Minister of Justice was into security procedures.

• (9:40 p.m.)

That was the other rug that was whipped out from under him. A judicial inquiry cannot remove from a member of this house, let alone a minister of the Crown, the responsibility of substantiating his charges.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Nielsen: Only parliament can absolve a member of that responsibility.

An hon. Member: What are you trying to hide?

Mr. Nielsen: When parliament allows that to happen parliament ceases to exist.

Mr. Turner: May I ask the hon. gentleman a question? In respect of the charges the hon.

gentleman brought against the former minister of justice, did parliament make a decision or was it made by an independent inquiry under the presidency of Chief Justice Dorion?

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Nielsen: I intended to mention that precedent myself, had the Minister without Portfolio not raised it for me.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh.

Mr. Nielsen: Sir, parliament has a precedent in the occurrences of November of 1964 when those opposite demanded that charges be made when I raised the matters of that day. Those charges were made.

Mr. Pickersgill: They were not.

Mr. Nielsen: They were made and as a result an inquiry was set up.

Mr. McIlraith: No.

Mr. Nielsen: That, sir, is the case.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Greene: Did you put up your seat?

Mr. Nielsen: The Minister of Agriculture has mentioned the very point at issue here, and the very point which parliament must deal with in regard to the words of the Minister of Justice.

The Minister of Agriculture asks whether I put up my seat. Let me say that I understood all along that my seat was at stake.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh.

Mr. McIlraith: You refused to lay charges.

Mr. Mackasey: Would the hon. member not admit that the minister of immigration was completely innocent of his charges?

Mr. Nielsen: This is another error perpetuated by the deliberate misconstruction by members on the other side of the house. There were no charges made against the Minister of Immigration, at any time, and if the hon. member for Verdun will check the debates of November 23 to November 25 inclusive he will find that on not one, on not two, but on three or four separate occasions I said at that time that I was casting no aspersions on the then Minister of Citizenship and Immigration.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh.

Mr. Nielsen: You need only check the record.

Mr. Cashin: On the matter of privilege, I suggest you check the record.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

An hon. Member: Go back to Joey.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

An hon. Member: You better go back to fishing, Cashin.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. It seems to me that we are—

An hon. Member: Let's not talk about fishing. We have caught a big one now.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. It seems to me we are getting away from whatever it was we were supposed to be discussing tonight.

Mr. Nielsen: Mr. Speaker, I submit that I have defined the issue that parliament must decide on its own accord. When any member, let alone a minister, makes a charge against another member, our practices and the practices followed at Westminster demand that the member substantiate them.

I should like to refer to another question before you, Mr. Speaker. You have ruled that a prima facie question of privilege exists and this places you in a very difficult position in not dealing immediately with the motion founded upon that case. I am not for a moment suggesting that Your Honour should not be given all the time necessary for a decision to be reached, but to accept as a general rule the principle that extensive time be taken, and I am not casting any reflections when I use that term, in order to determine the validity or non-validity of a motion, particularly when the motion or motions relate to a question of privilege as important and as urgent as this one, it seems to me that parliament itself is precluded from proceeding to dispose of the case until such time as a ruling is made.

We are now in the position of having three motions all revolving around an incident which you, sir, have ruled constitutes a prima facie breach of privilege. That being the case, and the prima facie breach of privilege having been adjudicated by you, sir, parliament must not be unduly impeded in dealing with it.

I should think, sir, that of the three motions, Your Honour might be prepared to deal with at least one, particularly the last one that was introduced, namely that a member who makes charges in the house must substantiate them and stake his seat on the

outcome. That is a well established principle and should be followed, particularly when the hon. member happens to be a minister of the Crown, and particularly because these charges affect a former prime minister, all of the present members of the Privy Council and those members who were part of the former government's administration.

Regarding the case now under discussion in which a member has made charges, I point out that strictly speaking no motion at all is required since the responsibility of the member making charges is well known and has been supported by Speakers throughout the years. The simple fact is that having made charges a member is obliged to substantiate them or give up his seat.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Nielsen: That is the position in which the minister finds himself and that is precisely the issue which parliament, not an inquiry, must decide.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh.

Mr. Nielsen: There is nothing to prevent the minister at this very moment from stating the details of his charges, the evidence upon which they are based, the names of the people involved, how they are involved and all the circumstances. The minister owes this not only to parliament but, as a man of honour and integrity, he owes it to himself.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Cardin: Mr. Speaker, I think it is quite obvious that the members opposite do not want an inquiry into this matter.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh.

Mr. Cardin: I should like to ask the hon. member for Yukon whether he can tell me what charges I made against the Leader of the Opposition or what charges I made against any member.

An hon. Member: All of them.

Mr. Cardin: Which one?

Hon. Hugh John Flemming (Victoria-Carleton): Mr. Speaker, if the Minister of Justice (Mr. Cardin) will read the *Journal* of this afternoon he will find on the front page that he is recorded as stating that ministers were involved. He will find that a member of the press gallery then queried "ministers"? The minister is reported as having replied "Yes, ministers." He then is reported as having added the word "Plural". If ever there was a question of privilege and justification for demanding that the minister substantiate his statement, this is it. The hon. member for Yukon has suggested he should do so in justice to himself. I am one who has quite a high opinion of the minister, but that high opinion is rapidly disappearing today as a result of the things he has been guilty of since this morning.

I suggest to you, Mr. Speaker, that you should not be splitting hairs about the rules and procedures when the reputations of a large group of people sitting in this house are at stake.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Flemming: The Prime Minister (Mr. Pearson) got to his feet this afternoon and, as I interpreted his remarks, referred to this matter as a little difference of opinion between parties and suggested that a bit of controversy exists.

• (9:50 p.m.)

I say to you, Mr. Speaker, that we may have our differences but I have never yet, in the time I have been here, known a minister or a member to make statements to the press that reflected on the honour and integrity of other members.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh.

Mr. Flemming: The Prime Minister laughs. I say that he is treating this matter as a great big joke. This is no joke.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Flemming: Therefore, in my opinion and to the extent that I happen to be personally involved—

An hon. Member: Aha.

Mr. Flemming: This is no joke; this is precisely the point. It becomes the duty of the Prime Minister to say to his Minister of Justice, "Prove what you have said". That is his duty. But the Prime Minister proposes to appoint a commission and the commission will sit for some time and consider this matter. As has been stated this evening, during that whole period of time the reputation of a number of people will be in jeopardy. Therefore I say to you, Mr. Speaker, that the Prime Minister has no choice in this matter.

The Prime Minister must of necessity demand that his Minister of Justice prove what he has said. We should also have the answer to this question: Was the Minister of Justice,

when he had the interview this morning with the press, speaking for the government or was he speaking for himself?

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Flemming: Is it usual for ministers of the Crown to call in—

Mr. Fairweather: He is not a usual minister.

Mr. Flemming: —the press; and is it usual to hold press interviews without consulting the Prime Minister?

An hon. Member: Sure.

Mr. Flemming: If it is, I say that the government is in pretty much the same position as the Minister of Justice, if they knew he was holding this interview and had some knowledge of what he was going to say.

Mr. Churchill: They are a party to it.

Mr. Flemming: In my opinion, the Prime Minister is doing a great disservice to this country if he does not demand that the Minister of Justice get to his feet just as soon as it can possibly be arranged and give to this house the basis of the statements he made this morning to the gentlemen of the press.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Starr: Come on, get up.

Mr. Muir (Cape Breton North and Victoria): Pearson, show some leadership, will you?

Mr. Dinsdale: Mr. Speaker, a few moments ago I endeavoured to rise to speak to the question of privilege and I was denied the opportunity because it was said we were dealing with a point of order. I do not know where we are now, but I trust I can speak to the question of privilege at this time.

Mr. Speaker: Order. There are only four minutes left, so I suppose there will be no difficulty in allowing the hon. member to speak for the last few minutes. I have some qualms about whether there is a prima facie case of privilege in the matter raised by the hon. member for Yukon (Mr. Nielsen), but there is so little time left that I am prepared to allow the hon. member for Brandon-Souris (Mr. Dinsdale) to speak.

Mr. Dinsdale: I rise, Mr. Speaker, because during the course of the day certain gentlemen of the press have been asking whether I was involved in the Munsinger case. I make that point to reinforce the statement already made by my colleague, the hon. member who is my deskmate, and because I believe an accusation has been made against certain hon. members which puts a blanket of suspicion over a good many members of the House of Commons.

I also rise in my place because this is the second time—

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh.

Mr. Dinsdale: There is so much laughter coming from the Liberal side of the house that I can hardly hear myself speak.

Mr. Ricard: They are irresponsible over there.

Mr. Dinsdale: This is the second time that I have been attacked in the house by a Minister of Justice and charges have been made along these same lines. It seems to me that there is some conspiracy going on in the government ranks, and the close cohesion of the Liberal backbenchers in their noisy, vociferous response to everything that comes from the government side tonight substantiates that viewpoint. Before I was attacked in the house I had intimation from an honourable minister of the Crown that they were going to attack me, they were going to get me and other hon. members of the former Diefenbaker government.

The first intimation I had that I was going to be attacked was a question put on the order paper by the hon. member for Hamilton West. I believe a statement must be made, an accusation having been made in the house, that pinpoints the specific charges, otherwise the only conclusion to which I can come is that the grand conspiracy to engage in a wholesale witch-hunt and character assassination on the part of the government is still under way.

Mr. Pearson: Mr. Speaker, I know it would be unusual, but we are the master of our own rules and regulations and if the house desires to give unanimous consent we could pass a resolution at once which would enable the government to set up this committee immediately.

Some hon. Member: Hear, hear.

Some hon. Members: No.

Mr. Lambert: The house will determine whether that shall be done.

Mr. Churchill: Mr. Speaker, that is about the most nonsensical suggestion I have heard from the Prime Minister over a good many years. Let me just draw Your Honour's attention to this fact—

Mr. Peters: Mr. Speaker, may I draw your attention to the fact that it is ten o'clock.

Mr. Nielsen: Not yet.

Mr. Churchill: I thought there was one minute to go.

Mr. Grégoire: Ten o'clock. Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. It is my duty to bring to the attention of hon. members that in accordance with the provisions of Provisional Standing Order 39A a motion to adjourn the house is deemed to have been made and seconded at this time. Therefore the question is that this house do now adjourn.

PROCEEDINGS ON ADJOURNMENT MOTION

A motion to adjourn the house under Provisional Standing Order 39A deemed to have been moved.

HEALTH AND WELFARE—MEDICARE—POSSIBLE SHORTAGE OF DOCTORS

Mr. Heward Grafftey (Brome-Missisquoi): Mr. Speaker, in spite of the drama and emotion that surrounds the house at the present time, I hope that the plea I have to make will not fall on deaf ears. Last week I asked the government whether any representations had been put before them to the effect that this country of ours, Canada, was faced with an imminent crisis relating to the shortage of doctors. Your Honour very wisely ruled that because the estimates of the Department of National Health and Welfare were before us, the question was out of order at that particular time.

• (10:00 p.m.)

The hon. member for Simcoe East (Mr. Rynard) subsequently asked the government whether in its opinion Canada was faced with an imminent crisis because of a shortage of doctors. The hon. member asked what the government was going to do about it. He documented his case, but at no time to my knowledge during the discussion of his estimates did the Minister of National Health and Welfare (Mr. MacEachen) deal with this pressing problem that is now facing our nation. While the Minister of Industry has jurisdiction over, and reports to the house in relation to research grants to the medical council, I felt that in this instance, because of medicare plans etc., my question should be directed to the Minister of National Health and Welfare.

I believe most sincerely, sir, along with other hon. members such as the hon. member for Simcoe East (Mr. Rynard), that this country is facing an imminent crisis relating to a shortage of doctors. Canada is running out of doctors, and unless immediate action is taken we shall be faced with a real crisis within two years. Already in smaller centres there are no replacements for the old family doctor who passes on. Last year hundreds of qualified applicants were turned down at our medical schools. I might add, Mr. Speaker, that in 1965 these schools turned out approximately the same number of doctors as ten years ago. In 1965 we had 1,000 medical graduates, but 400 of them left the country.

Some time ago, because of dissatisfaction with conditions in their native land as a result of socialized medicine, many doctors were coming to Canada. This situation has now changed. Not only do we lack medical schools but, as the hon. member for Simcoe East so well documented, some of the existing schools recently barely met proper accreditation standards.

Let me point out to you, Mr. Speaker, as I pointed out to the Minister of National Health and Welfare and to the Minister of Industry, that even today Canada ranks only twentieth in the world in its ratio of doctors to the total population. Today we have 1,000 teachers in our medical schools. If we want to maintain present standards until 1970, and excluding all considerations relating to medicare, we need 2,000 teachers and more schools. Yet our teachers as well as our doctors continue to move away and emigrate to the United States of America.

Why is this, Mr. Speaker? I do not intend to provide the whole answer tonight, but one major reason lies in the fact that more research is being done in medical schools in the United States. The federal government of the United States is responsible for 90 per cent of the financial support given to research in these medical schools. Last year United States federal assistance in this regard amounted to $1,300 million, while in the same year Canadian federal assistance to medical

school research amounted to approximately $15 million.

I know this is not the only answer, but who can wonder at the fact that our medical teachers continue to emigrate? I say the exodus must be stopped. I have pointed out that four medical schools—the hon. member for Simcoe East also pointed this out—are having a hard time to meet proper standards. Surely this is an urgent question and relates to federal assistance to research.

I finish by saying that while our medical schools should re-evaluate their policies—I am not just blaming the government for this, and blame is not something we want to discuss tonight—the federal government should increase greatly its assistance to medical research in Canada. For example, the province of Ontario has a five year plan amounting to $300 million for the enlargement of existing, and construction of new medical schools. I contend these schools will be mere shells unless we have the teachers to staff them.

Along with the hon. member for Simcoe East, who has led this discussion, I say that excellence of research attracts teachers. The difference between excellence and crisis is realistic federal expenditure. The government at Ottawa must announce a drive—as the hon. member for Simcoe East has often said, a crash program—for medical manpower. I say to this house and to the people of Canada that the crisis is nearer at hand than we think.

It is a sad thing, Mr. Speaker, that when I have put questions like this on the orders of the day they have been ruled out of order just because we were discussing estimates. We were discussing estimates and the Speaker had every right to rule my questions out of order at the time. But because the government did not take up this matter on estimates, I am obliged to bring it up again at this time.

I am sure that many members of parliament in this house feel strongly about this, and have their feelings aroused.

I only hope that questions of this nature are going to occupy this Canadian House of Commons in the days to come. What, Mr. Speaker, could be more serious for this great, young country of ours than a shortage of doctors? I am not saying that there is any blame involved. I should like to say to the government that I believe one, and only one part of the answer is a realistic federal expenditure to our medical institutions for research in order to rectify this grave problem.

Mrs. Margaret Rideout (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of National Health and Welfare): Mr. Speaker, the government has been giving careful study to the Gundy Report as well as to a series of earlier reports concerned with increased federal assistance to the development of people involved in providing medical care.

The announcement of the Prime Minister concerning a health resources fund of $500 million, which will be put into effect retroactive to January 1, 1966, as soon as the necessary legislation has passed this house, should constitute an important step in this direction. It is being worked out in close consultation with the provinces and institutions concerned. This fund, together with other types of increased federal assistance to universities, such as medical research, will be an important initial step and one that will undoubtedly be reviewed periodically in the light of the results being achieved.

CANADIAN ECONOMY—STEPS TO MEET INCREASED COST OF LIVING

Mrs. Grace MacInnis (Vancouver-Kingsway): Mr. Speaker, last Monday in this house I asked this question of the Prime Minister to be found on page 2290 of *Hansard*:

> In view of the fact that this is consumer week and that the Prime Minister has personally endorsed it, is the right hon. gentleman planning any action this week to check the rising cost of living?

I received the brush-off on that question, and I have received the brush-off on a number of occasions when I have sought to bring attention to the way the living costs in this country are going up.

I, along with a great many other people, am concerned deeply over the lack of interest shown by the government every time this question is raised in the house. Other hon. members have brought it up over and over again, and each time they have been brushed off, and nothing has been done. I want to indicate that this is a very serious problem. The cost of living has reached an all time high in Canada.

Economists say that prices should not rise more than 2 per cent a year. Last year prices in Canada went up by 3.1 per cent. Included in the price rise were items such as food and housing. These are not luxuries. These are the bedrock essentials for families in this

country. Items which have gone up in price are protein foods such as meat, fish, chicken, which are essential proteins for body building. It is the fresh fruits and fresh vegetables which the Canada food rules list among the most important essentials for good diet in this country which have gone up in price.

Other foods which have gone up in price are butter and shortening. These are foods essential, as every mother knows, for building healthy bodies and strong nerves in their children and in other members of their families.

• (10:10 p.m.)

Each one of these food essentials is a "must" for children and adults alike. Yet already these things are beyond the range of low income families. I have had letters from women across this country in various provinces pointing out in despair that the price of milk has gone up to such an extent they can no longer afford to buy it in reasonable quantities. Bread prices have gone up. The price of oranges and the fresh fruits has risen until these things are completely out of the range of that quarter of our population which is living at the poverty level at the present time.

Yet the government is showing no disposition to do anything about this situation. Its only answer so far would seem to be an agreement to wait for a report of the Economic Council, a report which will not be available before the end of this year. This question of the steady, stealthy rise in the cost of living is becoming one of the foremost problems before this country, but we have been sitting here fighting about everything else under the sun without going anywhere near this issue, though it is vital to the needs of the low income group in this country. Any talk about a war on poverty is meaningless if we allow the cost of living to rise all the time.

What does the government intend to do about rising prices? This is what we want to know. Are hon. gentlemen on the treasury benches opposite going to wait for the Economic Council to report? If so, they are not heeding the warning of the Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development which issued a special report at the end of January about Canada, telling us we should do well to watch unnecessary price rises in this country and suggesting it might be well for this country to establish guide lines in this regard.

[Mrs. MacInnis (Vancouver-Kingsway).]

What we need now is something which the Consumers Association of Canada has been demanding since 1960, a department of consumer affairs which would be able to study this question of rising prices, a department which would be able to bring together organizations such as manufacturers, retailers, producers of household necessities, sales people and others and inquire about price rises and the reasons for them. We need a department to look after the interests of the consumers. It is long overdue.

We find the national president of the Consumers Association of Canada, Mrs. A. F. W. Plumptre, coming out with the following words:

> Consumers today face many problems with the spending of their incomes—rising food prices, uncertainty about the cost of borrowing to buy on instalment plans, misleading advertisements and merchandising devices, inadequate labelling of goods, and in general a lack of information as to how to get the best value for their dollars—

We find the Prime Minister (Mr. Pearson) endorsing this consumer week which is now almost at an end. He said:

> We in government appreciate and support the work done by the Consumers Association. We support the Association's renewed efforts to bring to the attention of more Canadians the many services and benefits they receive through the Association's efforts, and to increase membership in the Association so that those services and benefits can be broadened.

Then, when an hon. member rises in this house at the very beginning of consumer week and asks what the government intends to do this week, to mark consumer week, in order to check the rising cost of living, we find members of the government sitting there with smiles on their faces, saying no single word in reply.

I ask you, Mr. Speaker: is it not time something was done about one of the really important questions facing this country? Is it not time something was done to check the steady rise in the cost of living which has put the important things of life, the bedrock essentials, beyond the range of a good quarter of our population in a very large measure and which now menaces other sections of the population as well?

Mr. Jean Chrétien (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Finance): Mr. Speaker, it is the policy of the government to ensure that relative stability of costs and prices is maintained in the Canadian economy. Such stability will help sustain the present economic

prosperity by keeping Canadian goods competitive in Canadian and foreign markets, and will help provide for a continued increase in employment and growth.

The government keeps close watch on movements in costs and prices. Recent movements in the consumer price index have reflected a number of special circumstances. For example, drought and other adverse weather conditions in many regions of North America have led to price increases in beef and pork, both in Canada and the United States. A substantial rise in automobile insurance rates, attributable to increased accident rates and larger average claims, has affected the index.

Medical insurance premiums were raised during the year, and these are reflected in the index. The prices of consumer services generally have increased more than usual. On the other hand, the price index for consumer durable goods, including automobiles, is actually lower than it was a year ago.

I should also like to draw the attention of hon. members to the recent unemployment situation. We are now happily experiencing the lowest unemployment rate in a decade, and in many areas of the country there is a heavy demand for skilled workers. In circumstances of strong demand, the need for restraint in prices and wage increases becomes greater, and the Minister of Finance (Mr. Sharp) has already urged such restraint upon Canadians.

So far cost and price pressures have not been general but have tended to concentrate in specific areas. In certain parts of Canada heavy demands have been placed on the construction industry. The government has taken steps to stretch out its own construction plans as a means of permitting the industry to accommodate others.

We have also had discussions with the provinces on this matter and we will be proposing legislative changes to allow provinces to continue to benefit from several shared cost programs by stretching out some of their construction programs. In this way, it is hoped that we will be able to maintain a steady and healthy rate of economic growth.

Naturally, the Bank of Canada takes account of the situation in regard to prices and costs in determining monetary policy, and what it has done has had the minister's approval. The government takes account of these factors in forming its economic policy and it can be anticipated that this, as well as other aspects of the economic situation, will be taken into account in determining budget policies.

ADMINISTRATION OF JUSTICE—STEVEN TRUSCOTT—REQUEST FOR INVESTIGATION

Mr. J. A. Byrne (Kootenay East): Mr. Speaker, the matter which I wish to bring to your attention this evening is based on information I have received from an authoress in Toronto who is preparing a book on the trial of Steven Truscott.

On Tuesday, June 9, 1959, a little 12 year old girl in the town of Clinton, Ontario, was brutally raped and murdered by strangulation. Upon reading the evidence of the trial court and events leading up to the trial, I am convinced this foul deed was the work of a yet unknown, physically mature, sex maniac. However, five months later, in October, a 14 year old male child, Steven Truscott, was tried in an adult court by a jury, and convicted. This child was forthwith sentenced and, I quote, "to be hanged by the neck until you are dead."

I ask hon. members is this not a grotesque display of our much vaunted British justice? Even if the child were guilty as charged, and I have very serious doubts that he is, is this not a terrible sentence to be meted out to a 14 year old, who would have to be mentally deranged to perform such a crime? There are many serious minded persons who have taken the trouble to read the trial evidence, and to read about events leading up to the trial, who share my view. Among them is Hon. George Wardrope, former minister of reform institutions in the Ontario government. Speaking to the Nipigon Board of Trade in his own constituency he expressed grave doubts of Steven Truscott's guilt. He had taken an interest in the boy who had an excellent record at the training school, and he had talked with him at some length.

• (10:20 p.m.)

Everything about the lad revealed a quite normal teenager and a nice boy. From the very outset the cards were stacked against this boy. The entire community had adjudged him guilty because they wanted to believe the murderer had been apprehended. The defence evidence was glossed over in the charge to the jury by the trial judge. The evidence against him was purely circumstantial. In effect, the only evidence was that he had been seen with the little girl on the handlebars of his bicycle while he had been taking

her to a destination which she had requested. This information Steven had volunteered before the body was found, and the finger of suspicion pointed at him.

Defence evidence which would have proven conclusively that Steven had left the little girl far from the scene of the murder, and a perfect alibi, was disallowed. Mr. Speaker, I personally am so convinced of this boy's innocence, that I am prepared, if necessary, to stake my seat in the House of Commons on the outcome of an inquiry, or a royal commission, that would examine all the circumstances of the conduct of all the persons involved in:

1. The investigation of the girl's disappearance; 2. The questioning of children at the R.C.A.F. station; 3. The interrogation and taking of statements from Steven; 4. The detention and examination of the boy; 5. All orders given to or by the police; 6. The taking, retaking and redrafting of statements from child witnesses; 7. The disposal of the case by Magistrate Holmes as juvenile court judge; 8. The dismissal of the defence appeal against that decision; 9. The preliminary hearing and committal for trial by Magistrate Holmes; 10. The publicity given the preliminary hearing; 11. The public attitude in Huron county that made the verdict a foregone conclusion in the minds of so many people; 12. The preparation of witnesses and collection of evidence for the trial; and, 13. Finally, and in great detail, the conduct of the trial itself, including the roles of the judge, the prosecutor, the police officers, the three Crown doctors, and all other persons who took part in the proceedings.

Mr. Speaker, personally I have almost lost confidence in our jury system, if not in our legal profession and our doctors. I implore the Solicitor General to give consideration to setting up such a commission.

Hon. L. T. Pennell (Solicitor General): Mr. Speaker, personally I have not had an opportunity to read the book which I understand has not yet been officially released. I understand, however, that officials of the Department of Justice will be studying its contents very shortly.

Under the circumstances I hope the hon. member will acquit me of any incivility if I say it would be most inappropriate for me to make any comment. However, if he raises the question at a later date, I may be in a position to make a more precise statement.

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

HOUSE OF COMMONS

Friday, March 11, 1966

The house met at 11 a.m.

ADMINISTRATION OF JUSTICE

MUNSINGER INVESTIGATION— SPEAKER'S RULING

Mr. Speaker: Order. Yesterday the hon. member for Calgary North (Mr. Harkness) raised a question of privilege affecting the Minister of Justice (Mr. Cardin).

Yesterday I referred hon. members to citation 104(5) of Beauchesne's fourth edition which determines the Chair's responsibility in such instances.

I also pointed out that even where a prima facie case of privilege exists it does not necessarily follow that a subsequent motion will be accepted by the Chair. I further stated yesterday that the matter of privilege put before the Chair related to the propriety of action or words of the Minister of Justice. The closing words of my ruling were as follows:

> I can come to no other conclusion than that the motion as drafted now cannot be accepted by the Chair because it is too general in terms and, according to precedents, does not specify the charge levelled against the minister.

I also referred hon. members to Bourinot's fourth edition, at page 162, as follows:

> A reference to a committee is no doubt the proper procedure in all cases in which there are reasonable doubts as to the facts of the course that should be pursued, especially when it is necessary to examine precedents or witnesses.

From the earliest days of our parliamentary history, the only motion that has been moved and accepted in such cases is one to refer the matter of the alleged breach of privilege of this house to the Committee of Privileges and Elections. I believe that in 100 years of Canadian parliamentary practice, there has never been an exception to this procedure.

Following my disallowance of the motion made by the hon. member for Calgary North, the following motions were submitted:

Mr. Nielsen, seconded by Mr. Harkness, moved:

> That the Minister of Justice do resign.

Another motion came from the hon. member for Winnipeg South Centre (Mr. Churchill), seconded by the hon. member for Ontario (Mr. Starr), in the following terms:

> That the Prime Minister immediately call for the resignation of the Minister of Justice on the basis of the improper conduct of the minister in the making of improper accusations against the right hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Diefenbaker and all privy councillors in the former government.

Later on, the hon. member for Yukon (Mr. Nielsen), seconded by the hon. member for Carleton (Mr. Bell), moved:

> That this house call upon the Minister of Justice to substantiate the charges and allegations he has made against the Leader of the Official Opposition and members of the former Conservative government now members of this house.

In considering all these motions, one must note that they are all couched in language that assumes that the Minister of Justice is in fact guilty of improper conduct, or of the use of improper language, even before the allegations have been established, and it is I submit no answer to this difficulty to argue that the Chair has declared there is a prima facie case of privilege.

Whether there is or is not an actual breach of privilege, beyond the appearance of things, beyond the prima facie aspect of the case, is not, of course, for the Chair to decide. In other words, the motions assume as a conclusion that an actual breach of privilege has been established. With respect, I submit that this type of motion cannot be moved consequent upon a question of privilege. As I said yesterday when I commented on the motion of the hon. member for Yukon, these are substantive motions which cannot be accepted under the guise of a question of privilege.

Hon. members will recall that during the course of my observations yesterday, I drew the attention of the house to a decision of Mr. Speaker Michener on questions of privilege, on June 19, 1959, and it seems to me the proposed motions are invalid also on the basis of the opinion expressed by Mr. Speaker Michener at that time.

At page 583 of volume 105 of the *Journals* for 1959 Mr. Speaker Michener is recorded as follows:

> Members of the House of Commons, like all other citizens, have the right to be regarded as innocent

until they are found guilty, and like other citizens they must be charged before they are obliged to stand trial in the courts. Parliament is a court with respect to its own privileges and dignity and the privileges of its members. The question arises whether the house, in the exercise of its judicial functions with respect to the conduct of any of its members, should deprive such member of any of the safeguards and privileges which every man enjoys in any court of the land.

Further, at page 584, and I repeat what I quoted yesterday:

In my view, simple justice requires that no honourable member should have to submit to investigation of his conduct by the house or a committee until he has been charged with an offence.

In the case before us no hon. member has taken the responsibility of making a specific charge against the minister. I repeat that in my view the responsibility devolving upon the Speaker under our practice in a case of alleged privilege is to ascertain whether there has been a prima facie breach of the privileges of the house, or of any member thereof.

May I refer hon. members to Abraham and Hawtrey's Parliamentary Dictionary, at page 40, where it is stated:

What the Speaker has to decide is whether, assuming that the facts are as stated, the conduct complained of could reasonably be held to be a breach of privilege.

• (11:10 a.m.)

As hon. members know, it is for the Speaker to determine points of order as they arise, and in the situation before the house, even though a prima facie case did obtain, for the reasons I have explained I cannot come to the conclusion that any of the motions moved yesterday are in order.

[*Translation*]

MUNSINGER INVESTIGATION—MOTION FOR JUDICIAL INQUIRY

Mr. Gilles Grégoire (Lapointe): Mr. Speaker, since we are still considering the question of privilege and a motion might still be accepted on the question of privilege, I move, seconded by the hon. member for Villeneuve (Mr. Caouette):

That the house recommend to the government that the substance of the statements made by the Minister of Justice to the House of Commons on Friday, March 4, 1966, his subsequent statements made on Thursday, March 10, 1966, regarding the Munsinger case and the complaint of the hon. member for Calgary North (Mr. Harkness), made subsequently, be referred to a judicial inquiry for consideration and report.

Hon. Marcel Lambert (Edmonton West): Who is the author?

[Mr. Speaker.]

Mr. Grégoire: Mr. Speaker, I hear the hon. member for Edmonton West ask who is the author. Let him stop making insinuations and if he has any charges to make, let him rise and make them. If he is brave enough, let him rise and make them.

Mr. Lambert: I ask who is the author of the motion.

Mr. Grégoire: Mr. Speaker, if he has a charge to make, let him do so. He is too scared to do that.

[*English*]

An hon. Member: Seconded by Mr. Pickersgill.

Mr. Starr (Ontario): You mean written by him.

Mr. Speaker, I move an amendment to the motion to the effect that the words, after the word "that" in the first line of the amendment of the member for Lapointe, be deleted.

Mr. Speaker: Order. The Chair would like to have an opportunity to rule on the admissibility of the motion before considering an amendment.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Grégoire: Mr. Speaker, may I make a few remarks about the validity of this motion? Before an amendment is moved or accepted, I should like to deal with my own motion. If you wish to render a decision on the validity of my motion, I shall speak afterwards.

[*English*]

Mr. Erik Nielsen (Yukon): Mr. Speaker, if I might speak on the question of the admissibility of the motion, I would suggest to Your Honour that it is an acceptable motion. The question of privilege still is before the house, is still before Your Honour, and has not been disposed of.

I might refer Your Honour to page 382 of May's sixteenth edition where it is set forth that a question of privilege is one that can only be decided by the house itself. Your Honour has seen fit to rule out the three previous motions that were raised on the question of privilege. If this motion is not accepted, then of course the situation will resolve itself again into what we had yesterday.

I would suggest, in order to allow the debate that is necessary on this question, because of its urgency, that the motion be accepted and any amendments thereto.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member is asking the Chair to overlook the rules and practice and give the house an opportunity to enter into debate. Obviously the Chair will not do that. The Chair will rule according to the practice and standing orders of the house.

[*Translation*]

Order. A motion has been moved by the hon. member for Lapointe. I must say regretfully that his motion is just as unacceptable as the one he moved yesterday. It is a substantive motion requiring advance notice, and as I mentioned in the ruling I just rendered, and for the reasons I explained a moment ago, the motion is not acceptable.

Mr. Grégoire: Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact that my motion is substantially the same as the amendment and as the one I intended to move yesterday, could not this be construed as a notice I am now giving, and on which I would like a decision within 48 hours which would be according to the usual time limit.

[*English*]

Mr. Thompson: Mr. Speaker, may I ask whether there are copies of this motion available?

Mr. Speaker: I regret that I did not hear the hon. member for Red Deer.

Mr. Thompson: Mr. Speaker, are there copies of this motion available? If they have been distributed I should like to point out that I did not get one.

Mr. Speaker: The motion was disposed of when it was ruled out of order, and it is not now before the house.

Hon. Michael Starr (Ontario): Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the hon. member for Brandon-Souris (Mr. Dinsdale):

> That this house call upon the Minister of Justice to substantiate the charges and allegations which he has made against the Leader of the Opposition and members of the Privy Council of the former government.

Mr. Caron: It is the same as yesterday, the very, very same.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Ontario, seconded by the hon. member for Brandon-Souris has moved that the house call upon the Minister of Justice to substantiate the charges and allegations he has made against the Leader of the Opposition and members of the Privy Council of the former government. I wonder whether there is any point in asking hon. members to address the Chair as to the admissibility of the motion. I should point out to the hon. member that this motion is substantially the same as the three that were moved yesterday. I think it would be unfair to the house for me to read again the judgment I have delivered, but I will do so if the hon. member wishes. I have given the reasons why I think this type of motion cannot be received. I therefore rule that this motion is also out of order.

Hon. Gordon Churchill (Winnipeg South Centre): Mr. Speaker, I think it would be of benefit to the house if you would repeat the reasons and indicate the type of motion that might be acceptable. I recall a case in 1956 when a question of privilege was raised in this house based on statements in newspapers. The newspapers were handed to the Clerk who read out the statements. The Speaker assisted the hon. member who raised the question of privilege in framing his motion. I suggest, sir, that you might give some advice to this house regarding this particular matter. We are doing our best to co-operate with the Speaker in this regard but we think that an unprecedented occurrence has taken place here in the House of Commons, and it may well be that new ground must be broken regarding the type of motion that might be introduced under these circumstances.

An hon. Member: Hire a lawyer.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. I understand the case to which the hon. member referred was one which affected the Chair and the Speaker, which is why that procedure was followed at that time.

For the benefit of hon. members, perhaps I should read again a part of the ruling which I read a moment ago and which applies to the motion just proposed by the hon. member for Ontario.

I made reference to Mr. Speaker Michener's decision of Friday, June 19, 1959 when I ruled on the first motion yesterday, and it seems to me that this also applies to the motion just proposed by the hon. member. The proposed motions are invalid also on the basis of the opinion expressed by Mr. Speaker Michener on June 19, 1959, as recorded at page 4930 of *Hansard* where he said:

> Members of the House of Commons, like all other citizens, have the right to be regarded as innocent until they are found guilty, and like other citizens they must be charged before they are obliged to stand trial in the courts. Parliament is a court with respect to its own privileges and dignity and the

privileges of its members. The question arises whether the house, in the exercise of its judicial functions with respect to the conduct of any of its members, should deprive such member of any of the safeguards and privileges which every man enjoys in any court of the land.

And then further on page 584 of the *Journals of the House of Commons* of Friday, June 19, 1959:

In my view, simple justice requires that no hon. member should have to submit to investigation of his conduct by the House or a committee until he has been charged with an offence.

• (11:20 a.m.)

I would repeat what I said yesterday and draw the attention of the house to these words which also appear at page 584:

In my view, simple justice requires that no honourable member should have to submit to investigation of his conduct by the house or a committee until he has been charged with an offence.

In the case before us no hon. member has taken the responsibility of making a specific charge against any hon. member. The hon. member for Winnipeg South Centre (Mr. Churchill) asks for the advice of the Chair as to what kind of motion could be received. This cannot be done; the Chair can only rule on what is actually before it and cannot rule on hypothetical cases or in the abstract.

Right Hon. L. B. Pearson (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, you have ruled that the motions that have been made are out of order in that they do not subscribe to the rules governing privilege, and you have quoted Mr. Speaker Michener to support your judgment in this matter. I recall that Mr. Speaker Michener was at that time given a good many days by the opposition to think over his ruling, and not a matter of a few hours. We are all the more grateful to you, Mr. Speaker, for giving your ruling in such a short time on such an important matter.

I think I should point out, however, that while you have ruled these motions out of order, for very good reasons, it is of course within the responsibility of the government to set up a judicial inquiry at once by order in council. The government is perfectly willing to do that at once. The Minister of Justice is most anxious to see it done and to have these allegations gone into at once by a judicial inquiry.

Mr. Pugh: What allegations?

Mr. Pearson: Perhaps my hon. friend would keep quiet until I have finished, just for a change.

[Mr. Speaker.]

An hon. Member: Your Minister of Justice should have kept quiet.

Mr. Pearson: If and when this order in council is passed, and it can be done quickly because we have precedent for this kind of thing now, there will be a supply motion on Monday and the opposition will have a chance to raise the subject as a grievance or as a vote of no confidence in the government for the way it has handled this matter and in connection with any action we have taken over the week end.

Mr. Starr: No, sir, not until the Minister of Justice gets up and names names.

Mr. Lambert: Mr. Speaker, with reference to that which the Prime Minister has now said, it is my contention that before a matter can be referred to a judicial inquiry it must be a matter certain. We have had so far no indication beyond rumour, beyond scuttlebutt, of any foundation for the statements made by a minister implicating a group, without specification. I would ask how it is possible to refer anything of this kind to a judicial inquiry. Those people involved must know what they face; it is the elementary principle of justice.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Lambert: Is a body of Privy Councillors, 15 or 20 in number, to suddenly appear before a judicial inquiry and be faced then by an accuser—

Mr. Woolliams: A witch-hunter.

Mr. Starr: McCarthyism.

Mr. Lambert: —without knowledge of what they are to face?

Mr. Pearson: It will be in the order in council.

Mr. Lambert: The Prime Minister says it will be in the order in council. Has the Prime Minister detailed knowledge which he has failed to disclose to the house?

Mr. MacEwan: Tell parliament, tell the House of Commons.

Mr. Lambert: This is the point. All the opposition has been asking is that the minister stand in his place like a man—

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Lambert: —and let him name names. On previous occasions names were named.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Lambert: He has not got names. He says he has not seen the file. There is not even a file that the Prime Minister can suggest should be referred to the judicial inquiry, unless he has knowledge which he fails to disclose to the house.

Mr. Pearson: Mr. Speaker, perhaps my hon. friend should look into the situation and should read the order in council setting up the Dorion inquiry. Perhaps to clarify this I might read to the house, and I shall be glad to table this, a communication, a letter which I have just received from the Minister of Justice on this matter, and it reads as follows:

My dear Prime Minister:

On Friday, March 4th, as recorded on page 2211 on *Hansard* I stated that the Leader of the Opposition "was accusing us of hiding the truth, of hiding evidence from the committee."

I added that he was "the very last person in the house who can afford to give advice on the handling of security cases in Canada," and I also said "I want the right honourable gentleman to tell the house about his participation in the Monseignor case when he was Prime Minister of this country."

To this the right honourable gentleman replied "I am not worried. Have your commission look into it. Put it on the agenda."

Mr. Churchill: That is the general one you mentioned.

Mr. Pearson: The letter goes on:

I have subsequently indicated that the Leader of the Opposition had failed to place the file on this case before the law officers of the Department of Justice for their advice, that the information given to the Leader of the Opposition when he was Prime Minister concerned a case in which security risks were involved.

I have alleged that the Leader of the Opposition mishandled this case and that he failed to seek the advice of the law officers of the Department of Justice as to the appropriate method of dealing with the case, and I am willing and anxious to have these allegations considered by a judicial inquiry which will be free to examine all aspects of the case. I will abide by the result of such inquiry, fully conscious of the consequences.

I have made and make no other charges.

Yours sincerely,

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh.

An hon. Member: Holy, holy, holy.

Mr. Starr: You cannot get away with that.

An hon. Member: Cardinism.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. The Chair recognizes the hon. member for Ontario.

Hon. Michael Starr (Ontario): Mr. Speaker, I am surprised and shocked by the Prime Minister's reading a letter of this kind, knowing full well that since those utterances were made, that are set out in this letter, the Minister of Justice has had a press conference in which he has gone beyond what happened—

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Starr: —on Friday. I am shocked and surprised now that the Prime Minister is an instrument and an accomplice to the spreading of rumours that are being spread around by the Minister of Justice, who has disgraced his position, which is one of the most respected positions in this country, to do with the meting out of justice.

The Minister of Justice in his press conference stated that there were more than two ministers involved. That means that any number can be involved. It is not enough that the Prime Minister stands in his place now and says, "We are prepared to have a judicial inquiry". It is not enough. Names have to be named now, before that inquiry is made. I specifically ask the Prime Minister, is it his intention, and does he do this intentionally? Does he intend that the cloud of suspicion should rest upon the heads of all those who are innocent?

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Starr: And if it is not, if it is not his intention then he should now clear the names of all those upon whom the cloud of suspicion has been cast by the Minister of Justice in his act of Cardinism, as is pointed out in all the newspapers across this country, who are ashamed of the Minister of Justice in the way he has conducted himself in that portfolio. The charges are not only levied against him, but the Prime Minister who is the head of the government is being implicated.

I think all of us in the House of Commons should see to it that the position of the Prime Minister of this country, whoever he may be, cannot be besmirched by anyone who wants to practise the sort of thing that the Minister of Justice is doing at this time.

Mr. T. C. Douglas (Burnaby-Coquitlam): Mr. Speaker, it seems to me that the Prime Minister either deliberately or unintentionally is confusing the entire question which is before the house. The question before the house is the question of privilege.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Douglas: Charges have been made by one of the Prime Minister's ministers, charges which have not been substantiated, charges which reflect very seriously upon members of this house, and some who may be outside this house.

Administration of Justice

• (11:30 a.m.)

All the Prime Minister proposes to do is to set up an inquiry of which he will frame the terms of reference on the basis of a letter which was written by the Minister of Justice (Mr. Cardin).

The Minister of Justice was very careful in that letter to refer only to his remarks which were made in the House of Commons. He makes no reference at all to the charges he made that this case would be worse than the Profumo case; that more than one minister was involved in the Munsinger case.

What the Prime Minister seeks to do now is this. Instead of having a proper investigation into the question of privilege, he is picking out carefully selected statements by the Minister of Justice on the terms on which he would like an investigation. I must tell the Prime Minister that he is not going to satisfy the members of this parliament or the people of Canada by having carefully framed terms of reference made in the corner by the government and passed by order in council, and using that as a substitute for a proper investigation.

I say to the Prime Minister that I think parliament is presenting a very unedifying spectacle to the people of this country, and the responsibility for this lies squarely on the Prime Minister's shoulders. One of his ministers has made very serious charges, charges which he says he makes without even having seen the Munsinger file. The minister either has to rise in the house and withdraw the statements he has made at a press conference, or he has to substantiate them.

As the man chiefly responsible for the conduct of this house and as leader of the government, the Prime Minister has a responsibility to see that ministers act with proper maturity and decorum. A minister of the crown, supposedly in possession of confidential information, cannot use his position to make wide accusations which reflect on the honour and integrity of other members. He has a responsibility now to urge his minister to do one of two things—withdraw his remarks or substantiate them. We are not going to be satisfied with an inquiry, the terms of which are drafted by the government.

If I understand Your Honour's ruling correctly, a motion on a question of privilege cannot cover the matter of an inquiry. It may be better to send this matter to the committee on privileges and elections, although I do not think this will satisfy anybody because it will probably just become a donnybrook. If the Prime Minister wants an investigation, I say to the Prime Minister that he will have to have terms of reference which are acceptable to those in all parts of the house. The terms of reference will have to set out the charges made by the minister, not only in this house but outside the house. The minister will then have to appear before such an inquiry and substantiate his charges, and place his seat and his portfolio at the disposition of that inquiry. The terms of reference of the inquiry must be such as to cover the charges which have been made, and the letter read by the Prime Minister from the Minister of Justice certainly does not cover the very serious allegations made by the Minister of Justice the other day.

I hope the Prime Minister will try to settle this matter, and settle it quickly. We spent all day yesterday on this and it would be a terrible thing if parliament becomes another shambles today. I suggest that the Prime Minister agree to an inquiry of which the terms of reference include the charges made by the minister outside the house and the questions of privilege raised by members inside the house; that the terms of reference make it abundantly clear that it is the Minister of Justice who has to accept responsibility for substantiating before the inquiry the charges which he has made.

Mr. Pearson: Mr. Speaker, my mind goes back to the other day when my hon. friend was in very hearty agreement with the policy of the government when it decided to draft an order in council in regard to a judicial inquiry. At that time there was no talk from him that such judicial inquiry was not what was required.

Mr. Starr: A name was named then.

Mr. Pearson: In previous cases an inquiry was instituted.

Mr. Cameron (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands): Mr. Speaker, the Prime Minister (Mr. Pearson) is referring to a case in which I was involved—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

Mr. Cameron (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands): That was a case of allegedly fraudulent electioneering—

Mr. Speaker: Order.

Mr. Pearson: If I may be permitted to continue, Mr. Speaker, my hon. friend became very indignant about charges being made without names being named. He has been in this house the last two or three years

when charges have been levelled against Privy Councillors in the government. We have been accused collectively of every crime in the calendar.

Mr. Starr: But names were named.

Mr. Pearson: No names were named.

Mr. Starr: Yes, they were.

Mr. Pearson: My hon. friend from Yukon kept insinuating: "Wait till next week when I get my answers, when I get my files; then heads will fall". No names were mentioned.

Now my hon. friend for Burnaby-Coquitlam, who had never a word to say on the previous occasions, becomes very indignant when I say that we will set up a judicial inquiry which will go into all aspects of this matter and the allegations in question. I stated, and I stated it last night, that we would do that. I have also said that if my hon. friend and hon. members opposite do not like this they can vote no confidence in the government on a supply motion and throw it out. My hon. friend was not in the house last night perhaps when I dealt with this inquiry, as reported at page 2532 of *Hansard*. I dealt in my statement with all the points which he has mentioned this morning as being suitable for the inquiry. What more do they want? He does not want this matter to be submitted to the committee on privileges and elections, and I would agree with him. He will get the order in council enabling the judicial officers concerned to go into all aspects of this matter. On that inquiry the Minister of Justice will stake his seat in this house. What more do they want, Mr. Speaker?

I have before me a great many clippings of statements made by members opposite about cleaning up the mess, prosecuting wrongdoers and international crime getting into the office of the Prime Minister—all that kind of thing. Were names named then? Of course they were not. We have been subjected to this kind of treatment now, for too long over here. And reputations have been ruined over here.

• (11:40 a.m.)

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Pearson: Because a member of the government did not pay a furniture bill until all the furniture had been delivered he was pilloried and persecuted.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh.

Mr. Pearson: Now those gentlemen on the other side of the house who have been so free with their accusations over the last few years are getting a little of it, and they don't like it.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Pearson: We have said we will set up a judicial inquiry which will go into all the aspects of this case, all the allegations made—the references made in the press conference as well as the references made in the house. And I hope this will satisfy hon. gentlemen opposite.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Douglas: It now becomes apparent why these charges have been made by the Minister of Justice. Apparently this is part of a counter campaign—

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Douglas: —to relieve the government's feelings after all the attacks to which they have been subjected. I want to say to the Prime Minister that whatever attacks have been made on the government by members on this side of the house, at least the charges were made in the house where they could be replied to, and not outside the house.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Douglas: When a minister of justice tries members in other parts of the house in a trial before a press conference, and then refuses to get up in the house and substantiate what he said, it becomes very apparent that what the government is trying to do is tell the people of Canada that while they may be bad, the people in the Conservative party are no better. This is a queer way to run a country.

The Prime Minister asks: What more do you want? We want the Prime Minister to let us see the terms of reference so that we may be sure they contain something more than the statements which are found in the letter of the Minister of Justice. We want set out in the terms of reference what the charges of the Minister of Justice were before the press conference—

Mr. McIlraith: Would the hon. member permit a question?

Mr. Nielsen: Could I ask a question?

Mr. Speaker: The Minister of Public Works.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh.

Mr. Speaker: Order. The hon. member for Yukon can ask his question afterwards. I have to recognize one or the other. One at a time; the Minister of Public Works.

Administration of Justice

Hon. G. J. McIlraith (Minister of Public Works): I wanted to ask the hon. member if he did not feel that the undertaking given by the Prime Minister last night is sufficiently wide. I will quote it as it appears at page 2532 of *Hansard*:

Mr. Speaker, perhaps I might be permitted to read the amendment. It is that we should:

"—take such steps as are necessary to establish a judicial inquiry into the security case referred to by the Minister of Justice and by the Leader of the Opposition on March 4, 1966, at *Hansard* page 2211 . . . . referred to by the Minister of Justice in a press conference on March 10, 1966 . . . . and referred to in a question of privilege raised by the hon. member for Calgary North at the commencement of proceedings this March 10, 1966."

This, it will be seen, includes the statements made at the press conference.

Some hon. Members: No, it does not.

Mr. McIlraith: I am asking the hon. member for Burnaby-Coquitlam specifically what is the difference between what he is asking and what was offered in that undertaking. Would he explain that, because it seems that the government has already indicated its willingness to accept what he is requesting?

Mr. Douglas: I would be glad to do that. First, I was pointing out that the letter of the Minister of Justice this morning, which the Prime Minister seemed to indicate would be the basis of an inquiry—

Some hon. Members: No.

Mr. Douglas: —does not contain any reference to the charges. Second, the amendment which the Prime Minister was quoting last night as reported at page 2532 of *Hansard*, says only—

—into the security case referred to by the Minister of Justice and by the Leader of the Opposition on March 4, 1966, at *Hansard* page 2211 . . . . referred to by the Minister of Justice in a press conference on March 10, 1966—

A reference to statements made at a press conference is not the same as "containing the charges". It seems to me that if there is to be an investigation, then the charges, specific statements by the minister, must be referred to the committee.

Mr. Favreau: Which ones?

Mr. Douglas: This should be done in clear-cut terms—

Mr. Nielsen: May I ask the hon. member a question?

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Yukon seeks the floor for the purpose of asking a question.

[Mr. Speaker.]

Mr. Douglas: Let me finish the sentence. Merely to ensure that the inquiry shall include a reference to the statements made by the minister at a press conference without anything specifically being in the terms of reference as to what those statements were, and what those charges were, would seem to me much too inept.

Mr. Nielsen: The question I have to ask the hon. member, because of the importance of this matter, is this: Does he not agree that regardless of the terms of reference there cannot be an inquiry outside this house to determine a question of privilege affecting this house? Does he not agree that no inquiry can deal with the privileges of parliament —that no outside body can take away from parliament the right to settle this question of privilege here?

Mr. Douglas: The answer to that question is obvious. If the matter is to be dealt with by this house, then the gentlemen to my right who are aggrieved have it in their power to move that this question be referred to the committee on privileges and elections. If they wish to do that, that is the place to have it settled. But if the Prime Minister is going to have an inquiry set up, all I am anxious about is that the inquiry should be specific and that the charges which the minister made in public be delineated and that the responsibility be upon the minister to substantiate them.

I think there ought to be included in the terms of reference some specific quotations from the statements made by the Minister of Justice at the press conference as they appear at page 2483 of *Hansard*. All I am saying to the Prime Minister is this—that merely to hold an investigation into the Munsinger case is not enough.

• (11:50 a.m.)

If the Minister of Justice had made no charges, then I would be satisfied to have an investigation into the Munsinger case, but since the Minister of Justice had made specific charges, then the onus is on him to substantiate those charges and they should be set out in the terms of reference.

Mr. Starr: That is right. He has to name names.

Mr. Eric A. Winkler (Grey-Bruce): Mr. Speaker, I will take up but a few moments of the time of the house. I would like to return to *Hansard* of Monday, March 7 where, as recorded at page 2297, in the right hand column, the Prime Minister (Mr. Pearson) at

that time indicated the institution of a judicial inquiry, and I quote from there:

> —but not into any particular case. This has been done already through the order in council in connection with the case before the committee. The inquiry will be into the operation of our security **procedures generally, with a view to ascertaining** first, whether they are now adequate in light of present circumstances for the protection of the state against subversive action; second, whether they sufficiently protect the rights of private individuals in any investigations which are made under existing procedures.

I submit to you, Mr. Speaker, and to the house that the terms were sufficient at that time, and are now, to inquire into the case that is under discussion had not the impropriety and unnecessary intervention of the minister taken place. But that impropriety having been created by the Minister of Justice (Mr. Cardin)—and it is certainly substantiated by everything and everyone who has participated, and who has observed outside the house—we are now beyond this, and the minister must rise in the house and answer for the statements he has made, for the course he has followed. This is all we ask.

A few moments ago the Prime Minister asked the hon. member for Burnaby-Coquitlam (Mr. Douglas) "What more does the hon. member want"? I suggest, without putting words into the hon. member's mouth, that this is what we want. We want the minister to rise in his place and answer for the things that have taken place since that time. We want him to substantiate his charges.

That being done, Mr. Speaker, we can return to the ordinary business of the house, but from my very humble position in this party and on this side of the house I must inform the minister, and the supporters of the government, that we will not move until this happens—

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Winkler: We will not move into any other area of discussion. We will not move into any other area of business because we feel this is important not only to the members of the house, but now to the entire country.

Now, Mr. Speaker, just for the sake of the record, to see how some of these things develop, I refer to an article which appeared in the Toronto *Telegram* on Tuesday, March 8, written by Mr. Douglas Fisher. I do not have to go through the whole terms of this article, but it points out very clearly how this and other matters are handled, presumably by the government, with the press. Here is a man with whom I have not always agreed, and I think all members of the press gallery have not agreed with him from time to time, but he has his finger on the key of things. This is the way this whole matter was projected in the first place. I think the minister had the advantage of the press, so that he proceeded to do what he did this week.

All we are asking from the government of the country for the sake of the members under suspicion, is that the Minister of Justice rise in his place and conclude this argument so that the house can proceed, so that this despicable situation, created by himself, is terminated by himself, not on Monday but today.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Speaker: The Minister without Portfolio, on a point of order.

Hon. John N. Turner (Minister without Portfolio): Mr. Speaker, since there is no motion or matter of business properly before the house I wonder whether the house could not be persuaded and you, Mr. Speaker, could not be convinced that we should move to a proper item of business in the house, so that the matters can properly be substantiated where they should be substantiated, through a judicial inquiry—

Mr. Winkler: You heard what I said.

Mr. Turner: —to take them out of the heat and passion of this place in order that parliament can get on with the business of the country.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Réal Caouette (Villeneuve): Mr. Speaker, since yesterday we have been witnessing a spectacle which is not a pretty sight outside parliament, according to the reports we see in the press and the news the whole population is getting.

Insinuations have been made right and left. It seems that both sides of the house are trying to bring out everything ugly and dirty to debase and belittle the dignity of the House of Commons.

Since yesterday, we have been listening to the Conservatives complaining about the fact that the Minister of Justice (Mr. Cardin), on March 4, asked the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Diefenbaker) what part he had played in

the Munsinger affair, since it is now generally admitted that there is a Munsinger affair.

The Conservatives feel offended. They said the Minister of Justice is making insinuations right and left. Insinuations right and left, Mr. Speaker, we have heard a lot of them in the last four years in this house, since we came here, at least from the Conservatives.

A little earlier the Prime Minister (Mr. Pearson) said, quite rightly, and please note that I am not a Liberal at all, I am not at all interested in protecting the Prime Minister's seat or that of any minister, but I will say that for years the Conservatives have been making treacherous attacks against people who did not deserve that.

Mr. Lambert: Against whom?

Mr. Caouette: They even insinuated that the former Postmaster General, then Minister of Citizenship and Immigration, received in his office criminals, that is what I said, or people connected with organized crime in Canada. When the hon. member for Yukon (Mr. Nielsen) asked the minister in the house: "Where were you when Rivard or his lawyers or his accomplices came to your office?" Insinuations were made.

More were made also a little earlier when the hon. member for Edmonton West asked the hon. member for Lapointe: "Who prepared the motion you have just submitted to the Speaker?" As if the hon. member for Lapointe was not as intelligent as the hon. member for Edmonton West.

The hon. member for Lapointe can eat up one by one fifty members like the hon. member for Edmonton West. We have heard insinuations since 1962, during all the previous sessions, and particularly since yesterday.

When the Minister of Justice asked what part the Leader of the Opposition had played in the Munsinger case, the latter should have answered, but instead he said to the Minister of Justice: "Give us proof". And please note, Mr. Speaker, that the Minister of Justice had been, for three weeks, the target of all kinds of sarcastic remarks from the official opposition; they were trying to belittle him, to flatten him out with the Spencer case, which was discussed here for approximately three weeks.

When, in a moment of impatience, the Minister of Justice asked the Leader of the Opposition: "Why not tell us about the part you played in the Munsinger case?" the immediate reply was: "Bring us before a judicial commission or a judicial inquiry."

[Mr. Caouette.]

The pure are not all to be found among the Conservatives. Since yesterday, the Prime Minister has been offering to set up a judicial commission or a judicial inquiry where the statements made by the Minister of Justice himself will be dealt with and the actions and participation of the Leader of the Opposition examined by a judge or commissioner. Mr. Speaker, I maintain that the Conservatives are afraid of such a judicial commission.

We of the Créditistes wholeheartedly support the proposal made by the Prime Minister, who is willing to have that commission set up immediately, within the next 48 hours, so that the Munsinger case can be fully examined and cleared up.

Then, Mr. Speaker, the statements or, if you prefer, the insinuations made by the Minister of Justice will be studied. Should he be proven wrong, I would be the first to ask for the minister's resignation, but let us give him the opportunity to go before that judicial inquiry.

• (12:00 noon)

[*English*]

Mr. J. P. Nowlan (Digby-Annapolis-Kings): Will the hon. member permit a question? I am a little mad and I am a little sick. I think it was a sickening spectacle I saw, and I am going to comment on that.

Some hon. Members: Order.

Mr. Nowlan: The question I have is this: If the members of your party had been the subject matter of the press conference held yesterday, would you have been supporting the government as you are suggesting you are going to support it; in other words, would the inquiry, rather than the principle of having the names named, satisfy you?

[*Translation*]

Mr. Caouette: Mr. Speaker, the Minister's press conference can be looked into by the judicial inquiry just like any other question.

If the judicial inquiry's report or decision should indicate that the Minister did not act according to justice and order, we can always convene the committee on privileges and elections, before which any minister or member can be called and judged.

Mr. Speaker, we support the right hon. Prime Minister's suggestion. The Conservatives should quit acting like hypocrites and accept the judicial inquiry now offered. Let us cease giving the Canadian people the shameful spectacle the Conservatives are now inflicting upon the house.

Mr. Lambert: You are not involved yourself.

Mr. Caouette: Fifty Lamberts; I am not afraid of Lambert syrup.

Mr. Lambert: We are not interested in loud-mouths.

[*English*]

Mr. Jack McIntosh (Swift Current-Maple Creek): Mr. Speaker—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

Mr. McIntosh: Mr. Speaker, being one member in this house who has had some experience with a judicial inquiry such as the Prime Minister has suggested, I would like to say a few words to the front benches on this side, through you Mr. Speaker, and issue a word of warning. Before I do so I also would like to refer the house to an article written by Doug Fisher in December 1963. He was talking about judicial inquiries—you laugh; go ahead. This is what he says in respect of this type of inquiry, and it was in January 1964 he wrote this article:

> It seems the Liberals felt that an inquiry of the right kind, for the right period, might open a can of worms—

I suggest this is the reason the Prime Minister made this suggestion. Then he goes on further to say:

> A strange thing that a committee designed to check into a question of privilege (i.e. into a personal insult) ends up asking for an investigation into a phase of the Department of Agriculture.

I mention this, Mr. Speaker, to point out what can happen with these so-called judicial inquiries. I have said in this house many times that they are not judicial inquiries, that they are political inquiries, and last night as I saw the Minister of Transport and the Prime Minister walking into this house—as I saw the Minister of Transport walking into this house licking his lips—I knew that history was repeating itself; it was the establishment again coming up with some idea of how to get out of this mess and how they could, by suggesting a judicial inquiry, shove it off on to some unbeknown judge who would work on their behalf.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh.

Mr. McIntosh: Mr. Speaker, the Prime Minister and the former Minister of Justice are jumping in their seats—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

Hon. J. R. Nicholson (Minister of Labour): On a question of privilege, Mr. Speaker, a suggestion has been made that a judge would be placed in the position—

Mr. McIntosh: I have the floor—

Mr. Nicholson: On the question of privilege, the hon. member suggested that a member of the judiciary of this country would be made a tool of this government. By doing so he reflects on the government and on our judiciary.

Mr. McIntosh: Mr. Speaker—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. In general terms, the hon. member knows no comment should be made which reflects on the judiciary.

Some hon. Members: Withdraw.

Mr. McIntosh: I will not withdraw it, Mr. Speaker, because I made no accusation.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh.

Mr. McIntosh: I said I believe something, and I still believe it. I would point out that in the composition of this judicial inquiry I was talking about the commissioner at that time was a defeated Liberal candidate, and all his legal counsel were either defeated Liberal candidates or—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. I cannot allow the hon. member to continue this line of argument. I want to remind him, and all hon. members, that I have allowed all hon. members from all parties represented in the house on both sides of the chamber to participate in this debate this morning, following upon the ruling which I delivered shortly after eleven o'clock. Now there is still nothing before the house. The only way this debate can continue would be if a new question of privilege were raised, because as hon. members realize, in the course of yesterday, we were discussing a specific question of privilege that was held in abeyance to give the Chair an opportunity to study the motions which were made subsequent thereto. Certainly we must reach a point where an item has to come before the house, since there is nothing now. Unless a new question of privilege is raised, I would suggest to hon. members that we should call orders of the day.

Mr. Erik Nielsen (Yukon): Mr. Speaker, I would suggest to Your Honour that the question of privilege that was raised yesterday is still before Your Honour and still before the house.

An hon. Member: No.

Mr. Nielsen: Yes it is. The motion has been disallowed by Your Honour, but the question of privilege is already before us. There are other motions which could be moved. I think we should allow the government the widest possible opportunity to extract themselves from the situation in which the Minister of Justice has placed them.

Your ruling, Mr. Speaker, and the ruling by Mr. Speaker Michener, upon which you partially based your ruling, and which I thought was correctly cited by Your Honour, applies exactly to the question of privilege that is before this house. The question of the members of the Privy Council, and the Leader of the Opposition who have been slandered and who have been subjected to accusations and insinuations, both inside and outside this house, by the Minister of Justice, must be dealt with on the basis of privilege, which this house and only this house has the jurisdiction to dispose of.

The rulings, as I said to you, sir, make the point that no hon. member should be deprived of the safeguards which apply to everyone in ordinary legal proceedings, and that no member should be subjected to an investigation of his conduct by an inquiry by the committee on privileges and elections, or by any other process, without specific charges being made.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Nielsen: This is exactly what the Prime Minister and the Minister of Justice, abetted by the hon. members for Lapointe and Villeneuve, are attempting to do in the case of the Leader of the Opposition and members of the Privy Council on this side of the house who have been slandered by the Minister of Justice. Is the Leader of the Opposition not entitled to have those same safeguards as referred to by Your Honour and by Mr. Speaker Michener? Is the Leader of the Opposition not entitled to the same rights and safeguards which Your Honour has claimed for any member of the house?

• (12:10 p.m.)

Charges have been made against the Leader of the Opposition and against members of the Privy Council. Is the minister to be allowed to slander the Leader of the Opposition with impunity?

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh.

[Mr. Nielsen.]

Mr. Nielsen: They laugh; they consider it a joking matter, but it is one of the most important and gravest matters ever brought before this house.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh.

Mr. Nielsen: They treat it as a joke.

Mr. Greene: Would the hon. member permit a question?

An hon. Member: Even the Prime Minister laughs.

Mr. Greene: I wonder whether the hon. member could help us. He has stated a precedent that there can be no inquiry unless specific charges are made by a member. Could he help us by telling us what member made what specific charges and risked his seat as a precursor to the Dorion inquiry?

Mr. Nielsen: The hon. member was here in his seat in November of 1964 and he not only heard me name people, dates and places, but he heard me refer to sections of the Criminal Code of Canada in making those charges.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. Is the hon. member now speaking on the original question of privilege? What worries the Chair is that if we are now on the original question of privilege the hon. member has already taken part in the debate and can only speak once to that question. He cannot get up and speak twice, three times or more often on the same question of privilege. He is in a bit of difficulty if he is speaking on the same question of privilege in seeking to address the Chair at this time.

Mr. Nielsen: Mr. Speaker, on the point of order and with no reflection—I think I must preface my remarks in that way all the time because of the sensitivity of members on the opposite side—on Your Honour's observation, the Prime Minister and several other members of this house have participated more than once during what has been a general discussion on the question of privilege. I am simply availing myself of the same right that other members have availed themselves of during this discussion.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. The Chair cannot accept the suggestion of the hon. member. There was an exchange this morning following the suggestion made by the right hon. Prime Minister. The Chair was lenient and allowed members to discuss the suggestion. Now that this apparently has been set aside we should return to what is before the house,

and the only thing we can have before the house is a question of privilege. If we have a specific question of privilege before us each member is entitled to speak to it once, but not more than once.

Mr. Grégoire: Mr. Speaker, on the point of order—

Mr. Nielsen: Mr. Speaker, I rise on the point of order.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Grégoire: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker.

At the start of this sitting, a while ago, I moved a motion which was rejected by Your Honour on the grounds that it was a substantive motion, which therefore required 48 hours notice.

Now, as I gave 48 hours' notice and sent such motion in writing, it is by that very fact accepted. As that was the only reason for its rejection, my motion, therefore, is in order and can be discussed.

That is why I maintain that it is now the matter under discussion, because the motion I had moved had been rejected for the sole reason that it was a substantive motion and required 48 hours notice.

Thus, it is before the house. In fact, it is the only acceptable motion before the house, whether it be discussed now or in 48 hours, but it is accepted, since the 48 hours' notice has been given officially.

[*English*]

Mr. Nielsen: On the point of order, Mr. Speaker. Your Honour has pointed out that no member can speak twice in the same debate. I submit to Your Honour that you quite properly allowed a discussion on the question of privilege which was raised yesterday and which is still before the house. I submit that members are not confined to speaking once in a debate prior to the house being seized of a proper motion. Your Honour has quite properly allowed several members to speak more than once. I think this is very essential in order that—

Mr. Speaker: The hon. members have spoken more than once because there were three questions of privilege. Hon. members did raise different questions of privilege yesterday, and made a point of saying that these were different questions of privilege, as is recorded in *Hansard*. The members who moved the new questions insisted that they were different questions of privilege which would give rise to different motions. Of course if we had a new question of privilege the Chair would allow hon. members to speak a second time to the second question, and a third time to the third question. However, there is not now a new question of privilege before us. It may be that the hon. member proposes to move a new motion, and if he wants to do so it should be done very soon.

I understand the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Knowles) wishes to speak to the point of order.

Mr. Pickersgill: No, the Minister of National Health and Welfare.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. I recognize the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre.

Mr. Stanley Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Mr. Speaker, I should like to say a few words on the point of order because it might be useful at least for this member to indicate where he thinks we are.

Yesterday the member for Calgary North (Mr. Harkness) raised a question of privilege. There was some considerable debate before Your Honour made a ruling. Your Honour ruled that in your opinion there was a prima facie case of privilege. At the same time you ruled that the particular motion the hon. member for Calgary North moved was not acceptable. Let it be clear that you did rule there was a prima facie case of privilege.

On the basis of your ruling that there was a prima facie case of privilege the debate went on and other members sought to move motions. Some motions were ruled out of order and some you took under advisement. This morning at eleven o'clock you gave your ruling from the Chair on the motions moved yesterday. You ruled them out of order. Immediately the hon. member for Lapointe (Mr. Grégoire) rose and his words were to this effect, that Your Honour has ruled the motions out of order, but the question of privilege is still before us. Whereupon he sought to move as a motion what he attempted to move as an amendment yesterday. Your Honour ruled that motion out of order.

Mr. Grégoire: No.

Mr. Knowles: I am sorry; Your Honour did rule that motion out of order, whereupon the debate continued.

In the course of the debate the Prime Minister, by bringing in a letter from the Minister of Justice, managed to get the house discussing the subject matter of the very motion the hon. member for Lapointe had

tried to move, and so the discussion has gone on. The ruling that Your Honour is citing to the effect that a member can speak only once is a well known one, but it applies when there is a motion before the house. It applies to a proper debate. I regret that this discussion is still going on and I would support Your Honour in any effort you might make to suggest that we have had sufficient discussion as to whether or not there is a point of privilege. I am sure Your Honour has the understanding of the house, namely that you have tried not to clamp down but to let the matter resolve itself if it could be resolved. Since you have allowed members of all parties to continue to discuss the general question of privilege, and various proposals such as the one made by the Prime Minister, I do not think you can now apply the ruling which applies only when a motion has been made.

I submit that we are procedurally still where we were yesterday when the hon. member for Calgary North raised his question of privilege and when you ruled that although his motion was not in order there was a prima facie complaint of privilege.

I think it should be noted, sir, that the point of privilege raised by the hon. member for Calgary North was not in regard to the Munsinger case, but rather in respect of certain actions on the part of the Minister of Justice. Your Honour ruled that the point raised by the hon. member for Calgary North was a prima facie case of privilege. I submit that Your Honour having allowed the Prime Minister to discuss a proposal for an inquiry, which you say cannot be voted upon, and other matters than the actions of the Minister of Justice in this house, then it is pretty difficult procedurally to stop this discussion.

I therefore rise procedurally to defend the rights, in terms of consistency, of members to continue discussing the point of privilege. At the same time, as a member of parliament who, as my leader has expressed, has the concern of all of us for what this discussion is doing, I hope that we can soon agree that we are getting nowhere by this discussion. I hope we can soon agree that it might be better to let this debate come to a conclusion, and let those who are affected by it make a decision as to what they should do on Monday. The Prime Minister has made it clear that even though the house may not be satisfied with the kind of inquiry he proposes, it is the government's intention to go through with it, and the government can do that because it is an order in council matter and not a house matter.

If I may sum up what I am trying to say, I think Your Honour is in difficulty if you try to tell members they cannot continue the discussion because of the way the debate has gone, but I think you should also have the support of the house in any reasonable effort you make to bring this discussion to an early conclusion.

• (12:20 p.m.)

Mr. Nielsen: Mr. Speaker, I was interrupted by a point of order raised by the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Knowles)—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. The minister seeks the floor on a point of order.

Hon. A. J. MacEachen (Minister of National Health and Welfare): Mr. Speaker, I have been watching the proceedings of the house since yesterday afternoon very carefully and I have been deeply worried about the kind of situation in which the house has got itself. Yesterday the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Knowles)—

Mr. Muir (Cape Breton North and Victoria): Your Minister of Justice put us in this mess.

Mr. MacEachen: I am speaking from a purely procedural point of view at the moment, Mr. Speaker. Yesterday the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre made a very important observation. Those of us who have been in the house for any length of time, and those of us who have made an effort to understand the rules of the house, know that a question of privilege is not an aimless exercise in debate; that it has always been the position of Speakers that if a question of privilege is raised it is the obligation of the Speaker as the first step to determine whether it is a prima facie case of privilege.

Mr. Nielsen: The Speaker has done that.

Mr. MacEachen: The Speaker has discharged his responsibility in that respect. Having taken that course, it is up to the house to formulate a remedy and to put a motion before the house. The hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre took that position yesterday. At various times yesterday afternoon, in the evening and again this morning we have been engaged in a debate with no proceeding whatsoever before the house. It is obvious from the authorities, and one such authority is citation 113 to be found on page

102 of Beauchesne, that "a question of privilege ought rarely to come up in Parliament. It should be dealt with by a motion giving the house power to impose a reparation or apply a remedy."

This has been the traditional course. I have observed on previous occasions that when a question of privilege has been raised and when the house has been unable to formulate a remedy or a motion for the consideration of the house, the Speaker has terminated the debate. That has been the position. There are certain obvious traditional methods that could be applied in this case, if hon. members sought to do so, in the way of a motion. This has not been done and I understand the reasons and agree with them. For example, the traditional course that has been employed is to send a matter of this kind to the standing committee on privileges and elections.

Mr. Nielsen: After charges have been made.

Mr. MacEachen: I could quote precedents of cases and subject matters that have been sent to the standing committee on privileges and elections when no charges were asserted. If you look at the celebrated case before Mr. Speaker Michener when the conduct of the hon. member for Peel was brought into question, that is the most definitive statement on privilege that has ever been made by a Speaker in this chamber. Mr. Speaker Michener took several days to formulate his decision. In that case he took the view that he would not send the matter of conduct of the hon. member for Peel to the committee on Privileges and Elections in the absence of specific charges. He also stated that there were precedents in the history of this parliament when cases were sent to the committee without the formulation of specific charges. So that is a course that could be employed. Why is it not being employed? It is not being employed because I believe it would be a futile course. Yesterday I was deeply moved by the speech made by the hon. member for Victoria-Carleton (Mr. Flemming), who rarely intervenes in debate, but when he does he does it effectively, and he did so last night.

I appreciated his point of view. He understands that the situation which is facing the house cannot be resolved by sending this matter to a parliamentary committee. The hon. member for Burnaby-Coquitlam (Mr. Douglas) took that view, and I think hon. members obviously understand that this question cannot be resolved in that way. The course which is the traditional way of solving such a problem, applying a remedy or imposing a reparation, referred to in Beauchesne, has not been employed. We understand the reason.

Mr. Nielsen: Mr. Speaker, would the minister permit a question? Is it not also traditional that a member of this house who makes charges must substantiate those charges or take the only other alternate course?

Mr. Lambert: Or specify them.

Mr. MacEachen: I understand that it could be moved by any hon. member that this subject matter be sent to the standing committee on privileges and elections. That could be done. It is a motion that would have to be held to be in order. But it is not being done for obvious reasons, and I agree with those reasons, because sending this matter to a standing committee of this house will not resolve the important question raised by the hon. member for Victoria-Carleton and the hon. member for Calgary North (Mr. Harkness). For both these hon. gentlemen I have a very great respect and I respect their moral position.

The government is suggesting that a judicial inquiry be established under a judge. We have employed this remedy, imposed this reparation, in previous cases. It has been advocated by hon. members in all parties confronted with a question of personal integrity or civil liberties that the proper way to deal with such matters is through a judicial inquiry. The hon. member who is the Whip of the official opposition has stated that he will not proceed to other business. I suggest to him and to all hon. members that the only way in which this matter can properly be resolved is to refer it to a judicial inquiry.

Mr. Churchill: What matter?

Mr. Starr: Mr. Speaker, would the minister permit a question?

Mr. MacEachen: The Prime Minister (Mr. Pearson) has read a letter from the Minister of Justice (Mr. Cardin)—

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh.

Mr. MacEachen: —in which the Minister of Justice stated—

Mr. Horner (Acadia): He did not read the one letter he should have read.

Mr. MacEachen: —that he wanted his allegations—

Mr. Nielsen: Accusations.

Mr. MacEachen: If you want to call them accusations, that is your word, but in the letter he stated that his allegations—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. I should like to interrupt the minister. My understanding is that the minister took the floor on a point of order while the hon. member for Yukon (Mr. Nielsen) had the floor.

Mr. Starr: May I ask the minister a question at this point? He said the proper way to proceed is to have this matter referred to a commission of inquiry. Without specifically naming persons or laying specific charges, is the minister implying that he wishes the hon. member for Victoria-Carleton and the hon. member for Calgary North to appear before that inquiry? Is that what he means?

Mr. Nielsen: And all the rest of them.

Mr. Starr: These hon. members for whom the minister said he had such great respect.

Mr. MacEachen: I have.

Mr. Starr: Yet you want them to appear before such an inquiry.

Mr. MacEachen: I have not suggested that.

Mr. Starr: Well, what else is going to be done?

Mr. MacEachen: It has been suggested, and hon. members ought to be very clear about this, by the Minister of Justice that the former prime minister mishandled a security case. That is the nub of the matter.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh.

Mr. Lewis: On March 4, not on March 10.

Mr. MacEachen: The issue here is a statement, an allegation, a charge if you like, by the Minister of Justice that the former prime minister mishandled a security case.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh.

• (12:30 p.m.)

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. I should like to bring to the attention of the minister that the hon. member for Yukon had the floor. I can only assume that the hon. member for Yukon has no objection to the minister continuing at this point. If he does object, then he has the floor.

Mr. Nielsen: Mr. Speaker—

Mr. MacEachen: I was speaking on the point of order that was raised.

[Mr. Nielsen.]

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. I suggest that we not complicate things too much. The minister might like to complete his remarks, with the assent of the hon. member for Yukon.

Mr. Nielsen: I thought I had the floor.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. The hon. member for Edmonton-Strathcona perhaps did not notice that the hon. member for Yukon had agreed to allow the minister to raise his question.

Mr. Nugent: Mr. Speaker, you have heard the minister on a point of order. You have heard several. I have been waiting to speak on the point of order. I would ask Your Honour to bring the minister to order. It is not up to the hon. member for Yukon to grant permission. After completing the point of order the minister started on a question of privilege. I would still like to speak on the point of order.

Mr. Speaker: Perhaps I might suggest to hon. members that the minister should be allowed to complete his remarks. If the hon. member wants to speak after, I shall be pleased to recognize him.

Mr. Nielsen: I should like to hear the minister, and I intend to rise after he has finished.

Mr. Cameron (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands): The minister had agreed to answer a question which I think I started. My question is: Is the minister proposing that this commission of inquiry is to confine itself to the investigation of the charges made by the Minister of Justice in this house, or is he excluding the charges that he made at the press conference?

Mr. MacEachen: Mr. Speaker—

An hon. Member: All right, Favreau.

Mr. MacEachen: It is absolutely clear that the judicial inquiry will investigate all aspects of this matter.

An hon. Member: What matter?

Mr. MacEachen: And the letter of the Minister of Justice to the Prime Minister which was read earlier indicated willingness on the part of the Minister of Justice—

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh.

Mr. MacEachen: —to have all aspects gone into. His statements in the house, his statements at the press conference in regard to this matter can be gone into and gone into

thoroughly. The Prime Minister, speaking in the house today, has undertaken to the house that this course of action will be followed.

I simply say to hon. members opposite that this is the only reasonable way, the only fair way that this matter can be brought to a conclusion. It is the only possible way that will resolve the kind of issue of principle that has properly agitated hon. members opposite.

Mr. Starr: Not only that.

Mr. MacEachen: Especially the hon. member for Victoria-Carleton and the hon. member for Calgary North.

An hon. Member: Speak for yourself.

Mr. MacEachen: The Minister of Justice is not shirking his responsibilities.

Mr. Starr: He is so.

Mr. MacEachen: He is not.

Mr. Starr: He has lost his responsibilities.

Mr. MacEachen: He has made allegations and he has stated—

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh.

Mr. MacEachen: He has stated—the Prime Minister has stated that if the allegations of the Minister of Justice are proved to be unfounded then he stakes his seat on the outcome of that inquiry.

Mr. Starr: One moment—

Mr. MacEachen: What more courageous act do you want from the Minister of Justice?

Mr. Winkler: Let him stand up. Let him stand up.

Mr. MacEachen: Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Justice is now ready to stake his political future—

Mr. Winkler: Let him stand up.

Mr. MacEachen: —and his seat on the outcome of this inquiry. All I am asking—

Mr. Starr: Would the minister permit a question?

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. May we have order?

Mr. MacEachen: All I am asking is that hon. members realize what the Minister of Justice is prepared to do and what the government is prepared to do in terms of a comprehensive inquiry into all the allegations.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh.

Mr. MacEachen: Mr. Speaker, what I say now will be somewhat inconsistent with the course I have followed because I have talked extensively myself, but there is no motion before the house. There is no action that the house can take on this matter. In the absence of any motion, in the absence of a remedy formulated by the house that can be decided upon, I suggest it is the obligation of the Chair, and I suggest this respectfully, at an early moment to suggest a course of action that would bring the house back to the order of business.

Mr. Starr: I should like to ask the minister a question.

Mr. Flemming: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, since the minister has introduced my name into the debate I think I should correct the interpretation he made of my remarks. I am sure he would want me to do this. My remarks are found on page 2535 of yesterday's *Hansard*, about half way down the left hand column:

> In my opinion, the Prime Minister is doing a great disservice to this country if he does not demand that the Minister of Justice get to his feet just as soon as it can possibly be arranged and give to this house the basis of the statements he made this morning to the gentlemen of the press.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Flemming: I am stating that purely for the benefit of the minister so that he will not be under the mistaken impression that my remarks applied to what was said in the house last Friday and did not apply to the press conference which the Minister of Justice had with the gentlemen of the press.

An hon. Member: He knew what was said.

Mr. Starr: Mr. Speaker, may I ask a question of the minister before we go any further? It is a repetition of the former question that the minister did not answer. Does he think, with regard to his usage if the words "fair and just" in what he said, that it would be fair and just that upon the setting up of this inquiry the hon. member for Victoria-Carleton and the hon. member for Calgary North should appear before that commission to justify their innocence in this affair?

Mr. MacEachen: I did not suggest that for a moment.

Mr. Starr: How can you proceed in this matter without the Minister of Justice specifically naming the people involved?

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Nielsen: Mr. Speaker, I was dealing with the question of privilege before the house before the point of order intervened. I was dealing with the point that a commission of inquiry or the Standing Committee on Privileges and Elections cannot possibly deal with this matter now in the absence of specific details which the minister is obliged to give the house. Otherwise any such inquiry must of necessity have before it all Privy Councillors, past and present, of the former administration, including the Leader of the Opposition, because of the sweeping charges that the minister has made.

An hon. Member: A few over there, too.

Mr. Nielsen: "More than two", he said at his press conference. Contrary to some opinions which have been expressed to Your Honour this afternoon, the Minister of Justice in the debate last Friday, as found on page 2211 of *Hansard*, used words that directly accused the Leader of the Opposition of participation—"participation" was the word he used—in the Munsinger case.

Sir, these slanderous remarks cannot be allowed to pass with impunity. The proposals of the Prime Minister, of the Minister of National Health and Welfare and of the Minister of Justice in his letter, a letter which I submit should be tabled immediately as our rules require, to the effect that the conduct of the Leader of the Opposition be investigated, cannot be allowed to be accepted by the house. The proposal by the Prime Minister in the house this afternoon, not being required to be substantiated in any way whatsoever by a specific charge by the minister, in lieu of withdrawal or resignation, cannot be allowed to be accepted by the house.

I submit, sir, that the words of Mr. Speaker Michener apply directly to the present situation and to the case of the Leader of the Opposition and make it immediately incumbent upon the Minister of Justice and the Prime Minister here and now to make their specific and detailed charges. They must either do that or they must withdraw, or the minister must resign his seat in the house. There can be no departure in my submission from this principle. That is the essential and the only issue that is raised in the question of privilege before the house, and it can only be resolved—

• (12:40 p.m.)

Mr. Grégoire: Would the hon. member permit a question?

[Mr. Starr.]

Mr. Nielsen: —by this house.

Mr. Grégoire: I should like to ask the hon. member for Yukon why he did not resign after false insinuations were made against the hon. member for Matapédia-Matane (Mr. Tremblay)?

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Nielsen: Hon. members opposite applaud that question but if the hon. member for Lapointe (Mr. Grégoire) had taken the trouble to recheck, as I did last night, he would have found that not on one but on three occasions on November 25 I said that I was not casting any reflection on the then minister of citizenship and immigration.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh.

Mr. Nielsen: Hon. members groan but that appears on the record on three separate occasions. The Minister of Transport has his *Hansard* there and can look it up. In my submission, Mr. Speaker, no inquiry can deal with the privileges of parliament. No outside body can take away from parliament the right to deal with its own privileges regardless of any terms of reference that may be set up.

What, sir, is the position of the Prime Minister? In what position has he placed himself? He has offered to set up a royal commission to investigate the actions of a former prime minister. Does he really expect the house to support that? I suggest not, sir. How many inquiries does the Prime Minister want in this field? When the Minister of Justice raised the matter the Leader of the Opposition—

Mr. Pickersgill: The Leader of the Opposition said he wanted one.

Mr. Nielsen: When the Minister of Justice very injudiciously and emotionally inserted the words "Monseignor case" into the debate last Friday he drew this remark from the Leader of the Opposition, as reported at page 2211 of *Hansard*:

> I am not worried. Have your commission look into it. Put it on the agenda.

No other member can suggest any other interpretation of those words uttered at that time than that the Leader of the Opposition meant that that case should be made the subject of the second inquiry which the Prime Minister announced on Monday.

Mr. Pickersgill: Would the hon. gentleman allow me to ask him a question? How could the Leader of the Opposition on Friday have been referring to a royal commission which

no one had suggested at that time and which was not even decided upon until Monday? The hon. member should at least get his chronology right.

Mr. Nielsen: Mr. Speaker, I believe the record will show that not only were we discussing the desirability of setting up an inquiry to deal specifically with the Spencer case but also one to deal with national security generally. The decision was made on Monday—at least, it was announced on Monday—but the matter certainly entered the discussion during the debate.

Mr. Winkler: No doubt about that.

Mr. Nielsen: The Prime Minister has set up an inquiry to look into the Spencer case. He has announced a further royal commission into the whole field of security.

Mr. Pearson: Security procedures.

Mr. Nielsen: Yes, security procedures. That is the charge that the Minister of Justice is making, that when the Leader of the Opposition was prime minister he mishandled the Munsinger case. He accused him last Friday, of participation in the Munsinger case.

The Leader of the Opposition has suggested that the Munsinger case be put on the agenda. The Prime Minister obviously noted that suggestion because he referred to it yesterday. But it was referred to by him in a very curious and twisted form. The Prime Minister is now suggesting a third royal commission into an identical field.

An hon. Member: No, no.

Mr. Nielsen: Yes, yes. In announcing the appointment of a commission into security procedures last Monday the Prime Minister made it quite plain that such a commission would cover the whole field of security procedures and the adequacy of measures. The Minister of Justice has now charged that this case—I refer to the Munsinger case—was a bona fide case of security.

The Prime Minister said that the second commission which he announced on Monday was going to look into the whole field of security procedures. If, without having seen the file, the Minister of Justice is right and this is a bona fide case involving security, why not refer it to the second commission announced by the Prime Minister on Monday last? The Minister of Justice has criticized the actions of the Leader of the Opposition when he was prime minister in handling the case vis-à-vis its security aspects. It properly belongs as a subject of the general inquiry announced by the Prime Minister. He has not, so far as I know, dealt with the morality aspects no doubt considering this beyond his purview. In the face of the Prime Minister's announcement on Monday last the statements made by the Minister of Justice are such as would come before the inquiry set up by the government on security measures. The Prime Minister knew this and the Minister of Justice knew it. But the minister could not wait—

Mr. Pickersgill: Mr. Speaker, I should like, very respectfully, to rise on a point of order. It seems to me that the hon. gentleman is not now discussing anything which has any relation to any purported question of privilege. He is making an argument that this case should be referred not to the inquiry that my right hon. friend suggested this morning but to some other inquiry. That might be an interesting matter for debate—

Mr. Nielsen: The Prime Minister actually held that out.

Mr. Pickersgill: Mr. Speaker, I am speaking to a point of order dealing with procedure. I have listened very respectfully to hon. gentlemen opposite and I think the same standard should apply to both sides of the house.

Mr. MacInnis (Cape Breton South): Mr. Speaker, on a point of order—

Mr. Pickersgill: My point of order is this.

Mr. MacInnis (Cape Breton South): Mr. Speaker—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. There is a point of order before the house.

Mr. MacInnis (Cape Breton South): Then on a question of privilege, Mr. Speaker—

Mr. Speaker: Why not allow the minister to complete his point of order and I will recognize the hon. member after?

Mr. MacInnis (Cape Breton South): My question of privilege arises out of remarks just made by the Minister of Transport.

Mr. Speaker: I will allow the hon. member to raise his question of privilege after the minister has completed his remarks.

Mr. MacInnis (Cape Breton South): I would call Your Honour's attention to the fact that the rules require that an hon. member should raise a question of privilege immediately and I want to raise a question of privilege as the result of a remark made by the Minister of Transport.

Mr. Speaker: "Immediately" may mean one or two minutes later. I suggest to the hon. member it would be so much easier to allow the minister to complete his remarks. I agree with the hon. member that if he feels his question of privilege should be raised at this time he should raise it and I will recognize him. I was just asking for his co-operation in allowing one statement to be finished first. There is before the house a statement being made by the hon. member for Yukon, a point of order which has been raised by the Minister of Transport, and now a question of privilege on the point of order. It seems to me this is not a very good way to carry on the debate. I should like to hear the minister and then the question of privilege.

Mr. MacInnis (Cape Breton South): On my question of privilege—

Mr. Speaker: Very well. If the hon. member insists on raising his question of privilege now I will hear him.

Mr. MacInnis (Cape Breton South): I raise my question of privilege because I recall that a previous Speaker ruled the hon. member for Brome-Missisquoi out of order because seven seconds had elapsed. My question of privilege is that the minister has stated that the Chair should see that both sides have equal opportunity in the matter of raising points of order or questions of privilege, whatever the case may be. I would call to Your Honour's attention that again the Minister of Transport is continuing to abuse the rules by rising without recognition from the Chair.

Mr. Speaker: Order. I will recognize him now.

• (12:50 p.m.)

Hon. J. W. Pickersgill (Minister of Transport): Mr. Speaker, so there will be no misunderstanding, I did not make any admonition to you, sir. I merely said to hon. gentlemen opposite that I had listened politely to them and I hoped they would listen politely to me, as I think most of them want to do. My point is this, sir. The hon. gentleman is embarking upon a debate which seems to me to have wandered very far afield from any possible question of privilege. In the course of his remarks he said there had been no specific charges made. If there have been no specific charges it is hard to see how there can be any question of privilege before the house. If all that exists is a grievance—

Mr. Brand: On a point of order—

Mr. Speaker: There can only be one point of order raised at a time.

[Mr. MacInnis (Cape Breton South).]

Mr. Pickersgill: I was speaking to a point of order. There cannot be a point of order on a point of order.

Mr. Brand: On a question of privilege—

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Saskatoon on a question of privilege.

Mr. Brand: On a question of privilege affecting the Chair, I believe that a ruling once made by the Chair cannot be challenged. This is now being done by the hon. member for Bonavista-Twillingate.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh.

Mr. Pickersgill: I was not seeking to challenge any ruling. I was rising on a point of order with respect to the speech now being made by the hon. member for Yukon. My point of order is a simple one. The hon. member has said there are no specific charges. If he looks at the record he will see he was complaining there were no specific charges. If there were no specific charges, I do not know what question of privilege he was talking about. It seems to me that under the guise of privilege he is seeking to develop a grievance. There is a procedure under our rules for dealing with grievances. That procedure will be in effect on Monday, if the government's plans continue with respect to a motion for supply. At that time the life of the government will be at stake and hon. gentlemen will be able under the rules to challenge the government and defeat it if they can.

An hon. Member: Just you wait.

Mr. Pickersgill: If, as the hon. gentleman himself has said, there are no specific charges to be considered, he cannot be speaking on a question of privilege and therefore, since there is nothing else before the house, there is no justification for his continuing his speech at this time.

Mr. Brand: I should like to bring to the attention of the house that Your Honour has already ruled that there is a prima facie case of privilege here; yet this decision is being argued by the Minister of Transport.

Mr. Nielsen: On the point of order spuriously made by the Minister of Transport, he has twisted my remarks out of all proportion. As he knows, I detailed a whole list of the charges the Minister of Justice made both in the house and in the press. I put this on record in *Hansard* yesterday. What I meant when I referred to specific charges, as I believe the minister knows, was that no inquiry, whether a judicial inquiry or an

inquiry by the Committee on Privileges and Elections, can hope to cope with the sweeping charges made by the Minister of Justice unless it requires the attendance of all Privy Councillors of the previous administration, past and present, and that specific charges must be brought against those to whom the minister referred when he made his statement to the press.

The Minister of Justice must name names if it is expected we will ever get anywhere with that matter. He must substantiate what he has said or he must resign. This is what I was referring to, as I believe the minister knows.

Mr. Pickersgill: Would the hon. member mention any citation in any of the authorities which gives the slightest justification for the course which he, in his pontifical fashion, suggests must be followed by the minister? The other day Your Honour recited Mr. Speaker Michener's famous ruling and there is certainly no warrant for such a course there. Mr. Speaker Michener said there must be a specific motion and we do not have such a motion before us today. The hon. member put a question to me and I will reply to it if I am permitted to do so. The only charge which I have seen is the charge by the Minister of Justice that the Leader of the Opposition mishandled a security case.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh.

Mr. Pickersgill: I know of no other charge. If the hon. member does, let him state it instead of making these insinuations.

Mr. Nielsen: I do not know where the Minister of Transport was yesterday. I put them on record yesterday.

An hon. Member: Read them.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. May I suggest to hon. members that the debate should be carried on without any shouting from one side of the chamber to the other.

Mr. Nielsen: The minister should read them; they are on the record. It was not simply a charge that the previous prime minister mishandled this case. There is a charge, appearing at page 2211 of *Hansard*, that the Leader of the Opposition, when he was prime minister, participated in the Munsinger case.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh.

Mr. Nielsen: There was a charge by the Minister of Justice that more than two Privy Councillors are involved in this case and that it is worse in some respects than the Profumo affair. I listed many more examples in *Hansard* yesterday. When I made reference to specific charges—the hon. gentleman knows this—what it was intended he should understand was that the minister had an obligation before any proceedings can be taken to name the ministers he thinks are involved, without having had reference to the files, and a further obligation to substantiate the charges he has made both inside and outside this house.

One of the outstanding political commentators in the minister's own province, Mr. Claude Ryan of *Le Devoir*, said this morning in analysing the minister's conduct, and I quote a translation:

> Instead of following a line of conduct dictated by logic and tradition, Mr. Cardin performed one after the other, (coup sur coup) two acts which showed his real stature, that of a small-time politician (petit politicien) of partisan spirit.

And again:

> Already, the manner in which the minister last week revived the Munsinger affair was disgraceful (disgracieuse) and unworthy of a Minister of the Crown.
>
> Yesterday, the minister went farther. Making use of information which he did not officially possess, dealing with files not under his authority, he accused "a number" of former Conservative ministers of having been involved in an incident about which he admits he knows neither the details nor the exact significance. Without having consulted his Cabinet colleagues he demands an inquiry into the Munsinger affair, exposing himself once again to a new repulse from a leader acting only through fear and opportunism.

Mr. Ryan refers to the statement that the minister was tired of charges by the Leader of the Opposition that the Liberals were plunged in scandal. Then he goes on:

> Coming from a man to whom this country has confided the administration of justice and who enjoys, on account of his position, extremely powerful instruments of pressure, such proposals are absolutely unacceptable.

This is not just the opinion in the province of Quebec; it is the opinion across this country. The editorial I have just read, written by a noted editorial writer in the minister's own province, sums up precisely the case for the opposition in this affair, that a minister shall not use his high office to blacken with impunity members of this parliament. I point out to hon. gentlemen on my left in the Ralliement Creditiste and in the Social Credit party—

An hon. Member: One o'clock.

Mr. Nielsen: —that if this tactic is allowed to go unpunished by this parliament every member of this house is open to the same treatment.

• (1:00 p.m.)

Some hon. Members: One o'clock.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. I take the liberty to mention to the hon. member for Yukon that the time allotted to him under the rules expired some 12 minutes ago. According to the information I have from the table he started making his speech at 12.10, and the Chair has made allowance for the many interruptions. Allowance of some 10 minutes or so has been made for the points of order and questions of privilege that were raised while the hon. member had the floor. So, with regret, I have to advise him his time has expired.

Mr. Peters: On a point of order, may I ask Your Honour if it is possible to revert to the old standing orders and adjourn for lunch?

Mr. Speaker: It is a very worth-while suggestion but the Chair is in no position to accept it.

Mr. Andrew Brewin (Greenwood): Mr. Speaker, I agree with what has been said by members of my own party that this is a debate that should be as short as it possibly can be. However, I want to add a few words, not in the spirit of attack and counter-attack, smear and counter-smear which seems to me to be the root trouble that has caused the morass or mess we are in at the present time. I want to try to make a contribution, if I may, to some sort of resolution of the difficulty we are in.

Mr. Churchill: May I ask a question before the hon. member proceeds? What does he mean by smear and counter-smear, particularly counter-smear?

Mr. Brewin: I do not think I want to answer that question in any detail now. Surely all members of the house know there have been attacks and counter-attacks, insinuations and counter-insinuations, and if they do not know that I am afraid—

Mr. Churchill: Substantiate that.

Mr. Brewin: —they do not appreciate what has been going on in the house for some time.

Mr. Churchill: I rise on a question of privilege, Mr. Speaker. The hon. member now entering into the debate is making vague, unsubstantiated charges against members of the house. He is talking about smear and counter-smear, attacks and counter-attacks, but I am particularly interested in this reference to smear and counter-smear.

An hon. Member: Well, you have done a lot.

Mr. Churchill: He is making an unsubstantiated attack on members of the house. Let the hon. member mention any smear or counter-smear in which I have been engaged, because I am one of the members of the house.

Mr. Brewin: Mr. Speaker—

Mr. Churchill: I remain on the question of privilege. If the hon. member for Lapointe (Mr. Grégoire), uncourageously standing behind the curtains, has accused me of smearing, then I ask Your Honour to have him withdraw that remark.

Mr. Grégoire: I told you—all the Conservative party.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: The hon. member for Cape Breton South.

Mr. MacInnis (Cape Breton South): On a question of privilege, Mr. Speaker, is the Chair going to permit the hon. member for Lapointe to interject from behind the curtain a remark in reference to smearing and allow it to stand without even asking him to withdraw the remark which was made behind the curtain?

Mr. Grégoire: Mr. Speaker—

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order. Would the hon. member please sit down. Remarks made outside the curtain are made outside the official confines of the house and I doubt that the Speaker has any right to rule on them.

Mr. Grégoire: On the question of privilege, Mr. Speaker—

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order. I have given the floor to the hon. member for Cape Breton South. If he has finished his remarks I will hear the hon. member for Lapointe.

Mr. Grégoire: It is very easy to substantiate all these things and to prove my case I should like to table *Hansard* for the last two years.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Grégoire: Is there unanimous consent?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order. I would suggest to the hon. member for Lapointe that this has already been dealt with very effectively.

Mr. Brewin: Mr. Speaker, if the hon. member for Winnipeg South Centre (Mr. Churchill) thinks I have made any particular reference to him I can assure him I did not. I want to get on with what I hope will be a contribution to the solution of the problems before the house. I want to say that I could not help but regret the statement made by the Prime Minister (Mr. Pearson) at the opening of the House of Commons today when he read a letter from the Minister of Justice, because it seemed to me that if that letter and that statement had been somewhat different we might be moving toward some sort of a solution of this matter. What I regret about the letter and the statement is that they seemed to omit from their recital of the facts what is the basic problem facing this house, that is, not the statements made in the house but the statements made in a press conference by the Minister of Justice in which a blanket allegation was made against certain members of the house.

I for one, Mr. Speaker, think that a judicial inquiry, at least as a preliminary, would be far preferable to a reference to a committee of the house where political passions and political feelings are bound to be aroused, and I approve of the proposal for a judicial inquiry. I concede the point that this house cannot abandon its right and duty to consider in the ultimate analysis the questions of privilege that members of the house may raise, but I can see that a judicial inquiry, with all the protection a judicial inquiry has, would at least be a better thing than a reference to the Committee on Privileges and Elections. But if we are to have a judicial inquiry we must have adequate and proper terms of reference.

Here I am not trying to discuss technicalities of what Mr. Speaker Michener's ruling was at some other time or whether the terms of reference are in order or out of order or are too broad. That would be a technical detail. But what I do say to the house is that these terms of reference must incorporate the specific words, the basic problem that exists here now, the charges made by the Minister of Justice against a group of members of the house.

Mr McIlraith: Would the hon. member permit a question? This very point was dealt with last night, and it was very clear that the remarks made by the Minister of Justice in the press conference on March 10, 1966, would be included. I thought that was made clear by the leader of the government when he spoke.

Mr. Brewin: I heard what the Minister of Public Works (Mr. McIlraith) said earlier in this debate. So far as I know, the reference made last night was not incorporated in the statement made by the Prime Minister this morning. I say that if the Prime Minister will undertake and make it clear—

Mr. Nicholson: Will the hon. member permit a question?

Mr. Brewin: I think I will permit it after I have finished making these few remarks. They will be fairly brief and I do not think I will be able to make my point if I try to answer a whole series of questions. What I want to say through you, Mr. Speaker, to the members of the government and to the Prime Minister in particular is that we want it abundantly clear that the terms of reference specifically refer not only to statements made in the house but to the statements made or alleged to have been made in the press conference which reflect on members of the house.

Mr. McIlraith: Yes.

Mr. Brewin: And I want to go a stage farther. In this instance I want to support the words of the hon. member for Yukon, because I want to make it perfectly clear that in my view no judicial inquiry would make sense unless the specific persons charged with offences were named in the terms of the inquiry. I know that no judge would want to hear a blanket charge against 15, 20, 30 or 100 people. Who is to appear? Who is to be called? The minister will have the obligation later, if such an inquiry is granted, of stating clearly and specifically whom he is charging.

I say if he has that information now, why should we be kept in suspense over it? Why should the people of Canada be kept in suspense? I say you cannot have the judicial inquiry proposed by the Prime Minister without specific charges being made.

• (1:10 p.m.)

It is a fundamental principle of justice, so far as I know, that these charges should be made clear and not be blanket allegations. If it were true that the Minister of Justice did not have enough knowledge to say who they were, then of course he never should have made the statement.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Brewin: If he does know, then why should the suspicion not be removed from those who are not charged and not affected by this matter so that they do not have to be condemned by the senior law officer of the Crown in Canada by a blanket aspersion against them? We should be sure that there is no attempt to deal with this matter in the Committee on Privileges and Elections where the chaos might exceed even what we have seen in the house. That is not the right way to do it. Let the government choose a judicial officer of the highest calibre and let him deal with this matter. But before that let us have it perfectly clear that the grave matter which this house is now discussing, the matter of the imputations made by the Minister of Justice in his press conference, is incorporated in the terms of reference, and that these imputations must be specific and not under the guise of some generalities.

I have had enough experience with judges and I respect them, most of them in any event, despite what one hon. member said. I know their approach to these things. If they can limit the matter or cut it down they will do so. As I say, right in the terms of the inquiry we should have the charges and they should not be the general charges we have heard so far; they should be specific charges within the minister's knowledge and based on the files he controls. If there are no such charges then he should withdraw and resign.

Mr. McIntosh: Mr. Speaker, may I ask the last speaker a question? The hon. member made reference to me and my thought in respect of judges. I am not quite sure he knows what my position is so far as judges are concerned. I would ask him, as a result of his remarks this morning, whether he disagrees with the editorial which appeared in the *Globe and Mail* today and particularly the part which says:

> But an inquiry is no longer sufficient.

This is what the people of Canada are thinking. The editorial goes on to say, and again I repeat this is what the people of Canada are thinking:

> Never in the history of Canada's parliament has a cabinet minister behaved with more irresponsibility than Mr. Cardin. The Munsinger case was to come before a judicial inquiry. He took it away from that inquiry. But he did not take it before the jury of parliament. No. He took it to the jury of rumor and scandal-mongering, on hearsay evidence, and in cold blood after a full night's consideration. Canada's Justice Minister did this.
>
> Mr. Cardin must resign.
>
> But his resignation will not, in itself, restore confidence in the government. Mr. Cardin told the *Globe* reporter—

[Mr. Brewin.]

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order.

Mr. McIntosh:

—that Mr. Pearson—

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order, please. I think the hon. member now should proceed to the question he was going to ask.

Mr. Lambert: He asked it.

Mr. McIntosh: Mr. Speaker, I will repeat it. I ask the hon. member for Greenwood whether he agrees with what I have already read from this editorial, particularly the last sentence which says:

> Mr. Pearson appeared as little more than a "me-too" accomplice in a smear campaign.

I am suggesting to the member for Greenwood in respect of a judicial inquiry that with his experience in such inquiries he knows—

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order.

Mr. McIntosh: My question—

Mr. Deputy Speaker: It is a very long and extended question.

Mr. Brewin: Mr. Speaker, I should like to answer the question by saying that, however good the editorial is, I am not trying to express opinions or make judgments as an editorial writer. I have nothing but respect for the Minister of Justice and I am sorry he has got himself into the mess he has. I am directing myself to a question of principle. I do not intend to associate myself with an editorial, although it may be just. The aspect I am dealing with is how this house can get out of the mess it is in.

Mr. McIntosh: Does the hon. member for Greenwood not agree that a judicial inquiry such as that proposed by the Prime Minister and instigated by the Minister of Transport would end up in more of a smear?

Mr. Brewin: I really cannot anticipate what a judicial inquiry would end up in. All I can say is that this is the best known procedure we have for investigating facts which have to be investigated.

Mr. Greene: Mr. Speaker—

Mr. Woolliams: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order before the minister speaks, just a moment before the Minister of Agriculture rose the Minister of Justice wanted to rise and you did not recognize him. I suggest that maybe he should now be heard.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: The Minister of Agriculture is recognized by the Chair.

Hon. J. J. Greene (Minister of Agriculture): Mr. Speaker, I was interested, first, in respect of the question in which we are now involved and in the approach taken, which I respectfully submit was very useful to the house, by the Minister of National Health and Welfare with regard to our procedures. In this regard I hope I may also add some contribution to the debate in respect of the point made by the hon. member for Greenwood concerning the nature of any reference and inquiry.

First of all, Mr. Speaker, I should like to point out, as the Minister of National Health and Welfare did, that the instituting of an inquiry is not a removal of the processes of the house in any way, shape or form. Inasmuch as there is no procedure apparently, as the current debate has indicated, whereby this question may be resolved in any proper and meaningful manner under the rules of the house, I submit that such an inquiry is for the very purpose of determining judicially any facts and conclusions, which will be approached in a judicial manner and on which the house can then take further action.

I point out quite respectfully that any findings made by a judicial inquiry are then for this house to take action on. If in fact a motion of censure against the Minister of Justice is substantiated by reason of the findings of fact of that judicial inquiry, then of course this house has recourse to those findings on which to base such a motion.

I see no other useful way in which we can proceed than in the way which the Minister of National Health and Welfare has pointed out. This is the only logical and, in fact, the only procedure available to us. I did wish to make the point that it is not an extra-territorial procedure in so far as this house is concerned but rather an effective and just method whereby we can determine judicially the facts on which any further action which this house deems necessary should be taken. It does not remove the matter from the ambit of control of this house in any way, and it is the only proper and just way in which this house can proceed further.

I might also respectfully point out, with respect to the point made by the hon. member for Greenwood in respect of the matter of a specific charge, that we have a precedent in this regard. I suggest this precedent was useful in the case in question, and the house gave unanimous consent, if I recollect rightly, at the time to the procedure which was employed in respect of the Dorion inquiry. Again this house was not abandoning its responsibility. This house felt, in view of some of the allegations which had been made, that a judicial finding of fact should be made so that if further action were deemed necessary by the house it could be based upon such a finding and not upon mere allegations, rumours or suspicion. I think that is what we are trying to do here.

• (1:20 p.m.)

With respect to the precedent that we have, in that instance the inquiry was not based on specific charges but rather on an investigation of general incidents that had occurred, general suspicions that had been aroused and general allegations that had been made to see if in fact a judicial conclusion could be drawn by that inquiry on which action by the house could be taken if the house deemed it necessary. If it was a question of having to make charges prior to an inquiry I submit that those charges, according to the rules of the house as I understand them, would have to be backed up by the member making them who would forfeit his seat if they were not fulfilled. I do not think hon. members can have it both ways. Either the inquiry is based, as I have suggested, on the idea of determining judicially the true facts regarding the many allegations that have been made or it is based on charges and conclusions from those charges. If the charges were not substantiated the hon. member who made them would forfeit his seat.

If the latter course was the procedure followed in the Dorion inquiry, then I would respectfully refer the house to page 10534 of *Hansard* for November 25, 1964, where the hon. member for Yukon is recorded as having made the following statement:

> He should make a clean breast of the whole thing to the Canadian people—

He went on to refer to the then minister of citizenship and immigration. To repeat, he said:

> He should make a clean breast of the whole thing to the Canadian people, all of whom are wondering about the minister and the procedure he has followed in this case. Likewise the Minister of Citizenship and Immigration should rise and tell the committee what he knows. I challenge him to rise now and tell the house where he was when the bribe was offered. I challenge him to rise now and tell us where he was when the bribe was offered.

Later, as reported on page 10535, the hon. member for Yukon is recorded as having said:

> He cannot deny—I do not impute anything to the Minister of Citizenship and Immigration—that what

I have said is a fact. There is contained in the police report a reference to the fact the Minister of Citizenship and Immigration was in his office at the time the bribe was offered.

The then minister of citizenship and immigration denied this fact as recorded at page 10534 of *Hansard* where he stated:

The hon. member for Yukon, in his question put to me, made an innuendo in trying to know where I was at the time that supposed offer was made to Mr. Lamontagne.

I want to tell the hon. member and the whole house that at no time before the occurrence of those supposed events have I been aware of anything with regard to that matter.

Mr. Churchill: Charges were made in the house and answered in the house.

Mr. Greene: Mr. Speaker, this is the submission I want to make in this regard. If in fact this other inquiry, which I submit was a precedent and quite a proper precedent for this house, was the result of the house wanting to determine in a judicial fashion, by a proper inquiry under all the auspices and protections of a judge, whether there were facts on which further action by the house should be taken, and if that inquiry was based on a charge by a member, surely when the then minister of citizenship and immigration was completely vindicated by Mr. Justice Dorion the hon. member for Yukon should no longer be with us. I suggest he is still here as big as life.

Mr. Lambert: What sort of sophistry is that?

Mr. Greene: I respectfully suggest this. I know that the hon. member for Yukon would obey the rules of the house and that he has respect for its rules and traditions. If in fact the Dorion inquiry was based on that premise, Mr. Speaker, the hon. member should have resigned.

Mr. Woolliams: Mr. Speaker, I do not want to interrupt the minister unless he wishes to be interrupted but would he permit a question at this time?

Mr. Greene: I would prefer to finish my statement, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Bell (Saint John-Albert): What about the press conference yesterday morning?

Mr. Churchill: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker. I draw your attention to the fact that the minister is now dealing at length with the Rivard case and we on this side of the house claim the right to do the same thing.

[Mr. Greene.]

Mr. Greene: With all respect, I am trying to be helpful as best I can with regard to the procedures that I think we are embarking on here. I am trying to help the Chair and the house generally with respect to the nature of the proceedings as they are now before us.

As has been pointed out earlier, I think we have no specific and proper procedures within parliamentary rules with which to solve this very difficult and serious problem. I merely suggest, Mr. Speaker, that this precedent is a sound one, for the reasons I have stated. The Dorion inquiry was not based on charges and the result that the member who made those charges either had to substantiate them or resign. Rather, it was based on a genuine concern of the whole house and a unanimous desire to wash all the linen that had to be washed with regard to the Rivard case in a judicial way and thus determine whether any further house action should be taken. If it were otherwise in this case, if it were a case of charge and responsibility, as the hon. member for Greenwood alleges it might be, then obviously the hon. member for Yukon would have had to resign.

Mr. Lambert: You are wrong.

Mr. Greene: I suggest it is quite obvious that the precedent is before us and that the purpose of such an inquiry is that the house may determine the facts judicially in respect of a situation such as this. I think that is what an inquiry would be set up to do. I do not suggest for a moment that hon. gentleman opposite, who have been so judicious in trying to finding truth, light and probity everywhere in this land by seeking evidence in respect of bankruptcies, searching files from Vancouver to Montreal, eliciting facts, truth and light, were not most concerned in this regard. I feel very sure they were sincere in their purpose. I do not think for a moment that they have changed their coats or all of a sudden suffered a metamorphosis. What was efficient to bring out the truth last year should be efficient to bring out the truth this year, namely, a judicial inquiry. I do not think that all of a sudden by some magical potion within the past year this has become an undesirable procedure.

Mr. Bell (Saint John-Albert): How about the press conference yesterday morning?

Mr. Greene: I do not think for a moment that hon. gentlemen opposite are attempting to prevent the shedding of light on these matters in a judicial fashion by carrying on debate here and by preventing the inquiry

from being brought into being. I know they are concerned about the truth and bringing out the truth about the matters involved in this case. I merely suggest to them that the best way we can bring out the facts in a judicial and fair way, under proper rules and procedures where witnesses are protected and where the judge with all his experience will be able to see to it that the process is not used to blacken anyone's name unfairly, is to set up an inquiry. I think we have a precedent for this in the Dorion inquiry which was accepted unanimously by the house at that time. Hon. members thought that was a wonderful procedure and I do not think the procedure has become any worse, any less responsible or effective as a result of the fact that it is now one year older.

I do suggest with respect to the qualms of the hon. gentlemen of the New Democratic party, which are quite proper, that this would not be some kind of a narrow restricted inquiry to prevent enlightenment with regard to the very situations on which we require to be enlightened, that they have the undertaking of the Prime Minister to the effect that the inquiry will be sufficiently broad that a judge may find on all facts pertinent to this matter, including the press conference and including anything that was said in this house.

• (1:30 p.m.)

Mr. Winkler: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, this morning when I rose and stated the case for this side of the house I did not disagree with the terms as stated by the Prime Minister regarding the judicial inquiry. We do not object to them now, but what we want and what must take place in this house today is that the Minister of Justice rise and substantiate his charges, his statements and all the inferences in his press conference. When that is done the situation will be resolved. It is that simple. So far as this minister is concerned, he should talk about dairy policy.

Mr. Greene: I will not speak of specious points of order, Mr. Speaker, because they have been made ad nauseam. But I do in all sincerity believe this is the best and the only way that I know in which this matter can be resolved in a manner that is just and proper and will still leave this house with full authority and responsibility to do whatever is deemed proper, whatever is deemed just and whatever is deemed to be in the best interests of the house after it has all the facts as found by the judicial inquiry.

Mr. Winkler: Are you going to allow this type of press conference to go on?

Mr. Greene: If there is no such finding of fact by the judicial officer who has the authority to do so at the hearing, if in fact any allegations that were made at the press conference are found to have no basis in fact, with the result that a member was traduced contrary to the rules of the house, then the house will have every authority and right to take action.

Mr. MacInnis (Cape Breton South): What is the Minister of Justice laughing at?

Mr. Greene: But such action by the house should be based on a finding of fact by the judicial authority and not through a procedure which does not exist, which is the position in which we now find ourselves.

Mr. Churchill: Mr. Speaker, would the minister permit a question?

Mr. Greene: I would be pleased to do so.

Mr. Churchill: Is the minister suggesting a commission of inquiry whose terms of reference would be headed "Prove your innocence"? My question is similar to that asked by the hon. member for Ontario this morning. Before that commission of inquiry would various hon. members from this side of the house be called to prove their innocence?

Mr. Greene: I certainly would not agree to an inquiry of this nature. I quite appreciate the difficult position of some hon. Privy Councillors opposite. The inquiry, as the Prime Minister has indicated, would give some respected judicial person broad authority to inquire into all the facts and certainly would not be for the purpose of putting anyone personally on trial. Any action pursuant to the findings of such an inquiry would be for the house to take and not for the judicial inquiry to take.

Mr. Bell (Saint John-Albert): Mr. Speaker, may I ask the minister a question? What is to prevent the Minister of Justice calling another press conference on Monday morning and making similar charges?

Mr. Greene: With respect, Mr. Speaker, I think this would be the very salutary benefit of the appointment of a commission of inquiry as quickly as possible. As the hon. member for Calgary North so properly requested last night, such an inquiry should be set up immediately because the matters with which it would be concerned would be sub judice and it would be most improper from that

point on for the minister or anyone else to comment upon them until the judge had made his findings.

I think it would have the very good effect of enabling this matter to be determined calmly by a judicial tribunal while we in this house carried on with the business of the country, which is what the people of this country wish us to do.

Mr. Lewis: Mr. Speaker, would the minister permit a question?

Mr. Greene: Yes.

Mr. Lewis: Has the minister been made aware of the fact that a Toronto newspaper now carries the story that the Munsinger woman, about whom we are talking, has been found alive in Germany and has offered to come back to Canada any time she is invited to do so?

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh.

Mr. More: Resign. You have given us false information.

Mr. Greene: I do not have that information, Mr. Speaker, because I do not have my ears attuned to the press gallery as keenly as my hon. friend. But surely this is all the more reason for holding a judicial inquiry with the broadest scope possible and as quickly as possible so that this good lady—

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh.

Mr. Greene: I use that term in the broadest possible sense, Mr. Speaker—so that this good lady may be permitted to give her evidence to enlighten the house.

Mr. Lewis: Would the minister allow another question? Would the minister undertake—

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order, please. Is the hon. member for York South rising to ask a question?

Mr. Lewis: Yes, Mr. Speaker. Will the minister permit another question? I am serious. I am not trying to be funny. This is far too serious a matter. Can the minister or the Minister of Justice on behalf of the government undertake that if the story is true that Miss Munsinger, if that is her name, is alive, the government will immediately take steps to bring her back to Canada in order that the truth may be known?

Mr. Greene: Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Agriculture does not yet have extradiction matters under his authority.

[Mr. Greene.]

Mr. Lewis: That would not be necessary. She has offered to come here.

Mr. Greene: I can only re-echo the words of the Prime Minister. He has given his undertaking that it will be the broadest possible inquiry and I personally feel very certain that every effort would be made, including no doubt making it as easy as possible for the good lady to get here, so we would have all the evidence it is possible to get for this inquiry.

Mr. Lambert: Mr. Speaker, may I ask the minister a question?

Mr. Greene: Yes.

Mr. Lambert: The minister is an experienced lawyer. Does he feel it is elementary justice that all members of the Privy Council at that time who may be involved should have to parade themselves before a commission or be called before a commission to prove their innocence?

Mr. Greene: As I said earlier, Mr. Speaker, I do not think this is in the nature of a trial of any individual.

Mr. Lambert: Is it not?

Mr. Greene: I have great confidence in the members of the judiciary and feel sure these matters could be resolved in such a way by a capable and experienced judge that nobody would be personally indicted before that inquiry unless he were shown by the facts to be guilty of an offence against the state.

Mr. Lambert: You would never go yourself.

Mr. Eldon M. Woolliams (Bow River): Mr. Speaker, I listened with great interest to the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Greene) and I think it is time we set out our position once again because in my view the Minister of Agriculture has probably misunderstood it. I want to draw an analogy which I am sure will appeal to the Minister of Agriculture because he practised law in an area which has given him an appreciation of a community in the true sense of the word. What the minister is really asking for is not a judicial inquiry but an inquisition. Suppose, for example, there was a robbery in the community of the Minister of Agriculture; would everybody in the community be brought before the bar of justice for trial with regard to the robbery, without anybody being named? That is the situation that exists here. The Prime Minister (Mr. Pearson) is not asking for a judicial inquiry at all; he is asking for an inquisition in respect of Privy Councillors who sit on this side of the house.

We have said that we have nothing to hide. I do not know the facts. The Minister of Justice (Mr. Cardin) said he has not seen the file but he disclosed many things and made many revelations in a press conference which he would not disclose in this house. I see that the Minister of Justice is not in his seat. He is never in his seat when something important and embarrassing to him is being dealt with.

Some hon. Members: Shame.

Mr. Woolliams: What we are asking the Minister of Justice to do is—

Some hon. Members: Shame.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order, please. The hon. member for Bow River.

Mr. Woolliams: I am glad to see the Minister of Justice back in the chamber. We are asking the Minister of Justice, the Prime Minister or somebody else to name these people. Let the Minister of Justice name them. If he is wrong in this regard, then of course he will lose his seat and resign as Minister of Justice. Let us have them named, because what the Minister of Justice has said has resulted in the whole front bench of this party standing charged. Who is to go before this inquiry?

I again draw the analogy of the community of the Minister of Agriculture. If there has been a robbery in his community, does everybody in the community appear at the trial? Does everybody go on trial? The only kind of justice of that nature that I have ever heard of is under a dictator like Hitler who took whole villages and towns and laid them to waste. Is that the kind of Justice the minister refers to?

• (1:40 p.m.)

Mr. Stewart: Would the hon. gentleman permit a question?

Mr. Woolliams: Always.

Mr. Stewart: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the hon. gentleman would tell the house what specific persons were mentioned in the order in council that brought on the Dorion inquiry?

Mr. Woolliams: I can certainly answer that, and I am glad you asked that question because I was just coming to it.

Mr. Stewart: Who?

Mr. Woolliams: Will you listen? You have asked a question. Let me answer and give me a hearing. That is all I am asking.

Mr. Stewart: You have it.

Mr. Woolliams: I will name some of them. Some of the people who were mentioned in the debate on that occasion when the charges in question were made were not members of the house. That differentiates this matter entirely from the Dorion inquiry entirely. Some of those people were executive assistants. One was an executive assistant to the Minister of Justice; another was executive assistant to another minister. They were not members of parliament. They were not Privy Councillors. That goes to the very crux of my argument. This is a matter of privilege for this house. That is the situation. It affects hon. members of the house.

An hon. Member: If we—

Mr. Woolliams: Therein lies the difference.

Mr. Stewart: Mr. Speaker, would the hon. gentleman agree to the establishment of an inquiry on terms comparable with the terms used in establishing the Dorion inquiry?

Mr. Woolliams: I have made my position very clear. It is that if the minister knows the Privy Councillors or the members of parliament or whoever he is charging in this house, if he has the names, let him stand in his place today and name those names.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Stewart: Will you read into the record the terms establishing the Dorion inquiry, terms which you are not now willing to accept.

Mr. Woolliams: I am not going to get into an argument. Let the Minister of Justice name those people. Let him deal with this in the way he was asked to in the Spencer case. I think the Minister of Justice would have to agree, because he admitted when I dealt with the Spencer case that I made a moving speech, that something has to be done. When the Minister of Justice mentioned Privy Councillors, does he mean every Privy Councillor in this row here?

An hon. Member: And outside the house?

Mr. Woolliams: And outside the house, and those that may be on the other side of the house?

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Woolliams: Whom does he mean? Who stands charged before this kind of bar of justice? That is why I say he does not want an inquiry. He wants an inquisition. That inquisition would be the kind of inquisition

that would try to smear the whole Conservative party. This is really what is behind all this. I listened to the Prime Minister this morning and I was ashamed. I have always had respect for every Prime Minister of this country, whether Liberal or Conservative, because he has always been from one party or the other.

The Prime Minister today rose in his place and he was annoyed that the opposition dared to stand up. He pointed out that one executive assistant from the Department of Justice now stands charged before the bar of justice in a court room. Because the Conservatives have dared to stand up he now says, "I am going to punish all Privy Councillors accordingly."

That is the Prime Minister's case. That is why the *Globe and Mail* and all national newspapers are critical of the Minister of Justice and of the Prime Minister. In fact, the *Globe and Mail* has gone so far as to demand the Prime Minister's resignation because not only has he lost control of the House of Commons but he has lost the confidence of the people. Therein lies the crux of the whole thing.

What remedies are before the house? The Minister of Justice should do this. What would be wrong in the Minister of Justice naming these people in committee of the whole of the House of Commons? This, Mr. Speaker, is a matter of privilege for members of the House of Commons and for Privy Councillors not connected with the House of Commons or who have not sat in the house. Therein lies the difference. Therein is how we can differentiate this case from the Dorion inquiry.

The Minister of Agriculture must appreciate that difference. I ask him this, and it is a question I wanted to put to him when he was on his feet. I wanted to hear what he had to say because I have always felt he would be fair. Does the Minister of Agriculture believe that every Privy Councillor on this side of the house should appear before that inquiry? Does he believe that, without knowing the people involved, they should come before it as if it were an inquisition and prove their innocence? Is this the kind of justice the Prime Minister and the Minister of Justice now recommend? Is this the kind of justice they are recommending, that a judicial inquiry be set up where people are not named and where everybody has to prove his innocence? If that is the new system of justice I say to the Minister of Justice that, although he has tried to resign on at least one occasion, he will not have to resign. He will be fired.

Mr. Nielsen: That is his case.

Mr. Woolliams: Because that is what he is asking Canada and the members of parliament to do. He is asking the Privy Councillors to prove their innocence. He is saying: We will not name you. Bring in the whole community. Charge everybody. Everybody will go through the smear and then we will find out what the facts are. He does not want to find out the facts. He wants an inquisition to be imposed on the Conservative Party as a punishment because we dare to raise our voices in the House of Common and particularly because the hon. member for Yukon dared to raise such serious matters as were dealt with by the Dorion Commission.

That is the punishment and the price the Conservative party must pay for daring to bring before this house a situation so serious as was disclosed in the Dorion report. That is what the Minister of Justice wants. He wants recriminations. He want reproaches.

Is this the kind of thing I mentioned to him with regard to the Spencer case? Is this the kind of tradition I mentioned with reference to his own family? I have read in the newspapers that he wanted to quit and go back to the practice of law in his community. It would be hard for him to practice the kind of law which obliges persons to prove their innocence or countenances the setting up of an inquisition.

An hon. Member: Robespierre.

Mr. Woolliams: The Minister of Justice is guilty of malicious slander, inside and outside the house, never before equalled by any other Minister of Justice or any other member of the House of Commons.

Mr. Nielsen: That is their charge.

Mr. Woolliams: In a situation such as this let him stand up in the House of Commons and let him name these people. If the lady in question is alive that may put a different aspect on the situation.

Mr. Nielsen: That has been looked into

Mr. Woolliams: Let the Minister of Justice say who should appear before that commission, who should appear before that judicial inquiry. If not, then the Minister of Justice should consent to be cross-examined by the house in committee of the whole to enable members to find out the facts with

reference to this matter. This to me is the crux of the whole situation.

Several ministers of the government and several hon. members have raised this question. Not as a member of parliament but as a Canadian I want to say that we should not spend two or three days debating such a question unless it is—

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh.

Mr. Woolliams: Let me just ask this question. Whose primary responsibility is this? Is this the Prime Minister's responsibility? Is it the government's and particularly, sir, the Minister of Justice? Is he responsible?

Mr. Nielsen: He will not get up.

Mr. Woolliams: In regard to the press conference he was cowardly because he would not say inside the house what he has said to the press.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Woolliams: Now he says, and I charge him with this, "I have not read the file". If he has not read the file how can he tell us what is in it? Has he got someone else to read the file to him? The Minister of Justice should, and I say this not only as a member of parliament but as a Canadian, stand and clear the air. He should make these charges so that we can get back to the business of the House of Commons. I say, and I do not care if it costs me my seat or if I lose the next election, that if we are going to have this sort of inquisition we must consider some of the most important aspects of the law. We have to consider the freedom and liberty of the individual. We have to consider the freedom and liberty of the Privy Councillors. Since when did a different law apply to Privy Councillors in this country than applies to the average citizen?

• (1:50 p.m.)

Mr. McIlraith: You should ask the hon. member for Yukon.

Mr. Woolliams: The hon. gentleman talks about the hon. member for Yukon. I am proud of the hon. member for Yukon who has dared to stand up in his place in this House of Commons. I know why the Liberal house leader says that. It is because in his own heart he does not condone today what is going on in his own government.

Mr. McIlraith: If the hon. member is interested in having this matter cleared up, that could be done in the proper way very quickly and very easily since it is a security matter, by having a judicial commission of inquiry appointed. The hon. member knows he is making this scene because he is afraid to have this matter investigated.

Mr. Woolliams: Mr. Speaker, I would be very surprised if the house leader ever charged me or any member of the House of Commons with being afraid. I may be guilty of many faults but I do not think I have ever been afraid. I say to him that we would be prepared to have an inquiry of any kind, and I would be the first to agree to it, if the Minister of Justice would name names, set out the circumstances and disclose what is in the file. Therein lies the difference.

Mr. Greene: Would the hon. member permit a question?

Mr. Woolliams: Certainly.

Mr. Greene: The hon. member had some doubts, as I understood it, as to the difference in procedure between this case and Dorion. I think he invoked some argument that it might not be proper for Privy Councillor after Privy Councillor to be called as witnesses. I would ask the hon. member, what is the difference between this and the Dorion inquiry, where no member of parliament was named—

Mr. Nielsen: Yes, they were.

Mr. Greene: Please let me finish. I have granted that courtesy to hon. members opposite and I would ask them to do the same for me.

Mr. Woolliams: I will answer that question now.

Mr. Greene: May I finish?

Mr. Woolliams: No. Surely I can answer the question.

Mr. Greene: I have not completed my question.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order, please. The hon. member for Bow River agreed to a question from the Minister of Agriculture. We might hear the end of the question and then he can reply.

Mr. Woolliams: Let him put a question but not make a speech. I know he is getting used to that stuff which he uses in his department.

Mr. Greene: I trust I will have many years to get used to the department. What I wish to ask is this. Within the terms of reference of the Dorion inquiry no cabinet minister or member of parliament was named. I believe I am correct in that.

Mr. Nielsen: We are talking of leading up to the inquiry.

Mr. Greene: I am speaking of the terms of reference. No one was named. Yet members of parliament and Privy Councillors were called before that commission, as could have been any member of parliament or Privy Councillor. I see no difference between the two.

Mr. Woolliams: The Minister of Agriculture has confused two things. One is the terms of reference in the order in council and the other is the charges made by the hon. member for Yukon and perhaps others which led up to the order in council. The hon. member for Yukon named names. He gave the dates, he gave the places and the persons involved. Some may have been in the House of Commons; others were outside the House of Commons. The Minister of Justice has yet to name anyone except that he has implicated a whole slate of Privy Councillors in the Conservative party. I am sure the Minister of Agriculture understands the logic of the situation. He is quite right. Any member of parliament could have been called before the Dorion commission. Any witness might have been called. He himself might have been called as a witness. But they were not called as unnamed accused.

Mr. McIlraith: Yes, they were.

Mr. Woolliams: Will the Minister of Agriculture tell me of any precedent either in law or in parliament which allows charges to be made against people who are unnamed? What it is is an inquisition. That is what he wants. This is the punishment that the Minister of Justice and his party seek to impose because we have looked at the dirt and the skeletons in the closets of the Liberal party. This is the punishment. We have the threat of the Prime Minister and the threats made by other ministers.

To you as house leader, sir, I say this. Many of us entered this house in 1957 or 1958 but you are a senior member and have been here a long time. Although we differ in our politics we have learned to respect you. Personally I think you have made a lot better house leader than the former house leader. We have often admired your fairness. But today, sir, you asked me a question, the import of which you yourself do not accept in your own mind, namely, that Privy Councillors may be charged but not named. In view of the kind of lawyer you are and your prestige in the city I cannot believe that you agree with that kind of justice. I am sorry to hit you that hard because I have always thought of you as a gentleman.

Mr. McIlraith: Do you know any more jokes?

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order, please. I think the kind of remarks the hon. member for Bow River is making now are an indication that it might be a far better practice to direct his remarks to the Chair.

Mr. Woolliams: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I appreciate it does not relieve me of my responsibility to the Chair if I am forced to answer hon. members across the way. Therefore I am remiss if I do not address you on all occasions. Let me summarize, Mr. Speaker. In this situation the house should go into committee of the whole and ask the Minister of Justice who are involved, what files he has seen, what facts he has, what evidence he has, and what is behind all these smear tactics. When we have this information then the situation will be different. There will then be a fair inquiry, not an inquisition.

Mr. Lambert: Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Agriculture—it is unfortunate he has slipped from the chamber—reminded me of someone who would take a pail of water and throw into it a handful of fine sand. All he did was to blur the picture. He was making use of red herrings and going off into the Rivard matter which has no connection with this particular case.

The minister and others should distinguish two matters in their minds. First of all, there is the one to which no exception is taken by the opposition and that is the inquiry which was put forward and referred to on March 4. Although I joined the Privy Council much later than others, I am still a Privy Councillor and by inference implicated—

Mr. Nielsen: By the minister.

Mr. Lambert: —at a press conference outside the house. It has been instructive that the minister has not had the moral courage and intestinal fortitude to stand up in the house and say what he said outside. I find it singularly touching to have all these complaints coming from the government side about smears and what have you when the hon. member has the privilege of standing up and denying all the accusations which he made outside this house.

Let us not talk about furniture scandals. That matter was dug up by an enterprising newspaper man. He first brought up the story and the two ministers in question could not rush quickly enough to make exculpatory or incriminating statements, depending on which way you look at it, to the press. But the press put out the story. Nothing was said about it by the opposition.

• (2:00 p.m.)

The former Minister without Portfolio was chased out by his own administration. Mr. Dupuis was put out by his own side. The former member for Dollard was not mentioned by the hon. member for Yukon until that hon. member, then parliamentary secretary to the Prime Minister, identified himself in the house. Let us not have this nonsense about things being said outside the house. When we have had anything to say we have said it inside the house face to face. I should like to see the Minister of Justice stand up and accuse any one of these Privy Councillors, colleagues of mine in this house, if he has the guts to do it. That is what I want.

This business of being led on at a press conference does not excuse the minister. If he has made a statement he must stand by it. This is not a picayune thing. This is a wholly serious matter involving by inference morality and security. There was the allegation that it could be even more serious in some respects than the Profumo case. Well, I know some people like great headlines and anything which involves a radius of six inches from the navel is always more attractive to them. I agree entirely with the assertions of the hon. member for Greenwood on the matter of principle.

In order to make this perfectly clear, and taking account of those who would assert that there are no charges against the minister, I move, seconded by the hon. member for Ontario (Mr. Starr):

That the general and unspecified charges of involvement in the so-called Munsinger case against an unspecified number of members of this house, all Privy Councillors, made by the Minister of Justice, at a press conference on the morning of Thursday, March 10, constitute an unwarranted and unsubstantiated attack on the character, integrity and privileges of the said members, and this house directs that the Minister of Justice must forthwith from his seat specify and substantiate his charges and in default thereof he will withdraw such charges and allegations, apologize to the said members and to this house, and resign from this house.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Lambert: Mr. Speaker, I know you are seeing this motion for the first time. Bearing in mind what Your Honour has said about other motions I would submit to you that this motion does in a number of respects—I trust in all respects—meet the requirements in that it prefers a charge against the minister and directs certain action. It is specific. It refers to one particular incident and not to a whole course of conduct. It is a substantive motion in so far as the terms of privilege are concerned. It is entirely within the terms of privilege and therefore it is not subject to standing order 41 in requiring notice to be given. I submit that on all counts this motion meets the requirements.

Mr. Speaker: May I say that the hon. gentleman would perhaps agree with the Chair that if in 100 years of parliamentary history motions of this type have never been accepted before there is a prima facie case against the motion now proposed.

I cannot agree that this motion should be accepted, certainly not for the reasons the hon. member has mentioned. He himself says it is a substantive motion. I am in full agreement with that. It is a substantive motion and because of this, in the same way as the other motions made yesterday, I submit it might have been moved in other circumstances as a private member's motion. The motion requires notice and for this reason it cannot be accepted by the Chair.

Mr. McIlraith: We do not have copies of the motion. Is there a copy available?

Mr. Lambert: I am sorry. It is a manuscript. It was sent to the Speaker only. I myself have no other copy. I apologize to the house but this has been the practice on many occasions.

Mr. Speaker: As hon. members have noted, the Chair was seized of this motion at the last moment. I was not in the chair myself when it was moved originally and I took it for granted it had been read into the record. In any case, perhaps hon. members would allow me to read the motion at this time.

That the general and unspecified charges of involvement in the so-called Munsinger case against an unspecified number of members of this house, all Privy Councillors, made by the Minister of Justice, at a press conference on the morning of Thursday, March 10, constitute an unwarranted and unsubstantiated attack on the character, integrity and privileges of the said members, and this house directs that the Minister of Justice must forthwith from his seat specify and substantiate his charges and in default thereof he will withdraw such charges and allegations, apologize to the said members and to this house, and resign from this house.

Administration of Justice

Hon. R. A. Bell (Carleton): Mr. Speaker, when you ruled earlier today on various motions which had been presented Your Honour did not deal with the motion which I outlined and which I indicated my willingness to present, the general text of which appears at page 2520 of *Hansard* of last evening. I think it is common ground on all sides of the house that a motion might be presented to refer this whole matter to the Standing Committee on Privileges and Elections and that this would be in order. It is, equally, common ground that this would probably not be a satisfactory course. The Minister of National Health and Welfare (Mr. MacEachen) has described it as futile. I think it was the Prime Minister who suggested it might lead to a donnybrook. In any event, I think it is common ground on all sides of the house that a reference to the Standing Committee on Privileges and Elections would not be satisfactory.

• (2:10 p.m.)

But, sir, my submission to you is that if a reference to a standing committee of the house would be in order then inevitably so must a reference to the committee of the whole be in order, and it is such a motion that I want to place before the house now. The motion I propose to move—I regret it is only in my own handwriting—seconded by the hon. member for Edmonton-Strathcona (Mr. Nugent) is:

> That the house do now resolve itself into committee of the whole in order that hon. members may have an opportunity to examine the Minister of Justice so that he may advise the committee what evidence he has to substantiate the charges made inside and outside this chamber which have reflected upon members of Her Majesty's Privy Council.

Sir, before you put it to the house may I just add these additional comments. My submission to you is that if this matter of privilege can be referred to a standing committee then obviously it can be referred to the committee of the whole of this high court of parliament itself. I suggest to you, sir, that this is the technique whereby we can reach finality in this matter this day.

I personally am sick at heart at this spectacle in parliament which I believe is the most wonderful democratic institution in the world. I say it is time we returned to dignity, honour and the conduct of gentlemen. The Minister of Justice of this country has become the minister of injustice. He has degraded parliament and the Prime Minister has become an accomplice after the fact. My

[Mr. Speaker.]

motion will bring this whole sordid business to an end and bring it to an end this day, and the man who sits over there will stand up, speak up, or shut up.

Mr. McIlraith: On the matter of receiving this motion, Mr. Speaker, and on that only, may I point out that a motion has been presented by the hon. member for Edmonton West (Mr. Lambert), which has not been disposed of.

Mr. Bell (Carleton): It has.

Mr. McIlraith: I am sorry; I was mistaken. I intended raising a narrow point and I reserve the right to raise a question as to the propriety of this motion after it is put.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Caouette: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker. I think you have given your ruling on the motion presented by the hon. member for Edmonton West (Mr. Lambert), even before reading it.

The house leader was probably not here then, but the motion was certainly dealt with exactly like the previous motions.

Mr. Speaker: That is correct. The motion had been judged out of order. We now have before us the motion put forward by the hon. member for Carleton (Mr. Bell).

[*English*]

The house has before it a motion moved by the hon. member for Carleton which I will read as I understand hon. members, and in particular the Minister of Public Works, want to comment on it. It is moved by the hon. member for Carleton, seconded by the hon. member for Edmonton-Strathcona:

> That the house do now resolve itself into committee of the whole in order that hon. members may have an opportunity to examine the Minister of Justice so that he may advise the committee what evidence he has to substantiate the charges made inside and outside this chamber which have reflected upon members of Her Majesty's Privy Council.

Mr. McIlraith: Mr. Speaker, it must be obvious that this motion is a reference to the inquisition hon. members were speaking about a few minutes ago. It seems to me that what is being attempted here by hon. members, who were so anxious to protect the rights of hon. members, is to have the authority of a motion to conduct an inquisition on their part. If they propose any action against the Minister of Justice surely they must take the responsibility in the traditional way and make charges against him. When they make charges, then those charges can be investigated.

Mr. Muir (Lisgar): What about the minister's charges?

Mr. Bell (Carleton): Doesn't that apply to the minister?

Mr. McIlraith: Yes, that is my whole point. It does apply to the minister. The minister is alleged to have said certain things in a press conference yesterday—

An hon. Member: Does he deny them?

Mr. McIlraith: —the text of which I do not have before me. Because they involved matters that raised grave concern in the house, and I think quite properly—I am on record as having said they are of grave concern to the house, the Prime Minister is on record as having described them in that way and the hon. member for Calgary North (Mr. Harkness) is on record as having described them in that way—it seems obvious it is desirable that the matter be disposed of in an effective and quick way. And in view of that, it is well to consider this motion in perspective. The first suggestion was from the Prime Minister, that because of the gravity of the subject matter—

Mr. Nugent: I thought the minister was rising to speak on whether or not the motion was in order. Would he address himself to that point?

Mr. Speaker: I suggest to the minister that at this point he should limit his remarks to the legality of the motion moved by the hon. member.

Mr. Starr: It is pretty hard.

Mr. McIlraith: No, it is not hard.

Mr. Starr: Then try again.

Mr. McIlraith: The difficulty here is that hon. members opposite, and they may well be within their rights, have not seen fit to make charges arising out of the conduct of the Minister of Justice.

Mr. Starr: He has made the charges, not us.

Mr. McIlraith: And that being the case, they have no right to conduct these proceedings by way of privilege.

Mr. MacInnis (Cape Breton South): Would the minister permit a question?

Mr. Bell (Carleton): Would the minister permit a question?

Mr. McIlraith: Yes, in just a moment. That is my point; unless they are prepared to make a charge they have no right to avail themselves of the procedure they are seeking to use at this moment.

Mr. Starr: The minister has made the charges.

Mr. McIlraith: If they wish to make charges against the conduct of the minister outside the house, then they should make them.

Mr. Bell (Carleton): Would the Minister of Public Works permit another question? Does the minister agree with his colleague that at this stage of our proceedings this whole matter might be referred to the Standing Committee on Privileges and Elections? If it might, then wherein is there any difference of principle in it being referred this afternoon to the committee of the whole so that we can settle it and be done with the whole thing today?

Mr. McIlraith: I understand the hon. member's motion perfectly well. Referring the subject matter to the Committee on Privileges and Elections, while that may be technically possible, would be a futile exercise.

Mr. Bell (Carleton): I agree.

Mr. McIlraith: Because it involves a security matter.

Mr. Bell (Carleton): I agree.

Mr. McIlraith: And exactly the same arises where you deal with the matter in committee of the whole. It does not matter which committee. That is the point I wish to make in answer to the hon. member for Carleton. It is precisely the difficulty confronting the house in this case. It is the difficulty that has been running all through the discussion. That being so, the correct method in my view is a judicial inquiry into the whole matter where we can get to the facts as quickly as possible but regrettably not as quickly as hon. members opposite and I should think all members in the house would wish.

That is the only way that this matter can be cleared up. The motion now before the house is defective for the same reason as the other motion, and for the additional reason that it seeks to achieve, without any charge being laid, what cannot be achieved without the laying of a charge—as the judgment in the Pallett case shows.

• (2:20 p.m.)

Mr. Nugent: Would the minister permit a question?

Mr. MacInnis (Cape Breton South): Mr. Speaker, would the Minister of Public Works acquaint himself with the background of the

question? He referred to alleged statements outside the house. Would he confirm with the Minister of Justice whether or not the minister is prepared to deny them? The minister referred to it as a security matter. Would he acquaint himself with the fact that security was not necessarily involved but a security risk? He had better get acquainted with the background.

Mr. Nugent: Mr. Speaker, I was a little confused by what the Minister of Public Works had to say about the necessity of charges being made so that the matter could be dealt with properly. Surely the minister should now realize there have been charges laid and that in fact this house has given formal recognition to that situation by agreeing that there is a question of privilege which has arisen out of the charges made by the minister.

If we follow the logic of the Minister of Public Works, any time a member makes charges another member must charge him with something before this house can deal with the matters. Surely the initial point has been made that the minister has levelled accusations against members of the house and the house has recognized that a question of privilege arises because of those statements by the minister. The problem the house now faces is what do we do with the question of privilege which has arisen? How do we deal with it?

In the interest of the members affected by the charges levelled by the minister it is essential that the matter be cleared up immediately. The Minister of Public Works has admitted that the procedure of an inquiry in fact adds to the difficulties in respect of, shall I say, the burden on the Privy Councillors who are maligned, because this shadow would remain over their heads.

The procedure suggested by the hon. member for Carleton, therefore, is the only one which this house can immediately recognize. It recognizes the right of the Minister of Justice who has made these accusations to stand up and say what he meant by them, to give the information and delineate the accusations he is making against those persons whom he feels should be accused. It also gives all the accused, all the Privy Councillors, the right and the means of determining whether they are in fact suspected by the minister.

I submit that to refuse this suggestion would be for the house to say that it is right and just that the Privy Councillors shall have this suspicion hanging over them. I submit that that in itself is a breach of the privileges of those members brought about by the whole house. I submit it is not within our rights as members of this house to ask other members to bear such accusations if the house is capable of clearing the air on this matter.

The method suggested is the only one suggested so far, Mr. Speaker, which takes care of all the complaints. Many members in the house from all parties have spoken on this matter and not every member has suggested that a motion to refer it to the Committee on Privileges and Elections would be in order. It is recognized that the committee of the whole house has all the powers, rights and privileges of any of its lesser committees. The right to refer the matter to the committee of the whole house must be even stronger than the right to refer it to the Committee on Privileges and Elections.

I would ask Your Honour to remember the words of the Minister of National Health and Welfare this afternoon. I presume he was speaking for the government side of the house and therefore obviously the government has taken the position that the Committee on Privileges and Elections could be seized of this matter.

Mr. Speaker: There are a number of very interesting points which have been raised by hon. members who have taken part in this debate. I cannot agree with all of them. The hon. member for Edmonton-Strathcona, who has just resumed his seat, based part of his argument on the allegation that there is a question of privilege that has been recognized by the house. I do not agree with him on this point. What the Chair has said is that there is a prima facie case of privilege. Whether there is an actual case of a breach of privilege is not for the Chair to determine and is not determinable until the matter has been studied in a satisfactory way.

The usual way to do this is before the Committee on Privileges and Elections, as I said a moment ago when a previous motion was moved by the hon. member for Edmonton West. That has been the procedure followed for 100 years in our Canadian parliament and no argument has been submitted to me that this procedure should be departed from at this time. The hon. member says that the house has all the powers in the committee of the whole that the Committee on Privileges and Elections has, and that is a fact. For that matter the house itself has all the

powers of the committee of the whole, and what would be gained by moving from the house itself to the committee of the whole? I suggest nothing at all can be gained in this way. The motion as presented suggests that the committee of the whole consider this matter and that the way to do it is the way in which the hon. member for Carleton would want to do it. I should like to refer to citation 230 (1) of Beauchesne which says:

> The ordinary function of a Committee of the Whole House is deliberation, not enquiry.

For this reason I suggest the committee of the whole house should not be asked to conduct an inquiry or take over the responsibility which normally is assigned to a standing committee of the House of Commons. With respect, I also suggest to the hon. member that the motion to the effect that the house resolve itself into committee of the whole is a substantive motion which requires notice.

Lastly, I point out to hon. members that the issue here is the alleged misconduct of the Minister of Justice and that because of this a specific and detailed charge must be made against the minister himself. It is sometimes a little difficult to reconcile the two aspects of the case. There is the aspect that the minister is alleged to have made accusations relating to Privy Councillors and this is the very thing for which the minister is being reproached. But actually the question of privilege is based on the alleged impropriety of the words used by the Minister of Justice and in that regard a specific charge has to be laid, according to the terms of the judgment of Mr. Speaker Michener which I read into the record this morning.

Perhaps I have used too many reasons, but if I am wrong on one or two I may be right on the other two or three. So for all these reasons and the legal argument I must deny the motion of the hon. member for Carleton.

• (2:30 p.m.)

Mr. Churchill: Mr. Speaker, may I ask a question for information? It is not intended to be embarrassing. Did you draw to the attention of the house that the practice over 100 years has been the reference of matters of privilege to a select committee? In the course of your investigations have you found instances of privilege similar to the one we have been discussing during the past few days? It seems to me that this is somewhat different from other instances of privilege that have come to my attention as I have endeavoured to study the past history of this institution.

Mr. Speaker: I suggest to the hon. member that questions of that type cannot be asked of the Chair and I do not think I should be called upon to reply.

Mr. Heath Macquarrie (Queens): Mr. Speaker, not being of a disputatious disposition or belligerent nature I will try to do my best to lower the temperature but do nothing to lessen the anxiety which I am sure we all feel about this very important matter. If I may say so, sir, in passing, I have great admiration for the good nature and good judgment you have displayed in these difficult times.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Macquarrie: It seems to me that we have some potential contradictions of interrelationships which obviously we are having difficulty resolving. In the first place, it seems that while we cannot desist from talking we cannot procedurally progress in any particular direction. This a very serious situation and we must as a parliament come to a decision as to how to deal with this very important matter. We cannot go on arguing forever, because damage is being done while we are arguing and while we are waiting.

I believe one fundamental has been nailed down today, and we must never lose sight of it, that questions of member privilege and members' privileges, individual and collective, are matters for this chamber. We do not even have to go to our rule book for that; we can go to the British North America Act upon which this very institution is based and founded. The immunities and privileges are ours to decide and in the final analysis a member of this house has a responsibility, as the old British expression suggests, only to his peers, and that does not mean only to the House of Lords in that connection.

If we are having difficulty in finding proper motions perhaps I may invite the minister to introduce, through his own comment to us, a solution to this problem. I agree with what you say about whether we should reach this decision as a house, as the committee of the whole or as another committee, but I would invite the minister to assist the whole house in this great problem.

One of the problems, as I see it, and I am only speaking for myself, is that we recognize that privilege is ours but for reasons of

security and other reasons it may well be that this house should properly translate the question to another body. The body that has been mentioned is a commission of judicial inquiry. Before the house can do that it seems to me it must assure itself that none of those things which are precious to it for the preservation of its own privileges are in any way diminished. One of these comes to mind immediately, and it has been mentioned. We are reluctant to translate the area of scrutiny from ourselves to another judicial body until the privilege of some of our members is protected. I think this is the reason for the continual demand that names be named. What I believe we mean, in the proper sense, is that people be unnamed so that our members are protected before the arena of consideration has shifted from here to some other body.

The other aspect that impresses me is that we are also now faced with the suggestion that an act of the executive of the government, by order in council, empower a body to look into aspects of conduct and utterances which, as I have mentioned before, have reflection upon the house and some or all of its members. I should think that this chamber, before embarking upon such a step involving the relationship between the executive and legislative branches, which is the essence of our parliamentary system of government, would wish to know a great deal more about what are likely to be the terms of reference.

I would invite the person most able to help us in this regard, the Minister of Justice (Mr. Cardin) himself, to assist us in this very important matter. Certainly we have to move in some direction and I should like him to assure us that the members sitting in this house are not themselves involved in any of the allegations he is reported to have made in any part of this country. I should like him to let us know the manner in which he is or is not making use of security files in such a course as he has embarked upon, which has brought all this to a head.

The issue relates, of course, to conduct or, most certainly, to the utterances of one of the ministers of the Crown, a member of a government which exists by virtue of the continuing confidence of this chamber, and their relationship to us is of the essence, even if some of the members of our body are not involved. I think it is extremely serious that, as governments change and long after they have changed, security files involving people no longer in office are being ransacked and discussed publicly.

I am not one of those who are fully prepared to condemn the Minister of Justice outright, although he has made great mistakes. If I may say so, I think he has suffered a great deal. Perhaps if his Prime Minister had backed him last Friday and backed him down this Friday we would not be in the situation we are now in.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Caouette: Mr. Speaker, just a word or two or rather some questions I should like to ask the Prime Minister.

The Conservatives are now suggesting that the house should go into committee of the whole to study the matter and then refer the whole thing to the committee on privileges and elections, if need be.

Right now, if you happen to be walking anywhere in the corridors of the parliament buildings and to meet newspapermen or radio and television commentators, we are told that, according to confirmed reports, Miss Munsinger is very much alive and living in Munich.

Is the government exercising any control over the news which is reaching us today in parliament? Is Miss Munsinger alive? If newspapermen can state that telephone calls are being exchanged between Canada and Munich and that Miss Munsinger has allegedly revealed names at this time, is the government or the Prime Minister or the Minister of Justice (Mr. Cardin) controlling such news now? And if it is true that Miss Munsinger is alive and ready to come here and say what she knows about the Munsinger case, I cannot see why the Conservatives are insisting so much today on the whole thing being referred to the committee of the whole or the committee on privileges and elections.

The government should take it upon itself to have her come to Canada and to set up, as proposed this morning by the Prime Minister, a judicial inquiry where everything would come to light, so that the members of the government, Conservatives, Liberals or Créditistes, and all the population might know what this is all about.

I would like the Prime Minister to answer this question. Is it true that Miss Munsinger is alive and living in Munich? Has the government been informed of the telephone calls made today between Canada and Europe to

get information? Is it true also, as I was told a while ago, before coming into the house, that Miss Munsinger would have left Canada after being threatened?

I would like more details. The deeper we go into this case, the darker it gets. I would like the Prime Minister to tell us if he knows anything, if he is convinced or has had the confirmation that Miss Munsinger is still alive and can comply with the requests which the Conservatives have been making so vigorously since yesterday afternoon.

• (2:40 p.m.)

[*English*]

Mr. Fairweather: Mr. Speaker, would the hon. member for Villeneuve (Mr. Caouette) permit a question?

Mr. Caouette: Yes.

Mr. Fairweather: Does he not realize that if the usual course is followed we can expect to have Miss Munsinger on "This Hour Has Seven Days" next Sunday?

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh.

An hon. Member: The Prime Minister might make a telephone call.

Mr. Fairweather: He has already phoned.

Mr. Lambert: The minister could go on "This Hour Has Seven Days" too.

Mr. Pearson: He has been on.

Mr. Lambert: He could go on again.

Mr. Donald MacInnis (Cape Breton South): Mr. Speaker, last evening we heard the hon. member for Victoria-Carleton (Mr. Flemming) make a very moving appeal to the government in order to solve this particular situation and bring the facts to light. In so doing the only course open to the government is for the Minister of Justice to name names. In his appeal last night the hon. member for Victoria-Carleton placed his finger on one very important matter, that of the Minister of Justice speaking on behalf of the government.

Today very few of the Privy Councillors on the government benches have stood up in defence of the Minister of Justice. We had a very unacceptable defence from the Prime Minister (Mr. Pearson) similar to the defence he put up last week which eventually turned out to be unacceptable even to himself. The same will probably apply in this case and the chair will again be pulled from under the Minister of Justice. A defence was put up by the Minister of National Health and Welfare (Mr. MacEachen). I was very sorry he saw fit to take part in the debate today. I thought he could better serve his country in Nova Scotia where he had promised to be.

We also heard the defence put up by the Minister of Public Works (Mr. McIlraith). I would call your attention, sir, to the fact that he referred to the statements made in the press conference by the Minister of Justice, although he has not even taken it upon himself to acquire complete information from the Minister of Justice and find out whether the minister now wishes to deny the statements carried by the press. He also referred to it as a security matter. Here again he differs with the Minister of Justice who referred to it not as a security matter but possibly a security risk.

These defences which have been put up by the government have continued to weaken their case. We also heard a defence from the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Greene). I might say that his remarks would allow me, if the precedent he set were followed, to go into the Banks and Doyle affairs and suggest that we could probably have an exchange of fugitives with the United States in which we would give them Doyle in exchange for Banks. I say this because the Minister of Agriculture in his wanderings dealt with many, many questions.

The Prime Minister in his defence referred to the character assassination of Privy Councillors and to the furniture deal. I placed the original question in respect of that matter on the order paper at the advice of the house authorities because I was told it was the type of question that could not be asked on the orders of the day. Following their advice the question was put on the order paper. The answer came in a very unusual way. We had the confessions of two ministers and later their resignations. The Prime Minister and members on that side of the house like to point the finger and talk about insinuations. There were no insinuations. There was a simple question on the order paper, and if these members were involved in any way it was because of their confessions and resignations. This backs up the fact that character assassination is not necessarily carried out on this side of the house but is carried out by hon. members opposite.

[*Translation*]

Hon. René Tremblay (Matapédia-Matane): Mr. Speaker, I rise on a question of privilege.

The hon. member for Cape Breton South (Mr. MacInnis) has no right to say in the house that admissions were made by the ministers who, at the time, answered the charges laid by a member of the Conservative party.

On the contrary, it will be seen, by referring to *Hansard* of that day, that I categorically denied there was anything improper in the transactions. In any case, when I handed my resignation to the Prime Minister, I pointed out that I was taking the same stand I had taken at the time, to the effect that there was nothing improper in those transactions and that they had nothing to do with my resignation and I would ask the hon. member to withdraw his words, because there never was any admission and I am still convinced that the transaction was normal.

[*English*]

Mr. MacInnis (Cape Breton South): I am not going to dispute the words of the former—

Some hon. Members: Withdraw.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

Mr. MacInnis (Cape Breton South): I have no intention of disputing the words of the former minister. I referred to the fact that all this took place after a question appeared on the order paper. The former minister has given his reasons and I accept them. But it does not stand up to the statement made by the Prime Minister this morning when he brought up the question of the furniture deal and referred to us on this side of the house as character assassins. It was not I or any member on this side of the house who ran to the press after that question appeared on the order paper and confessed to the fact that we were involved with bankrupt furniture companies. The minister did not resign for that reason, and I withdraw my statement.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. I should like to suggest to all hon. members who take part in this debate that they should try to limit their comments to the question of privilege which has been submitted to the Chair and is being considered at the moment.

Mr. MacInnis (Cape Breton South): Having arrived in this house in the same way as all hon. members on that side of the chamber, through the procedure of a vote in my riding, I feel I am privileged to make statements in respect of furniture, in respect of Hal Banks, in respect of Doyle, in respect of Rivard,

Dorion and everybody else in the same way as the minister was given that privilege earlier today.

The former minister claims he did not resign because of the furniture deals. Why, then, did the Prime Minister bring that question up this morning? Why did he bring out this morning the suggestion that there were character assassins on this side of the house because of the furniture deals? Those were the Prime Minister's own words.

I referred to the defence put up last week by the Prime Minister in respect of the Minister of Justice, which defence was unacceptable to himself in the long run. The defence that has been put up today is a very weak one. There are many members of the Privy Council on the other side of the house and not all of them, because they recognize this situation for what it is, have stood up to defend the Minister of Justice. There is no justice in defending a minister who has made a blanket charge which refers to so many members of the house. I am not a lawyer and am not in a position to deal with what is justice in this country but the action of the Minister of Justice is, according to my understanding, a complete reversal of the principles of justice. It is my understanding that under our system of British justice you are innocent until proven guilty. But the position in which this government has placed former members of the Privy Council is this: You are all guilty until you come forward and prove yourselves innocent. This is exactly what the government is trying to do today in its feeble and unacceptable defence of a minister who should do what he intended to do last week and resign. I suggest that the next time the Prime Minister gets a letter from the Minister of Justice he should open it and take action on it.

• (2:50 p.m.)

Mr. K. H. More (Regina City): Mr. Speaker, I shall speak without provocation and without too much passion on this matter. I am not going to preface my remarks by saying I have a great regard for the Minister of Justice (Mr. Cardin). I have had no regard for him since a speech he made in this house back in 1962.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. More: I have lately re-read that speech twice. I will not bandy around such niceties at this time. It seems to me, sir, that we have had a great many lawyers participating in the motions and speeches before the house. I am

just an ordinary layman and backbencher. I once remember being told that arguments between lawyers were a layman's delight. I think this might be right. They are entertaining for a while. Whether that holds at all times I am not sure, and I am saying this in a kindly way to my friends who belong to that profession.

I should like to see some light cast on what is going on. Some of us want to know exactly what we are dealing with and what is going on. First of all, Mr. Speaker, it seems to me that we are confused by questions of privilege before the house and this has of course confused the whole debate. We have the matter of the Munsinger case and the direct charge the minister levelled that the former prime minister mishandled this case and participated in it. Those are two direct charges the minister made. Therefore I do not think there is any great problem in the house in resolving how to proceed on these charges.

We also have the allegations that the Minister of Justice is alleged to have made in a press conference. These have to do with an entirely different matter and no investigation of the Munsinger case can clear this matter up. The situation to which I refer is the alleged statements of the minister making a blanket allegation against the conduct of every Privy Councillor who served in the government of that day. This, I think, is conduct unbecoming to our Minister of Justice.

We have asked him and we are pressing that he use the opportunity given in the house to state his charges in a definitive manner so that those who are not involved in any way whatsoever will have the cloud that they carry removed from them. Surely a man of honour, if such he be, would want to do this at the first opportunity. Why he hides behind the eloquent words of his colleagues and the confusing statements of the Prime Minister and others in this matter is something I do not understand.

What is he charging these Privy Councillors with? First of all, he said, "Well, the lady is dead". We have reason to believe today, because of evidence that has been uncovered, that this statement is false. We shall have to see definitely whether it is or is not. However, if this statement is false the Minister of Justice, having made it public at a press conference, is derelict, neglectful and unfit for the job he holds.

Surely the Minister of Justice should know better than to make a statement at a press conference or any other place if he has not the facts to base it on. It would appear now that the statement that the lady was dead is false. That is one thing. As I read events, the Minister of Justice is unfit to continue in the position he holds.

What is his charge against the Privy Councillors? Is he charging that they were responsible for a security leak? Is the charge one to the effect that they were guilty of improper moral conduct? The minister has already said that this case is worse than the Profumo case. I point out that Profumo did not have to leave the British parliament because of his improper moral conduct outside the house. He had to leave parliament because he lied to parliament. Does the minister think that any former Privy Councillor lied to parliament? If he does, he has the responsibility to get up in the house now and say so.

I do not know much about procedure but I am going to say that the house cannot itself resolve this second matter. The first one I am forgetting about and it should not be confused with the second matter. In the first one the name of a man, the former Prime Minister, has been mentioned. The second matter involves every former Privy Councillor. A blanket allegation of that kind coming from the Minister of Justice is something that he and only he can satisfy this house on by getting up and stating who the former Privy Councillors were and on what he based that allegation.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. J. P. Nowlan (Digby-Annapolis-Kings): Mr. Speaker, I have sat here for two days and I have heard many things. As a new member who has not participated in some of the battles of the past but as a member who perhaps vicariously is affected by some of the subject matter under discussion, I rise now to say a few words. The few words I will say will be said with somewhat of a heavy heart. I say them with a heavy heart because what is going on in this house illustrates the black hand of political assassination which hit parliament and still holds parliament in its grip. That hand is a hand of the past. Others fought elections in the past and all of us here have fought the past election. But this country wants this parliament to move ahead.

I have not met the Minister of Justice personally but I have heard many high tributes about him previously. Why then, after the Prime Minister resolved the difficulty the house was in one week ago, did the Minister of Justice resurrect the coals and stir up innuendos and insinuations which obviously would be provocative? It must have been obvious that his logic when he did that and his good sense and reason went out the window.

• (3:00 p.m.)

If this parliament illustrates anything and if this debate illustrates anything, they illustrate that the political passions of the past are polluting the problems of the present. I refer to political passions because obviously there must be some other passions which are affecting the present.

I have the highest regard for the Prime Minister as a person but I have been disappointed in him in this debate. I have been disappointed that he has come forward and has again tried to justify the untenable position of the Minister of Justice. As for the Minister of National Health and Welfare, I disagree with some of the remarks of my colleague from Cape Breton South (Mr. MacInnis). I think the Minister was trying to exercise some reason and moderation. Nova Scotia is a land of moderation because there they have a lot of difficulties. The people of Nova Scotia move in moderate ways. I expected the minister to exercise some logic and moderation in this debate. However, in listening to his words with interest I was somewhat disappointed when he did not go one step farther in explaining the alternatives that this house could follow in order to get out of this morass of political name calling. He did not go that one step farther, and I would ask him as a newcomer why it would be wrong for the Minister of Justice or the Prime Minister to stand up and name the two or the one who are affected in a vicarious way?

This whole matter is causing concern. Allegations have been made about the conduct of Privy Councillors and it is suggested that some of them come before a royal commission. Well, Mr. Speaker, there are some members of the Privy Council who will never be able to appear before a commission. That is what I am directing the attention of the house and of the Prime Minister to and that is why this matter has to be cleaned up.

In talking in homes, any homes, or in reading the local newspapers it is apparent that this matter should be cleared up. Whether it is this minister or that, it should be cleared up. If there are men, they ought to be named.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Nowlan: That is why I should like to know from the Minister of National Health and Welfare what would be wrong with that type of situation? As I say, what is happening in parliament is causing great concern across the country. There is sickness at the morass we are in. I should like the minister to answer that because there are many who perhaps can justify themselves who have left the government. We have a Lieutenant Governor in the land today who is a Privy Councillor. Also in defence we have another Lieutenant Governor who unfortunately will never be called before a judicial committee. And there are others who will never march before the judicial committee proposed by the Prime Minister.

This party has made it clear that it is in favour of a judicial committee. The debate which took place between the Leader of the Opposition and the Prime Minister clearly shows that we are in favour of a royal commission on security. But this personal passion, and battles of the past, pervert the thinking and logic of today and it cannot continue. I submit that hon. members opposite should use their basic common sense—and there are many hon. members opposite with basic common sense—and listen to the allegations. They should listen to the names of those involved, and then let us have an inquiry so that this matter can be cleaned up once and for all.

Mr. MacInnis (Cape Breton South): Mr. Speaker, may I put a question to my colleague from Digby-Annapolis-Kings. Is he aware that my objection to the presence of the Minister of National Health and Welfare, (Mr. MacEachen) who has made an unquestionably poor attempt today to defend the Minister of Justice, (Mr. Cardin) is because of the promise of the minister, along with the minister of mines, to go to Nova Scotia to look after the welfare of 6,000 miners, a matter which he has sidestepped in order to attempt to defend a minister here.

Mr. Nowlan: I might point out that there are 20 million people whose welfare is now concerned in this debate and whose problems will remain unresolved because of it.

Mr. MacInnis (Cape Breton South): Mr. Speaker, that prompts a further question.

May I ask the hon. member for Digby-Annapolis-Kings whether he thinks the Minister of National Health and Welfare is able to do anything for 20 million people when he cannot do anything for 6,000.

Mr. MacEachen: Mr. Speaker, I just want to speak for a moment on a question of personal privilege. It is a fact that I, in company with the Minister of Mines and Technical Surveys (Mr. Pepin) had intended to be in Halifax and Sydney today to undertake discussions with the provincial government and representatives of the coal industry on the union and management side. In view of the parliamentary situation and my responsibility as a member of the government, I decided to postpone the trip but not to cancel it. I called the Premier of Nova Scotia last night at 11.30, who understood the situation perfectly and agreed with me that we would have a meeting at a later date.

Mr. MacInnis (Cape Breton South): Mr. Speaker, on the question of personal privilege which has been raised by the minister, am I to understand from his remarks that the minister was to meet with the interested parties today, including the provincial government in Nova Scotia, the U.M.W. and the Dominion Coal Company?

Mr. MacEachen: That is so.

Mr. MacInnis (Cape Breton South): In reply to that question of privilege, I raise one myself. I spoke with the interested parties concerned yesterday, including the president of the U.M.W., who informed me by phone that he had not been invited to this particular conference in Halifax today, a matter which was confirmed by the provincial minister of mines for Nova Scotia. So now the minister has lied to the house.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh.

Mr. Speaker: Order; the hon. member for Cape Breton South (Mr. MacInnis) knows that he cannot say that another hon. member has lied to the house; that is elementary. There are many rules which are being disregarded in this house today, and just as many rules were disregarded yesterday, but we must draw the line somewhere. I cannot, and hon. members would not want me to, allow an hon. member to say of another hon. member that he has lied to the house. I would ask the hon. member to withdraw.

Mr. MacInnis (Cape Breton South): Mr. Speaker, I will quite unequivocally and willingly withdraw my remark that the minister lied to the house, but I would substitute the statement that he has certainly misled it.

Mr. Speaker: Order; the hon. member cannot say of another hon. member that he has misled the house. He can say that the remarks made by the hon. member are perhaps incorrect. Well, perhaps I could correct myself. He cannot say that an hon. member has wilfully misled the house.

Mr. Nielsen: The hon. member did not say that.

Mr. Speaker: Very well, I will accept that.

Mr. Nowlan: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. Because of the remarks made by the hon. member for Cape Breton South, who is quite concerned with this problem as are all hon. members from Nova Scotia, I hope that the Minister of National Health and Welfare will not forget the question I posed but will be able to answer it. Members of the backbenches spoke with him last night because they are somewhat disillusioned with parliament, and that might be the feeling of backbenchers on both sides.

I can understand that the Minister of Justice wanted to resign because some of the backbenchers in the house are fed up with parliament, but can he educate us by telling us what would be wrong in the minister or in the Prime Minister standing up in the house and naming one or two names?

[*Translation*]

Mr. Raymond Langlois (Mégantic): Mr. Speaker, after listening for a day and a half to the debate about Miss Munsinger, I notice that as the discussion wears on, more and more things are stirred up. It has been just found out that Miss Munsinger is alive and today we read in the papers that even the Attorneys General are beginning to stir things up in their respective provinces, adding a little spice.

Here, the more I hear the more I think that holding a full and complete inquiry into this case, as suggested, might contribute more to the security of the country than could have been expected at the beginning. And, in that connection, I am basing myself on an article published on Thursday, March 10, 1966, in a Montreal newspaper. It deals with remarks made by the Quebec Attorney General, or

Minister of Justice, Mr. Claude Wagner. The article reads as follows:

Will Wagner clear up fully the case of the "Polonaise"?

And here I wish to add that it is not Chopin's.

It is current knowledge—

—and I am quoting textually—

—in the capital—

Quebec City.

—that the last remark made by Mr. Claude Wagner about some federal members, particularly Mr. Erik Nielsen, "I—

—here Mr. Wagner is quoted in brackets:

—"I know what he has; but he does not know all I have—", I easily find his answer. It would seem that the words "all I have", coming from the Minister of Justice, mean that he undoubtedly has a complete list of all the people connected with organized crime in Canada, whose hold over the "belle province" is getting stronger, starting from the higher ups and going down to the lowest member of the gang. That list, which will be made public later, includes the names of influential people in judicial quarters and, in informed circles, it is said openly that some ministers will soon find themselves before the court, although it is not made clear whether they are members of the provincial or the federal cabinet.

More and more, there is talk also about the "Polonaise"—

Not Chopin's.

—who would be involved in fraudulent bankruptcies and arson cases.

And all I can tell you is that things have been stirred up.

Following that article and the comments by Mr. Wagner about that matter, may I direct a question to the Prime Minister or, if he is not here, to the Minister of Justice (Mr. Cardin). Within the limits of the inquiry, within the terms of reference, which the government has in mind, will it be possible to get the documents of the Quebec Minister of Justice, and if all that is linked to the same racket. about which so much pressure was exerted from the official opposition, so that an inquiry would be set up about fraudulent bankruptcies, it might then be appropriate if there is a connection in all this, to get to the bottom of all this and clean up, once and for all, the case of fraudulent bankruptcies as well as the Munsinger affair. I should like to have a reply from the Minister of Justice on all this, that is whether he feels it would be appropriate to include everything Mr. Wagner has in his files, so as to bring to light the whole Munsinger affair and fraudulent bankruptcies if they are connected. I feel that the two matters should be included.

[Mr. Langlois (Megantic).]

Mr. Ovide Laflamme (Québec-Montmorency): Mr. Speaker, I had no intention of rising in this discussion, but in view of the position taken by the opposition, it will necessarily keep on at least until six o'clock tonight. I want to endorse the words of the hon. member for Digby-Annapolis-Kings (Mr. Nowlan) to the effect that the work of the house is progressing very slowly. When he makes this remark, I think he should understand that, for the last three years, due precisely to lack of seriousness and insinuations which have been made and personal matters which have been raised in this house, particularly by the hon. member for Yukon (Mr. Nielsen), I have the feeling the Canadian people could stand one day's delay more or less to put an end to all these personal questions and return to the normal pursuance of the business of the house.

I also have the feeling that much more is being learned through the radio at this time and I respectfully submit, after all the speeches made by the members of the New Democratic Party, that the Munsinger affair would have been brought to light in any case, as is being done now by the press and that, at one time, we would have heard the members of the New Democratic Party and of the Conservative party accuse the Minister of Justice (Mr. Cardin).

Yet, those members spent 15 days discussing the Spencer case, that is the case of an alleged spy, simply because they would have received from someone a telegram saying he had been badly treated. For fifteen days, they sided with the Conservative party, just to examine that matter. But today they are opposed to the setting up of an inquiry proposed by the hon. member for Lapointe (Mr. Grégoire) and offered by the Prime Minister (Mr. Pearson). That is the stand they take, while for 15 days they maintained that the Spencer case should be dealt with in a non-partisan manner and by means of a judicial inquiry.

Then, why not refer this one to an independent judicial inquiry, a commission made up of non-partisan people, in order to clear it up once and for all and so that we may return to the business of the house?

I hope also that this will be a lesson to the hon. member for Yukon and show him that a member is not here for the sole purpose of making insinuations while hiding behind parliamentary immunity.

• (3:10 p.m.)

[*English*]

Mr. J. M. Forrestall (Halifax): As another new member of this house, and as a back-bencher in the sense in which we still accept the word, I feel I must make one or two comments before I leave this chamber this afternoon. I share with my colleague from Digby-Annapolis-Kings the concern felt by all Nova Scotians and all Canadians about what is happening here in Ottawa today as well as what happened during the last three or four days.

I can no longer feel that high level of respect for this house that I felt when I came here less than two months ago. The events of the last few days are beyond understanding. We have done nothing except try to establish one single point. But the attempt has failed. The minister remains in his seat. I appeal to him for the sake of all that is human and all that is good: stand up and comply with the wishes of the majority of members in this House. Mr. Speaker, I do not want to go home today carrying with me any responsibility for the shame which has been brought upon this house and the members in it.

I have had conversations today with people in Nova Scotia. They are concerned. The press is concerned. All news media are concerned. Even the children in grade seven of the school in the village from which I come are concerned. There was a debate among children in grade seven in a small classroom in Nova Scotia today. They are curious. Why are they curious? Why should some 20 members of the Privy Council be subjected to this continuing and apparently unending doubt which has been cast upon them? These are moral questions, all of them. These men undoubtedly came here with much the same purpose as I did, to try to serve those people who wanted representation in this house and who were prepared to support them and show their faith in them.

I cannot sit here silent, so great is the indignation which swells up in me, first, because we are not doing what I came here to do. But more important than that, I cannot accept the position in which these men have been left; it is repugnant to everything I have always cherished. I know no level of ethical or moral responsibility which would accept the silence of the other side of the house.

Let us end this shadow of accusation which surrounds these honourable men. Let them, and let the Canadian people go home this week end able to rest assured once and for all about the facts of this affair. I believe we should sit here until the Minister of Justice rises to his feet. Nothing is more important than the principle which has been violated in the past few days. If we are not prepared to do it, the Prime Minister must accept the responsibility of demanding—

An hon. Member: He has left the house.

Mr. Forrestall: He usually does that. Part of his nature in the last few days has been to face his responsibilities from outside the house. He always goes behind the curtain.

I say we must go on with the work we were sent here to do. By all means, let us get on with the business of this house. Let us get some legislation before us, and act. But I am not prepared, now, nor will I be six months from today, to act on anything in this house until the aspersions which have been cast have been cleared up.

I am not going to move from this house until we have heard from the minister. I do not think any hon. member can move from this house until this matter has been cleared up. I do not know how they can do so while these charges are hanging over the heads of every member on both sides of the chamber. The principle of the minister going outside this house to make charges is one which I do not cherish. Surely, the minister himself cherishes a higher sense of his responsibility than that. Let him name names. Then let us get on with the job we were sent here to do.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: The hon. member for Royal.

• (3:20 p.m.)

[*Translation*]

Mr. Grégoire: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker. Everything seems to be at a standstill at the moment and it appears that the discussion will not advance further unless the names are given, at least according to what the two previous speakers have just said. Well, the names have now been revealed on the radio and in the newspapers. It is said—

Mr. Vincent: Who gave them?

Mr. Grégoire: Miss Olga was found and she gave the names. That being the case, does the question of privilege still stand?

[*English*]

Mr. Fairweather: On a point of order—

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order, the Chair is of the opinion that if the hon. member for Lapointe (Mr. Grégoire) has a point of order he should state it now.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Grégoire: Precisely, if I rise on a point of order, it is to ask whether there still is a question of privilege before the house. Names have been named. Those named are not here. Is there a question of privilege affecting persons who are not members of the House of Commons? The question of privilege does no longer stand.

Exact information has been asked for and given. Does the question of privilege still exist? I suggest we put an end to these discussions, and proceed to something else. To end all this, Standing Order 24 says:

> A motion for reading the orders of the day shall have preference to any motion before the house.

There is no motion before the house. The orders of the day were not read today and I wish to move that the orders of the day be now read, so that we may carry on with the business of the house. We have heard enough of the same old thing, over and over again. Some action is now called for.

[*English*]

Mr. Churchill: Mr. Speaker, the hon. member for Lapointe—

Mr. Grégoire: I have a motion now.

Mr. Churchill: —on a spurious point of order has attempted to introduce a motion, and it should be ruled out of order.

Mr. Grégoire: I have a motion on the table.

Mr. Churchill: It is a smuggling procedure.

Mr. Nugent: An hon. member is not allowed to rise on a point of order and make a motion,—

Mr. Grégoire: Mr. Speaker, my motion is on the table.

Mr. Nugent: —especially when the hon. member for Royal had been recognized.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order. I should like to point out to the hon. member for Lapointe that the motion he has moved is a superseding motion, but as a superseding motion there must—

Mr. Starr: Mr. Speaker—

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order, please—but as a superseding motion it must supersede something which is already normally before the house. I must admit that at the moment there is no motion before the house. There is no motion which can be superseded by a further motion moved by the hon. member for Lapointe, and therefore I declare his motion out of order.

[Mr. Deputy Speaker.]

[*Translation*]

Mr. Grégoire: Mr. Speaker, since you did not ask for the opinion of the house before, may I respectfully submit that the speaker, last night, ruled that we were still on Bill S-10. It is at that stage that the discussion of the question of privilege was carried on. Since we are now considering Bill S-10, my motion is in order.

[*English*]

Mr. Fairweather: Mr. Speaker, you have recognized me.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order; I should point out to the hon. member for Lapointe that the orders of the day have not been called. While it is quite true that at a certain point in our proceedings yesterday the house was discussing Bill S-10, the house has not reached that stage today. The hon. member for Royal.

Mr. R. Gordon L. Fairweather (Royal): Mr. Speaker—

Mr. Pickersgill: What are we debating?

Mr. Fairweather: Exactly the same thing, I would say to the Minister of Transport (Mr. Pickersgill), as was the Prime Minister (Mr. Pearson) and everybody else who has taken part in this debate.

Mr. Pickersgill: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, I have not spoken in this debate. I only raised a point of order.

Mr. Fairweather: I did not say you had.

Mr. Pickersgill: I only raised a point of order, which I raise again, and that is if the hon. member's motion was out of order then there is nothing before the house. To what is the hon. member for Royal speaking?

Mr. Nugent: A question of privilege.

Mr. Fairweather: I am speaking to the same question of privilege that the Prime Minister of Canada spoke to a little while ago, and to which the Minister of Justice (Mr. Cardin) has not the courage to speak.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Pickersgill: Mr. Speaker—

Mr. Fairweather: I know you know a great deal about other procedures in the house, but you are not going to interrupt me.

Mr. Pickersgill: Don't be too sure.

Mr. Fairweather: Mr. Speaker, I have two questions I should like to ask and leave on the record. Perhaps they will be answered

when some of the members on the government front bench have the courage to speak in this debate. The first is to the President of the Privy Council (Mr. Favreau).

I am wondering whether the file, or the alleged file, on the Munsinger case was presented to him during his tenure of office as Minister of Justice and, if it was presented to him, what action did he take upon it?

The second question is to the Solicitor General (Mr. Pennell), a man for whom we all have a great deal of admiration and respect. I wonder whether the actual transfer of responsibility for the R.C.M.P., from the ministry of justice to the department of the Solicitor General, has taken place? I know it has not been done by legislation, but I wonder whether it has been done by administrative order. If so, has the Solicitor General seen the Munsinger file? If he has seen it, what action has he proposed?

Now, the interesting thing about this case, if there is any interest left after the vile words of the last couple of days, is the suspicion left that the minister's press conference of yesterday was part of a deliberate plan, of which the minister is chief protagonist. This suspicion is confirmed by the silence of the Minister of Justice. The suspicion is further confirmed by the insinuations, repeated many times by many hon. members, about the similarity of the Dorion inquiry to the matter before us now.

I did not happen to agree with the Minister of Justice in the way he managed, if that is the word, or behaved in connection with the Spencer case. However, I did agree that he exhibited a great deal of courage, personal courage, and loyalty to a party. If these are things to be boasted about, I think he is entitled to that credit for his courage in putting, as the papers have said, his Prime Minister and his party before his own personal inclinations. But this courage of Tuesday and Wednesday melted and slipped away on Thursday when he took part in his really quite extraordinary press interview, and so on. As a matter of fact, I do not suppose a minister has had the distinction lately in this country of being the reason for a new word creeping into the language.

In a book which a philosopher wrote about 20 or 30 years ago when other situations were facing this country, he posed the question, "When our children ask us 20 years from now what did you accomplish in those days we shall perhaps be glad to answer, like the French revolutionists after the terror, 'I survived.' "

The thing that concerns me, and a great many other members, is the survival of this institution. This is what this privilege is about. Many of us who have been part of this institution for the last little while are almost inclined to despair. This is a place apparently where men can be destroyed. Not only can their future usefulness be destroyed, but those of us, the flotsam that are left after such attacks, can be destroyed in spirit, and I think this is bad for the country. I do not boast when I say this. I do not think it matters very much about me as an individual, but I think it matters a great deal about this place as an institution.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Fairweather: —and this place is being fouled.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

• (3:30 p.m.)

Mr. Fairweather: Mr. Speaker, what I cannot get through my head is that there are some men here who are willing to conspire to do irreparable damage to this institution. They damage its usefulness and they damage themselves as they go about their business outside the house where they are brave men. But inside the house they have no courage. God knows, there are enough people who question this parliament and whether parliament is an institution which can survive. There are inquiries, there are columnists, and there are people dealing with this all over the world. Here we sit, locked in this unseemly mess. It does damage to this place, and yet the minister sits there without any courage to remove a smear which has been done to men of honour, two at least of whom are not even alive to answer the charge.

An hon. Member: Shame.

Mr. Fairweather: Some of us, in our way, have tried to study this by research, even by experiment, because that is what we are doing now with the new rules; we are experimenting. Here we have a mockery, a travesty of the experiment. However, we have tried in our simple way, perhaps, to make this place work so that people can regard it and respect it as an institution and so that children do not debate its usefulness.

Some of us care whether or not this is a place of excellence—a funny, old fashioned term, a funny, old fashioned thing—to say, excellence; but there are some of us here who seek it.

Mr. Herridge: Good old Victorian term.

Mr. Fairweather: The hon. member might be permitted to slip in occasionally one of his dangerous philosophies related to a Victorian term. I use that term, whether it is Victorian or what it is. I emphatically deplore our record, and I say "our record", because we have all been smeared by this type of thing. We are all a little lesser people because of it. We all have to go home to our constituencies and try to explain away our strange week here. We have to tell people what we have been about.

What in God's name have we been about here this week? What have we been up to this week? We have been witnessing a conspiracy enjoyed by a frustrated minister who wishes to commit hara-kiri and is willing to take other people down with him.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Fairweather: This man has demeaned and soiled this place, but does not have the courage to stand up in this house, and make the charges he loves to make when the press sit around his office. He will not do it now because he knows there are procedures which he cannot bear to have brought into play against him. That is why he will not get up. This strange man likes to go about in other places and environments making smears and statements; that is what he likes to do and that is why it will be hard to explain in the years that follow what we have been doing in these days.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Caouette: Mr. Speaker, the previous speaker stated emphatically that the Minister of Justice is not brave enough to rise and name names. Now, they are not giving any names themselves, but they insist that names be given. If no member is brave enough to name names in the house, some people outside the house have that courage.

In the Toronto *Star* of this afternoon—

[*English*]

Mr. Nielsen: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a question of order. My question of order is that the member for Villeneuve (Mr. Caouette) has indicated his intention to read into the record a story which has appeared in the Toronto *Star,* and perhaps in other press media in this country, stating facts which, unless they are read into the record of this place whereby immunity is gained, may constitute slander or libel against certain individuals. That is the first point.

Second, if the member for Villeneuve persists in reading into the record the story which he indicated it is his intention to read, from the Toronto *Star,* he must not only take the full consequences as a member for doing so but he must take the consequences that the minister has assumed in making these charges. I have seen the story, as have other hon. members. If he reads it, he is making precisely the charges, the minister made, but more specifically than he had the courage to do.

I therefore suggest to Your Honour that it is completely out of order for the hon. member to read into the record this Toronto *Star* story without adopting the views and opinions contained in the story, and taking the full consequences for his actions.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Caouette: Mr. Speaker, the member for Yukon (Mr. Nielsen) spends his time in the house reading press releases, press reports which may at times incriminate one or several persons.

Under the circumstances, I am not the one who wrote this item in the Toronto *Star*, but I am reading the report published today in that paper. I am not saying that the report is truthful but that someone outside the house has the courage to name names, that someone outside the house phoned to Munich this afternoon and talked to Miss Gerda Munsinger.

[*English*]

Mr. Churchill: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. The hon. member now is disclosing his purpose. He says he is going to read, from some article in the Toronto *Star*, the names of certain persons who allegedly are involved in some of these circumstances. There are some questions which immediately come to mind. What truth is there in the article? Are we assured of that by the hon. member? Is this a method of protecting the Minister of Justice who will not make the disclosure in the house? Is this a roundabout method of making further unsubstantiated charges? This all, sir, is a travesty of the

proceedings of our house, for the hon. member for Villeneuve to attempt this. I suggest that you rule out of order his attempt to read into the record what he now has disclosed to us he is about to read.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Grégoire: On the point of order, Mr. Speaker, you know as well as I do, that a member has never been required in the house to state he endorsed a press report. In this connection, I challenge the members for Winnipeg South Centre and for Yukon (Messrs. Churchill and Nielsen) to say that they endorse categorically and unequivocally all the press reports which their leader and themselves have read in the house in the past two years. I challenge them now to endorse them, because they will not do so.

In the past, members have always read press reports to support their arguments; it has always been accepted and allowed. I do not see why, suddenly, the Conservative members object to this procedure.

It is claimed that the hon. member for Villeneuve (Mr. Caouette) has risen to defend the Minister of Justice. I shall reply that the Minister of Justice can take care of himself and needs no help.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

• (3:40 p.m.)

[*English*]

Mr. Nugent: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. At the moment we are engaged in a debate on a question of privilege in respect of newspaper reports of statements that were made, in part outside this house to newspaper reports, by the Minister of Justice. It is, of course, obvious that the statements made by the Minister of Justice were blanket statements in that they covered several individuals. I suggest to Your Honour that the hon. member for Villeneuve (Mr. Caouette) now intends to take part in this debate by reading a further story that appeared in a newspaper. By doing so he is actively joining with the Minister of Justice in violating the privileges of the members of this house. The house has already decided there is a prima facie case of privilege. The hon. member, in attempting now to join in the action which has been found by this house to be improper, is flying directly in the face of the rules. The Chair has the right and duty to order him not to do so.

Mr. Cameron (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands): Mr. Speaker, I have not seen the story to which reference is made, but I assume it names some individuals. If it is allowed to be read into the record we shall have no means of knowing, unless the Minister of Justice summons his courage, whether these names are the ones the Minister of Justice had in his mind when he made his lamentable press report.

An hon. Member: That is right.

Mr. Cameron (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands): We shall merely be adding to the slander, if it is slander, and to the suspicion the minister aroused by making these statements without naming anyone. I suggest to Your Honour that you should prevent this from happening unless you have an undertaking from the Minister of Justice that he will immediately rise and tell the members of this house whether these are the names he had in mind.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: The Chair has no knowledge of the contents of the article which the hon. member for Villeneuve (Mr. Caouette) was about to read, but I point out to him that he would not be in order in reading statements of other people which appear in quotation marks which he would not make on his own responsibility in the house.

So far as reading newspaper articles is concerned, I should like to refer hon. members to citation 157 (3) (b) of Beauchesne's fourth edition which states:

> It is out of order to read extracts in a debate if they: (b) reflect upon any proceedings or any determination of the House,—

Let me read further from citation 157 (5) which states:

> It is not in order to read articles in newspapers, letters or communications emanating from persons outside the House and referring to, or commenting on, or denying anything said by a member or expressing any opinion reflecting on proceedings within the House.

May I go further, and read from paragraph (6) which states:

> On the 17th March, 1933, a member quoting a newspaper in debate was ruled out of order by the Deputy Speaker who said: The rule is quite clear, that the quoting of a newspaper, an author or a book which reflects upon debate before the House, either directly or indirectly is entirely out of order, because members are here to give their own opinion and not to quote the opinion of others . . . Members may quote an article or a book stating facts, but a commentary on any proceeding or any

discussion in the House, with the object of swinging an opinion to one side or the other, is out of order.'

The Chair, therefore, declares that the point of order raised by the hon. member is well founded.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Caouette: Mr. Speaker, contrary to the claims of the Conservatives a minute ago that I endorsed the statements contained in today's Toronto *Star,* this does not mean that I endorse them.

Every day in the house, we hear newpaper reports and comments read by hon. members who do not necessarily share the views expressed.

The same thing has happened several times to the hon. member for the Yukon. It did not mean that he endorsed them—

[*English*]

Some hon. Members: Order, order.

Mr. Nugent: Mr. Speaker, on the point of order, the hon. member is commenting now on the ruling which the Chair has made. He is criticizing that ruling, and I think he is out of order.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Caouette: Mr. Speaker, I am not in the least questioning your ruling. I am speaking of what is happening in the house, continuously and daily, according to the tradition of the house.

We have known for 25 years the orders Mr. Speaker has just read. Yet, do all members always abide by those rules?

We are never supposed to read in the house articles from the outside, but we use them every day.

[*English*]

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order, please.

Mr. Brand: Mr. Speaker, it seems to me that the hon. member for Villeneuve is still criticizing the decision of the Chair, and I think he should be restrained from carrying on in this manner.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Caouette: Mr. Speaker, it is a very simple matter. The question is whether, in fact, Miss Gerda Munsinger was located in Munich, Germany, this afternoon. In Canada, we called her Olga, as the newspapermen did, and we wonder if it is true that she is actually alive. According to the Toronto *Star*—

[Mr. Deputy Speaker.]

[*English*]

Mr. Churchill: On the point of order, Mr. Speaker; the hon. member is now referring to a woman by the name of Munsinger. The Minister of Justice told us she was dead, so this story must obviously be false. Are we to be subjected to these false stories being read into the record? The Minister of Justice told us that the woman he named during his press conference was dead. She has now been revived or resurrected by the hon. member for Villeneuve. Obviously the story he is relying on cannot be true because we have to accept the statement of the Minister of Justice, speaking as a minister of the Crown and presumably with the approval of his colleagues in cabinet. What kind of nonsense is this we are hearing about some woman who does not exist?

[*Translation*]

Mr. Caouette: Mr. Speaker, that is exactly what we want to know, and here I quote—

[*English*]

The *Star* says it has located the Munsinger—

Mr. Nielsen: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order, please.

Mr. Caouette: Mr. Speaker, the *Star* reports—

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order, please. I have already advised the hon. member for Villeneuve that he would be out of order in quoting from a newspaper article reflecting on a proceeding in the house. I should point out to the hon. member that I have not said he would be out of order if he read from a newspaper or an article, but that reading from an article reflecting on any procedure in the house is out of order. I suggest to the hon. member that he is now doing just that.

• (3:50 p.m.)

[*Translation*]

Mr. Grégoire: On the point of order, Mr. Speaker, if the hon. member for Villeneuve (Mr. Caouette) is not allowed to quote from newspaper articles, how come the question of privilege was raised on the basis of newspaper reports?

The hon. member for Calgary North (Mr. Harkness) and the hon. member for Winnipeg South Centre (Mr. Churchill), as well as the hon. member for Yukon (Mr. Nielsen), did quote newspaper articles on a question of privilege.

[*English*]

Mr. Nielsen: On a question of privilege, Mr. Speaker—

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order, please. I recognize the very fine point which the hon. member for Lapointe (Mr. Grégoire) has raised. I should point out to him, though, that when the initial reference was made to newspapers it was not a reference to a proceeding taking place in this house. I suggest to the hon. member for Lapointe that there is a distinct difference.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Grégoire: On the point of order, Mr. Speaker—

[*English*]

Mr. Nielsen: On a question of privilege—

An hon. Member: Whose privilege?

Mr. Nielsen: The privileges of all members of this house. Your Honour has made a ruling. It is beneath the dignity of the Chair to have hon. members argue the merits of that ruling once made. The ruling has been made and it behooves no hon. member to take issue with that ruling, which is precisely what the hon. member for Lapointe (Mr. Grégoire) is doing.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Grégoire: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker. We accept the ruling you made a moment ago and the hon. member for Villeneuve will abide by it.

But you certainly have read, in Beauchesne, citation 157, paragraph 5, which says:

(5) It is not in order to read articles in newspapers—

And so on—

—emanating from persons outside the house and referring to, or commenting on, or denying anything said by a member—

We have the right to quote newspaper articles as long as it is not out of order. If you let the hon. member for Villeneuve read this article, you will find that it is not out of order. If it is against the rules, then the Conservatives can rise on a point of order.

It is permissible to read newspaper articles when it is according to the rules. To know if in this it is out of order, let them allow the member for Villeneuve to start reading his article. That is normal.

But they are afraid, Mr. Speaker, that is all.

There can be no harm in reading the article, it will not violate citation 157, paragraph 3, 5 and 6.

But to find out, the hon. member for Villeneuve must first read the article, otherwise you will never know. That is what we want.

We respect your ruling. The hon. member for Villeneuve will comply with it. I have read what he wishes to read. It is going to hurt, but it is not out of order.

[*English*]

Mr. Caouette: Mr. Speaker, according to the Canadian Press, and I quote in English:

The *Star* says it has located Gerda Munsinger, centre of a new sex-and-security debate in the Commons, alive and well in a Munich apartment.

Mr. Nielsen: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker—

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order. The hon. member for Yukon on a point of order.

Mr. Nielsen: My point of order is this. Your Honour has ruled that unless the hon. member adopts as his own the opinions in the article which he intends to read—

Mr. Caouette: Oh, no.

Mr. Nielsen: —he cannot read them into the record of this house. The rule is clear. The hon. member for Villeneuve knows what is in that press article, as I and many other members do because we were reading it in the lobbies. What is being attempted here is to read into the record statements which are now libellous but which will receive the cloak of immunity once they are read in this house.

Mr. Caouette: They are in the paper today.

Mr. Nielsen: That is fine, and if they are in the paper today that paper must take the responsibility for them and the possibility of having libel suits brought against it for the publication. But we in this house should not lend ourselves to abetting the creation of what constitutes libel by having the hon. member for Villeneuve read into the record something which has appeared in the press.

If the hon. member for Villeneuve wishes to take the responsibility of adopting those views as his own, let him read them into the record. As far as I am concerned there is nothing I am afraid to have read into the record. The hon. member must accept that responsibility and adopt those views as his own. He is afraid to do that, just as the minister is.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Grégoire: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. In your ruling a while ago, you did not mention that the hon. member for Villeneuve would have to accept the responsibility for the article. You mentioned citation 157, paragraph 3, subparagraph (b), and paragraphs 5 and 6. None of them stipulates that a member who reads a newspaper article assumes the responsibility for it.

Moreover, when members read to the house statements the press attributed to the Minister of Justice, not one of them took the responsibility for them.

Let the hon. member for Villeneuve read his newspaper article, which will be according to your instructions and rulings of a while ago. You did not mention at any time that the hon. member for Villeneuve had to accept the responsibility for it. I say, at this point, that in his usual fashion, the hon. member for Yukon (Mr. Nielsen) distorts the Speaker's statements, and that is a serious matter when one's mind is that crooked.

[*English*]

Mr. Nugent: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, the ruling that Your Honour made was that the hon. member would be out of order in reading this article.

Some hon. Members: No.

Mr. Nugent: If I might remind Your Honour of what you said, it was that unless the hon. member adopted the views contained in the article as his own, he would be out of order in reading it. Your Honour said that if he wanted to read it he would have to do so on his own responsibility. I ask you, sir, to ask hon. members to stop arguing against the ruling you have already made. You have ruled that it would be out of order for the hon. member to read the article and I ask you to ask him to stop reading it.

Mr. Churchill: Mr. Speaker, I should like to move that the house do now adjourn, seconded by the hon. member for Ontario (Mr. Starr).

An hon. Member: Chicken.

Mr. Winkler: Who is chicken around here? Let the minister get up and talk.

Mr. Starr: There hasn't been a backbone on the front benches opposite for two days now.

Mr. Pickersgill: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh.

[Mr. Nielson.]

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order, please.

Mr. Pickersgill: I am rising on a point of order.

Mr. Starr: The motion is not debatable.

Mr. Pickersgill: A point of order may be raised at any time.

Mr. Churchill: It is not debatable.

Mr. Pickersgill: I am rising on a point of order. The point of order is that there does not seem to be any proceeding before the house and the motion is therefore not in order.

Mr. Starr: The minister has risen on a point of order, but that is not a point of order.

Mr. Grégoire: On the point of order, Mr. Speaker—

Mr. Starr: There is no point of order.

Some hon. Members: Sit down.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order.

Mr. Grégoire: Are you annoyed, Mr. Speaker?

Mr. Deputy Speaker: It might be just as well if hon. members gave the Speaker the chance to make a ruling. He is going to make it anyway.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Yesterday during the proceedings of the house pretty much the same situation arose. The hon. member for Villeneuve (Mr. Caouette) was making a speech and the floor was taken from him, legitimately of course, by a point of order. When a point of order is put to the house, no member has the right to move that the house adjourn until the hon. member who was making the speech at the time has the floor again. I therefore declare that the motion is out of order at this particular time. The hon. member for Villeneuve.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Caouette: I go on in English—

[*English*]

In a copyright story from Munich by staff writer—

Mr. Nielsen: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker—

• (4:00 p.m.)

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order, please; I repeat the rule to the hon. member for Villeneuve (Mr. Caouette). The rule is quite clear, that the quoting of a newspaper article, or the author of a book, which reflects upon debate before the house either directly or indirectly, is out of order. I am not familiar with the contents of the article which the hon. member for Villeneuve is attempting to read, but it appears to the Chair, that he is about to read from an article which reflects upon the house and in doing so, he would be out of order.

May I also say to him that in the first part of the ruling I made a few minutes ago I suggested to him that he would be out of order if he were to read from statements appearing in quotation marks containing comments which it would be out of order for him to make on his own. I had hoped the hon. member for Villeneuve would co-operate with the Chair in this regard.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Caouette: I am in no way reflecting upon this debate. I am not accepting anybody else's words. I simply want to question the government, or the Minister of Justice, as to what is true in this?

It seems to me that, at this time, there are Conservatives who have an interest in knowing the article, in approving or disapproving it.

When I hear the hon. member for Yukon (Mr. Nielsen) say that I must take the responsibility for what is written in the report, I might ask him when does he take the responsibility for what he says in this house.

[*English*]

Mr. Nielsen: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a question of privilege. I want to say with regard to my participation in any of the debates in this house, that in ratifying the views and comments which I have read from the press, and other sources, throughout the whole eight years or more that I have been here, I have done that on my own responsibility as a member.

I agree with your opinions with respect to any articles that may be read into the record. That is the point of order. If the hon. member for Villeneuve (Mr. Caouette) is prepared to take the responsibility for the article he wants to read, then I suggest to you, sir, and to all members who are responsible for the words they utter in this house, that he should go ahead and read the article.

As long as the hon. member takes responsibility, and adopts the views and opinions stated in the article as being his own, he may read it. He is obliged to take responsibility, and so is the Minister of Justice with respect to stories which appear in the Ottawa *Citizen* this afternoon. What has happened may well take those newspapers off the libel hook on which they may have been. It ill behooves this house to adopt procedure which would have that result.

Mr. Speaker, you have made a ruling. You have asked the hon. member for Villeneuve to desist. I suggest to you, sir, that he should be restrained from reading the article.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order, please, it is not of course the business of the Chair to decide what effect the article referred to will have outside this house. The jurisdiction of the Chair is within the house itself. Again, I say to the hon. member for Villeneuve that if the article he intends to read in any way reflects upon the proceedings of this house, then he is out of order in reading the report.

Mr. Starr: Quite right.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: I had hoped the hon. member for Villeneuve would help the Chair in this regard.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Caouette: I take full and complete responsibility for the question I put to the government. And I can take it outside the house, by asking the same question, that is: "What is true in this?" That is what we want to know, for the guidance of the Conservatives also; we want to know exactly what took place.

Taking the responsibility for the question I have put to the Minister of Justice, I have a right to quote this report.

[*English*]

Mr. Nielsen: On the point of order, Mr. Speaker, the hon. member for Villeneuve is trying to do by the back door what he cannot do by the front door. Your ruling precludes his quoting from that article. If he wishes to state in the house the contents of the article we shall be pleased to have him do so on his own responsibility, by adopting the views of the writer of the article, which, as a responsible member of this house he must do.

I suggest to you, sir, that you have made your ruling. The hon. member for Villeneuve is persisting, and should not be allowed to do so.

Mr. Starr: He should be named.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Grégoire: Mr. Speaker, the member for Yukon is taking devious ways to prevent the hon. member for Villeneuve (Mr. Caouette) from reading a press report.

Let him quote the standing order stating that the hon. member for Villeneuve must assume responsibility for what he reads. Paragraph 1 of citation 157 of Beauchesne reads as follows:

> The practice of reading extracts from newspapers to support an argument in debate has been followed in the British house since 1840, when Speaker Peel—

Whom he never knew.

> —with the acquiescence of the house, allowed a member to proceed to read passages from a newspaper.

Let the member for Yukon tell us where in Beauchesne, May, Bourinot and all the others standing orders in English or in French—

Some hon. Members: Pascal.

Mr. Grégoire: Pascal or any other, it is said he must assume responsibility for that. The only duty of the hon. member for Villeneuve is to see that he does not go against the ruling you made and to comply with the provisions of paragraphs 3 and 7 of Beauchesne, citation 157.

If you want the hon. member to comply with them, allow him to read this press report, and you will see. But the member for Yukon objects even before a line is read. You cannot judge whether it is in order or not, because he is afraid of the article being read. How true it is, Mr. Speaker. Since a few minutes ago, they all look cowed. Just look at them. They even want to adjourn—

[*English*]

Mr. Bell (Carleton): Would the hon. gentleman permit a question?

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order, please. The hon. member for Saskatoon.

Mr. L. M. Brand (Saskatoon): Mr. Speaker, with all due deference to you, may I point out the standing rules of the house?

[*Translation*]

Mr. Grégoire: Mr. Speaker—

[*English*]

Mr. Brand: I have the floor. Would you sit down?

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh.

Mr. Winkler: That's the boy. You fellows know how to do it. The same old gang.

[Mr. Starr.]

Mr. Deputy Speaker: It is a little difficult for the Chair to listen to more than one member at the same time. At the moment the Chair proposes to listen to the hon. member for Saskatoon.

Mr. Brand: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. With all due deference, Mr. Speaker, I should like to refer to the decision you have recently made, and refer the hon. member for Villeneuve and yourself to Provisional Standing Order 12, subsection (1):

> Mr. Speaker shall preserve order and decorum, and shall decide questions of order. In explaining a point of order or practice, he shall state the Standing Order or authority applicable to the case. No debate shall be permitted on any such decision, nor shall any such decision be subject to an appeal to the House.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Caouette: Mr. Speaker, it is a fact that this article does not involve any member of this house.

[*English*]

The *Star* says—

Mr. Nielsen: Mr. Speaker—

Mr. Caouette: September 1,—

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order.

Mr. Nielsen: A point of order, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Caouette: The minister says—

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order, please, order. The Chair is having some difficulty. I have advised the hon. member for Villeneuve that he is not to read an article which reflects upon the proceedings of the house. The proper citations have been given to the hon. member and to the house. If the hon. member reads the article and it does reflect upon the proceedings of the house, he is out of order.

• (4:10 p.m.)

Mr. Langlois (Mégantic): I rise on a point of order. Without reflecting in any way on your decision, Mr. Speaker, you might find this article does not reflect on this debate but contains a few statements of historical fact which might enlighten the house.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Caouette: Mr. Speaker—

[*English*]

Mr. Nielsen: Mr. Speaker—

Some hon. Members : Sit down.

Mr. Nielsen: Hon. members opposite need not shout "Sit down."

Mr. Pickersgill: The hon. member for Villeneuve has the floor.

Mr. Nielsen: I rise on a point of order. I have here a citation which may assist Your Honour. At page 133 of Beauchesne Your Honour will find paragraph (8), which reads:

> A member having made assertions in speeches out of doors, relative to other members, and having repeated them in the House: Decided, that the proper way of proceeding with a view to ulterior measures was for the newspaper containing the expressions in question to be read by the Clerk at the table and for the admission by the member in question that he used them to be taken in a formal manner.

I would suggest that, on the basis of the preceding paragraphs to that citation, the article in question, which is in the possession of the hon. member for Villeneuve and which has been seen by a good many of us—I might say that the specific article has been seen by myself—be placed in the hands of the Clerk at the table. In that manner we may decide whether or not the substance of the point of order which I raised in the first place is indeed valid.

Mr. Herridge: Mr. Speaker, I have a point of order. I make this point of order in a spirit of good will and in an effort to pour oil on troubled waters.

In view of the fact that it is now known that Fräulein Gerda is alive in Munich and is prepared to testify—

Mr. Churchill: How do you know that? What is your evidence?

Mr. Herridge: —and in view of the precedent established last week by the Prime Minister, would the Secretary of State for External Affairs (Mr. Martin) undertake to telephone Fräulein Gerda and ask her whether she wants an inquiry, and whether she can give names and later come to Canada to testify? Would he permit the leaders of all opposition parties to listen in on the telephone extension?

Mr. Churchill: I rise on the point of order, sir.

Mr. Herridge: Is the minister going to reply?

Mr. Churchill: I want to speak to the point of order raised by the hon. member for Kootenay West (Mr. Herridge) in which he ridiculed, quite properly, the ministry. The reason I want to speak now is that he mentioned a person who the Minister of Justice told us and informed the press and the public was dead. How can there be any rhyme or reason in discussing this situation when this person is dead? Does the hon. member know that she is alive, or is the minister going to tell us from his own knowledge that the woman is alive? Is somebody posing as a person who used to be here?

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Has the hon. member a point of order?

Mr. Churchill: My point of order is that the hon. member for Kootenay West raised a point of order, mentioned the name of some woman living in Germany and was asking questions of the ministry. We have been assured by the ministry that the person so named is dead. What sort of farce is being made of this place?

Mr. Pickersgill: May I ask the hon. gentleman a question. Would the hon. gentleman cite the passage in *Hansard* where the Minister of Justice said this woman was dead?

Mr. Starr: That appears in the press.

Mr. Pickersgill: I said in *Hansard,* because we cannot quote newspapers.

Mr. Churchill: I suggest that the information as to the death of the woman came from the Minister of Justice by way of one of his notorious press conferences. We have been asked, as has the public, to accept statements made at these press conferences. If the woman is now alive, then what the minister said at a press conference was false. Other things which he said at a press conference are possibly false also. That is the only conclusion that can be drawn. Let the Minister of Justice rise right now and tell us that he knows, on his own authority that this woman is alive, is living in Germany, and is the woman who was reported to have been in Canada. He is afraid to do this.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Caouette: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker. Apparently Conservative members have the floor although I had caught your eye and you had recognized me.

The hon. member for Winnipeg South Centre (Mr. Churchill) says the Minister of Justice stated that Miss Munsinger was dead, always according to press reports, but as late as Thursday last, the Minister of Justice said that according to his information, Miss Munsinger had died of leukemia four years ago. The Minister did not affirm that she was

dead. He said that according to available information, she was supposed to have died four years ago.

Today, we learn that she is not dead. We learn from an article by Mr. Robert Reguly that Miss Munsinger is still alive—

[*English*]

Mr. Churchill: I rise on a point of order.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Caouette: Mr. Speaker, would you ask the hon. member for Winnipeg South Centre to sit down and remain glued to it so that I can finish what I have to say?

[*English*]

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order. The hon. member for Villeneuve was raising a point of order.

Mr. Churchill: He had started to read a press report when I rose on my point of order. He was reading a press report to the effect that this woman is alive.

Mr. Caouette: I raised a point of order, as did the hon. member a moment ago, and I did not interfere with his right to do so. I ask the hon. member, therefore, not to interfere with my right.

Mr. Nielsen: Then do not try and smuggle in the report.

Mr. Caouette: Oh, we know you.

Mr. Ricard: We know you, too.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Caouette: Mr. Speaker, the point is to get the facts straight.

The hon. member for Winnipeg South Centre claims the Minister of Justice stated that Miss Munsinger was dead. That is not exactly what he said. Apparently, he stated that according to information, she had died four years ago. So today, March 11, 1966, we discover she is very much alive and that she has spoken over the phone with Mr. Reguly of the Toronto *Star* and the story has it—

[*English*]

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order; a few moments ago the Chair was going to suggest that it return the floor to the hon. member for Villeneuve. Now, it is not so sure. I again ask the hon. member to refrain from quoting from this newspaper article and to proceed with his remarks.

Mr. MacInnis (Cape Breton South): On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, we have an hon. member who gets up on a point of order and raves away for 15 minutes without reaching it. My point of order is that reference has been made to a woman living in Germany who earlier was reported dead.

• (4:20 p.m.)

I have read the press reports, now, and I point out to you and to all hon. members of this house, that there is a dissimilarity in the names. The names are not even alike.

Mr. Langlois (Megantic): On a point of order; this is the first time in this house I have seen the official opposition in such a pitiful state that they are afraid of the dead.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: There is no point of order.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Caouette: Mr. Speaker, I am not making a statement, I am asking questions. The Conservatives do not understand anything about that. Have I the right to ask questions of the government and the Minister of Justice? I am not doing anything against citations 156, 157, 158 or 398 in Beauchesne. All I want is to ask questions, I am not making any statement myself. I take full responsibility for the questions I ask.

Is it true, for instance—I put the question to the Minister of Justice or to a former Minister of Justice, in case there is one who might wish to answer on the other side—that Miss Munsinger was very well acquainted with Hon. Pierre Sévigny, the former Associate Minister of National Defence, at Ottawa?

Now, the Munsinger case, as it was brought before the house—

[*English*]

Mr. Deputy Speaker: I think this is quite irrelevant to the proceedings now before the house.

Mr. Churchill: May I have the floor, then, if the hon. member is ruled out of order?

[*Translation*]

Mr. Caouette: I maintain, Mr. Speaker, that I have the right to ask questions.

So, is it true, as mentioned in statements we can read today, that another minister in the former Diefenbaker government knew "Miss Munsinger" perfectly well?

Now, is the Munsinger case, as mentioned in the article, a sexual affair or a matter of security in Canada?

Mr. Ricard: The minister does not know.

Mr. Caouette: Mr. Speaker, if it is merely a case of sex, it is none of parliament's business. If, on the other hand, it is a security case, then it concerns the government.

[*English*]

Mr. Churchill: I rise on a question of privilege. I heard the hon. member for Villeneuve say, or read out "another minister involved in the case". No name was given. Sir, this is a continuation of a campaign of innuendo and smear now being undertaken by the hon. member for Villeneuve. I wish to speak on this question of privilege. This is the type of thing to which we have been raising objections in the last two days. We have been raising questions of privilege because of accusations made against members of the Privy Council by the Minister of Justice at a press conference. Now, the hon. member for Villeneuve, who has told us he is accepting responsibility for statements he was reading from some newspaper article, is making accusations against members of the Privy Council without naming them.

Some hon. Members: Oh.

Mr. Churchill: The words he used were "another minister". This is on all fours with the type of question of privilege we have been raising with regard to the Minister of Justice at his press conference. This situation has reached the stage where parliament is simply being degraded.

An hon. Member: By whom?

Mr. Churchill: By members like the hon. member for Villeneuve, the Minister of Justice and others who are casting slurs and putting members of the House of Commons under suspicion.

Mr. Ricard: They are working together.

Mr. Churchill: My question of privilege affects me individually, it affects members of the House of Commons and certainly it affects all members of the Privy Council who served in an earlier government. This cannot be allowed to persist. This will bring about the destruction of parliament. That is what is happening. If members, whether on the government side or in any party in this house are to be permitted to make accusations like that without putting the name in front of the house—

An hon. Member: That is what you wanted.

Mr. Churchill: —without making a charge, we have reached the stage where we are living simply on rumour, innuendo, falsehood, smear and gossip, a stage where there is no confidence any more in this institution. This is a serious situation. That is why I am dealing with this particular question of privilege at this time.

It is an unfortunate turn of events that the hon. member for Villeneuve should join with members on the other side of the house, and particularly with the Minister of Justice, in attempting to disparage members of this house. The privileges of the house are of the greatest importance and members have always been greatly concerned when there has been any interference with, their privileges. We have heard today from many able speakers in the Conservative party about what is being done to this institution by this kind of procedure. We have heard from men who came here a few weeks ago, proud, as they should be, of the fact that they had been elected to this institution, and who then found that it had characteristics of which they were not aware. Indeed, until recently we who have been here much longer were not aware of those characteristics which downgrade this institution in the opinions of these members and of the public.

Now the hon. member for Villeneuve has added to our troubles by this accusation he has made on his own responsibility, without naming any person, but covering with a blanket of smear or innuendo the members of the Privy Council of the former administration. I feel this is something which cannot be allowed to go unchallenged. I am sure a number of my hon. friends will wish to speak on this question of privilege because we cannot, by our silence, appear to give consent to this type of attack which strikes at the very root of our system and which, if it is permitted to go on, will destroy this parliament.

Had I been speaking earlier on the other question of privilege which was before the house until a few minutes ago I would have dealt with the responsibility that rests on the Prime Minister. I did not have that opportunity. I have it now in connection with the matter raised by the hon. member for Villeneuve and I am taking advantage of it. I hope the Prime Minister of this country will intervene in an instance where members of this house are placed—

Mr. Grégoire: On a point of order.

Administration of Justice

Mr. Churchill: I am speaking to a question of privilege.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: The hon. member for Winnipeg South Centre is on a question of privilege.

Mr. Grégoire: He is making a speech.

• (4:30 p.m.)

Mr. Churchill: I am on a question of personal privilege, and I raise this question of privilege because of the attack made on me, and made on members of the Privy Council of the former administration by the hon. member for Villeneuve (Mr. Caouette). That is why I am talking. I was going to say I wish that the Prime Minister (Mr. Pearson), custodian as he is of the traditions of this institution, would intervene. When members like the hon. member for Villeneuve cast these slurring remarks about hon. members and infringe on their privileges, I wish the Prime Minister would come here and add his voice to mine in condemning that type of action.

I wish that the dean of the House of Commons, the respected Secretary of State for External Affairs (Mr. Martin), who has lived in this institution for 30 years or more—

[*Translation*]

Mr. Grégoire: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker.

[*English*]

Mr. Churchill: —would raise his voice in condemnation of the action of the hon. member for Villeneuve. That is what I would like to see happen.

Mr. Grégoire: On a point of order—

Mr. Churchill: That is why I am speaking on this matter of personal privilege, and I cannot be interrupted on a point of order.

Mr. Grégoire: Mr. Speaker—

Mr. Deputy Speaker: The hon. member for Winnipeg South Centre (Mr. Churchill) is already on a question of privilege.

Mr. Grégoire: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker—

Some hon. Members: Sit down.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: The hon. member for Winnipeg South Centre is on a question of privilege.

Mr. Grégoire: Not any more; that is what I want to point out to you.

Mr. Nielsen: Are you the new Speaker?

[Mr. Grégoire.]

Mr. Deputy Speaker: The hon. member for Winnipeg South Centre.

Mr. Churchill: Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Grégoire: The hon. member for Villeneuve had the floor.

Mr. Churchill: I have the floor.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order. The hon. member for Winnipeg South Centre was given the floor on a question of privilege, and I hope that the hon. member for Lapointe (Mr. Grégoire) would allow him to continue.

Mr. Churchill: The hon. member for Villeneuve had the floor earlier but he raised a matter which brought me to my feet on a point of personal privilege and I am entitled, as Your Honour knows, to speak on this matter of personal privilege. I was showing how his unfounded accusation, for which he must accept responsibility, and for which he certainly should be reprimanded, was derived from some press report or another, referring to a woman whom the Minister of Justice assured us, according to his information, had been dead for over four years.

Is this an impostor who has brought names and accusations into public print to serve somebody's purpose? I say immediately that this matter should be investigated by the Minister of Justice and the R.C.M.P. to see whether or not we are being imposed upon by someone posing as the person whom the minister told us died four years ago. On the basis of this statement, which seems to be the statement of an impostor, the hon. member for Villeneuve accepting that statement as his own, has made an accusation against hon. members of the house.

That, sir, is the type of privilege of which all members should take note. Otherwise, if this goes on, if some other hon. member later today makes some other statement of similar character, then it is a question of one accusation after the other, and it is an infringement of the rights and privileges of this house. It is a shocking state of affairs that we should have reached this stage. I accordingly move, Mr. Speaker, seconded—

Mr. Caron: You cannot. It is impossible.

Mr. Nielsen: It is a question of privilege.

Mr. Churchill: I am making this motion, founded on my question of privilege, and I move, seconded by Mr. Winkler:

That the hon. member for Villeneuve be called upon to substantiate the charges made against a member of the Privy Council, or resign his seat.

While you are looking at my motion, sir, I point out I have had it framed, in this way in order that the hon. member for Villeneuve may be brought to account; that he may stand in his place and make his charges, clearly and distinctly, and prove his accusation.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Pickersgill: I should like to raise a purely technical point of order. We have been purporting—I never quite understood how—to be debating one question of privilege all day. Now, if another purported question of privilege—and I do not know whether you can raise another one in the midst of debate on the first one—is raised, does this mean that the first question of privilege is now superseded, and we cannot return to the debate on it. Are we dealing only with the second question? It seems to me Your Honour should address yourself to this point before considering whether the motion itself is in order.

Mr. MacInnis (Cape Breton South): Would the minister permit a question? Since the minister is wondering how we could raise a question of privilege during another question of privilege, would he turn around and ask the Minister of National Health and Welfare (Mr. MacEachen) who raised one himself this afternoon?

Mr. Churchill: That is what he did. Touché.

Mr. Bell (Saint John-Albert): That trip to Vancouver was too much for the Minister of Transport.

Mr. Pickersgill: I wish I was still there.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order; yesterday and again today on a couple of occasions it was the view of the Chair, particularly yesterday as expressed by Mr. Speaker, that a motion to adjourn could not be moved on a point of order.

• (4:40 p.m.)

Earlier today that same ruling was made by the Chair. Now, it would appear that if the statement made by the hon. member for Winnipeg South Centre could not have been a point of privilege, it might be considered as a question of order. But if that were so, then the Chair would have to rule this motion out of order as has been done in the two previous cases, and the Chair so rules.

Mr. Winkler: Mr. Speaker, speaking to this point of privilege, it seems to me that what I had to say to the house this morning has now almost come to pass and most surely will. We are seized again with another question of privilege created by a statement from another member of this house.

Mr. Grégoire: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order—

Mr. Winkler: I am on privilege, if you don't mind. I have been recognized, and I am speaking to the matter of privilege.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order, is the hon. member for Grey-Bruce on this question of privilege or a new one just at the moment?

Mr. Winkler: Mr. Speaker, I am speaking to the question of privilege raised by the hon. member for Winnipeg South Centre.

Mr. Grégoire: On a point of order—

Mr. Deputy Speaker: The hon. member for Lapointe on a point of order.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Grégoire: Mr. Speaker, you have not yet ruled on whether or not the question raised by the hon. member for Winnipeg South Centre (Mr. Churchill) is a prima facie question. The Chair has not yet made a decision on that.

Mr. Speaker, I respectfully submit that the hon. member for Winnipeg South Centre did not raise a real prima facie question of privilege, since the hon. member for Villeneuve (Mr. Caouette) mentioned an article in the Toronto *Star* and asked: Is it not true that according to the article in the Toronto *Star* this person, and that person are involved in the affair?

The member for Villeneuve did not make any charge but took a newspaper article published today and asked whether it was true, as reported in the article, that this person and that person were involved.

Under the circumstances, Mr. Speaker, I thought the hon. member for Winnipeg South Centre (Mr. Churchill) had not really raised a question of privilege since the hon. member for Villeneuve only asked "whether it was true that...", with regard to a newspaper article. This often happens during the question period when the right hon. Prime Minister is asked "Is it not true, as reported in a newspaper article, that a minister made such and such a statement?" The usual question is: "Is it not true that a newspaper quotes a minister as having said such and such a thing?" In such a case the hon. member who

asks the question does not assume responsibility for the matter nor does he decide whether or not the newspaper statement is true.

All the hon. member for Villeneuve did, and *Hansard* will prove it, was to ask a question, namely "Is it not true" or "Is it true that such and such would know Miss Munsinger, as reported in the Toronto *Star*?"

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, no question of privilege can be raised and I would ask you for a ruling in this connection.

Mr. Speaker: Order. I listened with great interest to the remarks made by the hon. member for Lapointe. I recognize that his point is well taken.

I do not think it is possible to rise on a question of privilege about another question of privilege, as stated a little earlier by the Deputy Speaker of the House (Mr. Batten).

There might have been a point of order raised by the hon. member for Winnipeg South Centre, but I agree with the hon. member for Lapointe that there is no prima facie case of privilege raised by the hon. member for Winnipeg South Centre. I recognize the hon. member for Villeneuve.

Mr. Caouette: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. It takes so long at times to make hon. members of the official opposition understand—

Mr. Speaker: On the other hand, before the hon. member resumes his speech, I take it upon myself to give him a word of warning. He cannot do indirectly what he is not allowed to do directly. In other words, if he feels that he cannot make certain statements on his own, he cannot make them indirectly by reading a newspaper article because he knows that he then assumes that those statements are justified and takes responsibility for them personally. I wish to remind him of that and I am sure that he will keep that in mind while he continues his speech.

Mr. Caouette: Thank you, Mr. Speaker, I will heed your advice. I am not making or repeating any statement concerning anyone. I am just asking the government some questions. I have the right to ask questions and I take the responsibility of asking my question or questions.

A few moments ago, the hon. member for Winnipeg South Centre (Mr. Churchill) said: The hon. member should complete his charges.

[Mr. Grégoire.]

I am not accusing anyone, I am asking questions. For the last two days, the hon. member for Winnipeg South Centre and other hon. members have been asking the government to give names, more names.

Well, today we are getting names and I am asking questions to find out if it is true or not that such and such was implicated in the Munsinger case.

I said a while ago, Mr. Speaker, that if the Munsinger case is nothing but a private matter, an intrusion in people's privacy, it has nothing to do with the nation's parliament, with the federal parliament. If it is a matter of national security, then the whole Munsinger case must be brought out in the open, from A to Z.

Now, I asked the government: Is it not true that Miss Munsinger, or Mrs. Munsinger, had—

Mr. Speaker: Order. I would remind the hon. member for Villeneuve of my recommendations of a while ago, and ask him not to forget the rather serious responsibility he is taking at the present time.

Mr. Caouette: Mr. Speaker, I am aware of my responsibility in asking those questions. Anyway, we will see the answers to these questions, probably all over the Canadian press tonight or tomorrow. All I want to ask, without mentioning anyone, or pointing to anyone, is this:

Is it true Miss Munsinger attended a banquet of the Conservative Party, in Montreal, at which the Leader of the Opposition and most of the cabinet members were present?

Is it true, according to what we hear, that Miss Munsinger is willing to come to Canada as a witness, that she is still living, and living in Munich?

Is it true she is willing to come to Canada to say all she knows about the case which concerns her?

Is it true she has said:

[*English*]

—"if they keep pushing my name around in Canada" but if so wanted protection, expressing fears for her life from a Montreal businessman-racketeer.

[*Translation*]

Is it true that Miss Munsinger said that?

Is it true that this is why the government offers the Conservatives the immediate creation of a judicial inquiry to discover the short and long of this Munsinger story, because we still hear about it, day after day.

We have now lost two days discussing this case and, Mr. Speaker, I repeat that if the security of the state is, or was, in danger, with this Munsinger affair, we have said all that can be said about the matter in this house, and I suggest that a judicial inquiry should be established.

If this matter concerns only personalities, I do not see what the interest in the private lives of people may have to do with this case, in this house, because a man's private life belongs to him, not to the Canadian Parliament.

I want to be very clear. What we seek here is not to accuse anybody, but rather to get the truth, to know where we are going.

If the Conservatives are so sincere and so eager to get names, why do they object to a judicial inquiry? Why do they not agree to what the Prime Minister of Canada has been suggesting since yesterday? Why do they not want to co-operate, so that we can go back to the orders of the day and get to work—

• (4:50 p.m.)

[*English*]

Mr. Starr: Mr. Speaker, since the hon. member for Villeneuve has asked a question I wonder whether he would allow me to answer it for him. He just asked why we did not want an inquiry at this time. Does he wish to have an answer?

Mr. Caron: No, not now.

Mr. Caouette: Not just now, in a minute.

Mr. Starr: Well, do not ask questions then.

Mr. Caouette: You take note of all my questions and then you can answer. You will have plenty to answer.

[*Translation*]

On the orders of the day, Mr. Speaker.

We have been discussing this case since yesterday. Why are the Conservatives turning down the offer of the Prime Minister which seems to me quite reasonable, coming from him? The Prime Minister granted them what they were asking for in the Spencer case and now the Conservatives are not interested in granting the same privilege to the Prime Minister, that is, to set up a judicial inquiry in the Munsinger case.

Mr. Speaker, all the time we are discussing any matter or matters which might reflect on someone's reputation or might have something to do with a person and the security of the state, 20 million Canadians are watching the members of parliament and witnessing the spectacle that has been going on in the House of Commons for the past two days, when we should be dealing with legislation, while allowing the setting up of a judicial inquiry which would settle the Munsinger case and enable us to clear up the matter.

Why are the Conservatives not more concerned about the legislation which we should be passing in the house in order to help the Canadian people?

There are poor and destitute people in Canada. There are legislative measures to fight against poverty in Canada, but we forget those who are hankering after justice while we linger over the discussion of a case that goes back four or five years.

The Conservatives refuse the judicial inquiry suggested or advocated by the Prime Minister of Canada. I said this morning, and I say again this afternoon, that we support the suggestion to set up this judicial inquiry in order to settle the Munsinger case once and for all.

Afterwards, if some people made any blunders, whether it be the Minister of Justice or anyone else, we could always refer the matter to the committee on privileges and elections and discuss the matter or the findings of the inquiry.

Mr. Speaker, I have no intention of saying any more today. However, I will say that it is a shame to keep every one here in parliament, to discuss a matter that should have been settled yesterday by adopting the suggestion made by the Prime Minister.

The Minister of Justice is told: Name people, lay your charges, name people.

The Prime Minister says: A judicial inquiry will provide all the names. It is no longer wanted. When truth is offered, it is refused. Someone must stick his neck out.

It is said: The Minister of Justice has exposed all the former ministers of the Diefenbaker government.

Mr. Speaker, things are not seen in this light outside parliament. To save a few small specimens of their breed, the Conservatives call on any prejudice. And at this time, every prejudice is good, according to them.

Mr. Speaker, let us stop all these insinuations and, as I said this morning, we have heard plenty of them in the last four years.

In fact, what is to be said about the insinuations made against the former Secretary of State, the former Justice Minister and the former Postmaster General?

It does not mean that I am in agreement with everything these people have done, but much has been made of these rumours and insinuations were spread throughout Canada, indicating that we had five or six French Canadians who were bandits and racketeers in Canada. The Conservatives did this, Mr. Speaker.

Let us stop wasting time around the Munsinger affair, and let us accept the Prime Minister's suggestion that a judicial inquiry be instituted to throw light on the question so that we, the legislators, can go ahead and start working for the benefit of 20 million Canadian citizens who are expecting results from our legislation.

[*English*]

Mr. Bell (Saint John-Albert): Mr. Speaker, is the minister going to reply to the questions asked by his new found friend?

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. The Chair has recognized the hon. member for Burnaby-Coquitlam.

Mr. Churchill: His friend wanted answers.

Mr. Douglas: Mr. Speaker, the house has been at an impasse now for two days and it is apparent that we are getting nowhere. It seems to me we have to find some way of resolving this matter, and resolving it as quickly as possible, so that the business of the house may continue in a normal way on Monday. There is no value at this time in placing the blame on one side or the other for these two days which we have wasted. I think the question now is, can we find some answer to the problem.

The hon. member for Villeneuve has said the answer lies in accepting the Prime Minister's offer of a judicial inquiry. I want to say that as far as we are concerned we have already indicated our willingness to have a judicial inquiry, providing the terms of reference are clear and specific. This was not true of the motion which was moved yesterday by the hon. member for Lapointe, which was used as the basis for the Prime Minister's offer.

I want to make it clear that merely referring the Munsinger case to a judicial inquiry, placing the onus on all the parties involved to prove their innocence, is wrong.

Mr. Nielsen: That is the principle.

Mr. Douglas: The reason this inquiry is being precipitated is that the Minister of Justice made certain charges outside the house. If there is going to be a proper inquiry, those charges must be contained in the terms of reference and the onus must be on the Minister of Justice to prove those charges, not on the other parties involved to prove their innocence.

Mr. Nielsen: That is right.

Mr. Douglas: Mr. Speaker, our objection has been that there has been no specific reference to the minister's charges. He has never made those charges in the House. I was somewhat concerned when a few minutes ago the Minister of Transport (Mr. Pickersgill) asked the member for Winnipeg South Centre (Mr. Churchill) whether he could quote from *Hansard* to show that the Minister of Justice had ever said that Olga Munsinger was dead. Of course, the statement about Olga Munsinger being dead was made by the Minister of Justice outside the house.

Mr. McIlraith: He never said it.

Mr. Douglas: It seems to me that the investigation is going to confine itself largely to the charges the minister has made in the house, and the only charge he has made in the house is that the Leader of the Opposition did not handle this security case properly.

Mr. Nielsen: He said he participated in the Munsinger case.

Mr. Pickersgill: Read yesterday's *Hansard*.

Mr. Douglas: Mr. Speaker, it seems to me—

Mr. Pickersgill: Mr. Speaker, I wonder whether I could ask a factual question? Has the hon. gentleman read yesterday's *Hansard* and the answer of the Minister of Justice which occasioned all this debate. I think he will find that he has circumscribed his point more than he intended to.

Mr. Douglas: I am saying that the important thing in the terms of reference is whether or not there will be specific charges made by the minister, either by taking a transcript of his interview with the press and attaching it to the terms of reference contained in the order in council, or by having the minister rise in this house and repeat the statements he made at the press conference.

• (5:00 p.m.)

Mr. Nielsen: Precisely.

Mr. Douglas: I do not know who is speaking for the government at the moment, it may be the house leader, but I ask whether they will undertake, so that we can get on

with the business of the house, to have the terms of reference of this judicial inquiry ready by Monday. Could we see copies of the order in council and the terms of reference at that time? If there could be general agreement as to those terms of reference, this matter could be dropped and we could go on with other business. I fear that if we do not resolve this matter over the week end it could result in a protracted and endless debate throughout the whole of next week.

Mr. McIlraith: Mr. Speaker, perhaps I may clarify one point arising out of the hon. member's remarks. I thought the Prime Minister made this very clear last night, in a house with a very thin attendance, when the question arose shortly after seven o'clock that what was to be included in the terms of reference of the judicial inquiry in addition to the other things that have been mentioned—

Mr. Churchill: Give us the page reference.

Mr. McIlraith: It is spelled out at page 2532 of *Hansard*. To be included in those terms of reference was all the remarks made by the Minister of Justice during the entire press conference, and the press conference is identified. When the hon. leader of the New Democratic Party was speaking earlier today I interrupted him because I sensed that he did not get the significance of what was said yesterday. I tried to clarify it for him in the form of a question. I thought I had done that.

I want to make it very clear that this has been the position since last night when this proposition was accepted by the Prime Minister. The hon. member for Calgary North was concerned with the need for speed in getting the matter forward, and he went on, after raising a question about timing, because he was concerned about any possible delay he said this:

> I think perhaps this might be the best way to deal with this matter—

Then, he went on to say that he wanted to be assured about the speed in setting up the commission. He immediately received that assurance from the Prime Minister. As to the undertaking with regard to the necessary order in council, the order in council could be ready very soon. There is one point that troubles me a little in this connection, and that is the naming of the judge or judges concerned and obtaining the necessary consent. There is usually a requirement that the judge receive the consent or permission of the Chief Justice to act. That kind of arrangement usually applies.

I think the Prime Minister's statement as it appears in *Hansard* is very, very clear about the willingness of the government.

Mr. Korchinski: But not his statement of this morning.

Mr. McIlraith: I think the willingness of the government to proceed in this way and immediately is very clear. I believe the Prime Minister made plain in the house yesterday and today how he regarded this matter, the need for dealing with it quickly and why there was that need. I dealt with this matter yesterday; and I was very specific on that point. I hope I have clarified the points that were concerning the hon. member for Burnaby-Coquitlam. If I have not, I will do my best to clarify them further.

Mr. Douglas: Mr. Speaker, it is not a matter of clarifying anything. I was fully aware of the discussion which had taken place. The point I wanted to make was that the press conference held by the minister is not a matter of official record. As my colleague for Greenwood pointed out, when a judge sits down to look at the terms of reference, he wants to deal with the record.

It seems to me that there ought to be in the order in council the specific things which the minister charged, first of all saying that there was a security risk, saying that two or more Privy Councillors were involved, saying that—

Mr. McIlraith: Mr. Speaker, so that I may understand the hon. member better, because I am a little confused at this point, if the whole press release is before the judge, how can that situation be improved upon by picking out excerpts from it?

Mr. Lambert: It is not a press release.

Mr. Douglas: To the best of my knowledge, there was no press release.

Mr. McIlraith: The press conference.

Mr. Douglas: Which was spread over an entire hour.

Mr. McIlraith: There is a transcript of the whole thing.

Mr. Douglas: If there is a complete transcript which can be included, and if the onus as set out in the order in council is placed on the minister to substantiate before the judicial inquiry the statements he made at that press conference, we would be satisfied with the terms of that order in council.

Mr. McIlraith: Mr. Speaker, I should like to clarify that point. I wanted to make it quite clear that the Prime Minister stated what the consequences would be if the things that were said in the press conference were not substantiated. That was made clear earlier today.

Mr. MacInnis (Cape Breton South): Let the minister get up and deny them.

Mr. McIlraith: The position taken by the Prime Minister today was very, very clear on that point.

Mr. Lambert: What about names?

Mr. McIlraith: The hon. member says, "What about names?" The hon. member knows perfectly well that the correct way to deal with this matter is not to give names. He certainly should not try to go on with this bluff, which he has been pulling all day,—

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. McIlraith: —trying to prevent the proper resolution of this very grave matter.

Mr. Churchill: Is the minister prepared to name me?

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh.

Mr. Churchill: Come on.

Mr. McIlraith: I will not be sucked into that trap. That is bluff of the poorest sort by the hon. member for Winnipeg South Centre.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. The hon. member for Red Deer.

Mr. Peters: Five o'clock, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: I regret to inform the hon. member that, much as I personally would like to move into private members' business, this cannot be done because we are still on the item of business that has precedence. If we returned to anything, it would not be private members' business; it would be government business. The hon. member for Red Deer.

Mr. MacInnis (Cape Breton South): I have a question for the house leader.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. The house leader has resumed his seat and the Chair has recognized the hon. member for Red Deer.

Mr. Knowles: Mr. Speaker, could we have unanimous consent to call it five o'clock? Surely, we have had enough.

[Mr. Douglas.]

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. If there is unanimous consent we could, of course, call it five o'clock. If there is unanimous agreement we could go on with private members' business at five o'clock. But it can only be done on that basis because, normally, if we suspended consideration of the question of privilege now before the house we would go on to government business. We would call routine proceedings.

Mr. Nielsen: As long as it does not prejudice the matter of privilege before the house, we would agree. The first matter of business, of course, on Monday would be the question of privilege before the house. Is this agreed?

• (5:10 p.m.)

Mr. Speaker: Of course; I am sure there is no difficulty about this. While I am on my feet I wish to make a further appeal to hon. members to consider the rulings that were made by the Chair yesterday and today. These rulings indicate to hon. members who have taken part in this debate how the matter can be resolved in the house from a strict procedural standpoint and in accordance with the rules. I had hoped that hon. members would see the situation in the light of the ruling that had been made by the Chair. I hoped that by six o'clock today some way might have been found to resolve the difficulty in which we are at the present time. Obviously, this will not come to pass this afternoon. However, I invite hon. members to give consideration to the rulings I have made, and to the suggestions I have made, as to what should be done by hon. members if they want to present a motion that will be acceptable to the Chair and that will be satisfactory according to precedent. If this were to be done at some time we might resolve the difficulty in which we are.

By agreement we have called it five o'clock?

Mr. Nielsen: Mr. Speaker, I want to make it quite clear that on Monday the first item before this house will be the question of privilege.

Mr. Speaker: I cannot assure the hon. member what will be the first item of business on Monday.

Mr. Nielsen: Then I cannot go along with it.

Mr. Speaker: There is no agreement.

Mr. R. N. Thompson (Red Deer): Mr. Speaker, I do not want to prolong the debate at this time if it is the consensus that we should adjourn. On the other hand, Mr. Speaker, I think it would be tragic if we should cut off the debate at this time and come back again on Monday to start at the same point we are now.

An hon. Member: Maybe not.

Mr. Thompson: We have not accomplished very much in these two days, except to lower further the image this house should enjoy, and to bring disrepute upon all of us who are part of it.

Mr. Speaker, I should like to make a few comments in support of the suggestion made by the hon. member for Burnaby-Coquitlam (Mr. Douglas) that some basis for negotiation or for agreement might be reached that might continue over the week end. Then, when we return on Monday we will have an alternative to what we have before us at the present time. There must be some answer to the problem which would avoid having to come back and continue with the same question of privilege. Unless something is done, we might continue in the same direction we are now going for another week.

I urge, in the name of reason and common sense, that all those here this afternoon realize that what is now happening is just further dividing us, and keeping us from the work that we should be doing. It is increasing further the differences of opinion and the bitterness which has developed out of this debate.

It seems to me that what we have seen happening here these last two days has provided a sorry spectacle, the consequences of which will be tragic if there is not a complete change of direction.

Mr. Lambert: Who started it?

Mr. Thompson: In recent years, this parliament has been dominated by some men who have used it as their private toy, as an arena for private vendettas. We have seen men fearful of the truth hiding behind bluster and innuendo. We have seen men playing to the gallery for publicity. We have seen the even more sinister fact of alliances growing up based on differences of race and language, as well as those on party lines.

It is difficult to say where the bulk of the blame should be placed; whether on the lack of leadership of the government, or the obstructionist tactics of the official opposition. Allocating the blame is not our desire at this time.

Mr. Kindt: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker. I wish the hon. member for Red Deer would name the people who are causing the roadblocks that he mentioned just now.

Mr. Thompson: The allocating of blame is not the major concern at this moment.

Mr. Kindt: You said the official opposition. I say, withdraw that.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh.

Mr. Thompson: It does not have to be withdrawn, Mr. Speaker, because the record of *Hansard* and the press for the last couple of years is evidence of all this.

How long do we think we can continue to wrangle in this house while the direction of the country shifts? If we do not give leadership and administration, someone else will. It is only by dint of good provincial governments providing leadership in their own areas that we have been allowed to bicker away the years that we already have.

Look at the situation we have here. We have banks trying to operate under an act that is technically no longer in force—

Mr. Lambert: Yes it is.

Mr. Thompson: —and is due for drastic revision. We have put off and put off this revision, and we are about to put it off again. Why has this happened, Mr. Speaker? It has happened because of what goes on in this house.

We have farmers trying to survive under agricultural legislation that is so far behind the times it is laughable. We have educational institutions trying to compete in an age of advanced technology, supported by an uncertain and haphazard grant structure.

We embark on unwieldy state welfare procedures, such as the ill conceived Canada Pension Plan foisted on us without any real study of priorities and needs.

Miss LaMarsh: You had better check that.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. I have the impression that the hon. member is not applying himself to the question of privilege that is before the house at this time. I appreciate the fact that hon. members who have taken part in the debate have not always limited themselves to the subject at hand. However, the hon. member's remarks seem to be quite some distance from the question of privilege, and I ask him to return to the consideration of that.

Mr. Thompson: Mr. Speaker, I respect your advice, and I compliment you on the way you have handled yourself and this house during the last several trying days. I point out, Mr. Speaker, that a lot has been said by people in these last couple of days which has not been relevant to the question before the house. Furthermore, Mr. Speaker, not one member of our party has spoken. This is the first time I have spoken. Beyond that, what I am saying is directly relevant to the particular situation in which we are now.

If we do not solve the problem which faces us at this time, when we come back on Monday we shall go on in exactly the same way as we have today. What I hope to say is very much part of the argument that, I think, relates directly to the question that you have before you, and that all of us are endeavouring to consider.

We have talked about the question of the free vote on capital punishment, Mr. Speaker. In the meantime we have a mounting list of convicted murderers with commuted death penalties and no clear policy about that, so far as this house is concerned. We have a growing crime rate and increasing evidence of international crime syndicates, as well as subversive groups strengthening their position in the country.

We have small businessmen forced out of business by discriminatory taxation policies that have grown up with no clear direction. Why has this happened, Mr. Speaker? Because we have spent the last four years calling each other names, and because we have had filibusters.

An hon. Member: That is an election speech.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please; the hon. member for Red Deer said a moment ago that what he has to say relates to the situation of the house. We should not discuss the situation of the house at the present time. We should discuss the matter before the house, which is the question of privilege.

Mr. Thompson: I am only following something which I thought Mr. Speaker said—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. The hon. member for Macleod (Mr. Kindt) seeks permission to ask a question of the hon. member for Red Deer.

Mr. Kindt: I wonder if the hon. member for Red Deer would let the house know who shot the cow and the pigs?

[Mr. Speaker.]

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh.

An hon. Member: Who had the gun?

Mr. Thompson: That kind of question, Mr. Speaker, indicates the type of man asking it. If he wants to know he might ask the R.C.M.P.

• (5:20 p.m.)

Now, Mr. Speaker, we are actually filibustering the business before the house instead of proceeding with some of the matters about which we have been talking. Our collective responsibility to 20 million people demands that we do something else. All I have tried to say is that the discussion before us should be terminated. It was brought on by the hon. member for Calgary North (Mr. Harkness). We shared the concern he expressed in his original presentation because we know him and respect him. We can understand the position in which he was placed as a result of the remarks which were made at the press conference and carried in the press. I sympathize with him, but I know he is a reasonable gentleman. He knows that some agreement must be arrived at.

When the Prime Minister suggested there should be a judicial inquiry with certain provisions, the hon. member said it seemed to be the only way to resolve the question. So, in principle, he agreed to it, provided certain items were included in the terms of reference.

Therefore, it seems to me that before we leave here tonight there should be some basis for negotiation over the week end to resolve this matter. As the hon. member for Burnaby-Coquitlam (Mr. Douglas) said, it would seem that the only basis on which to arrive at agreement is to accept the suggestion of the Prime Minister that a judicial inquiry be set up. The hon. member for Calgary North specified the need for urgent action. The hon. member for Burnaby-Coquitlam said there must be satisfactory terms of reference. We agree with this, and I think it is the only logical answer. I can see no other answer.

Certainly an answer will not be found by coming back here on Monday and wrangling all day. My suggestion would be this: Could not the hon. member for Calgary North and, if he wishes, somebody else as well, meet with the Prime Minister with a view to coming together and working out terms of reference satisfactory to both sides? This would enable the government, through an

order in council, to bring about this inquiry. This would seem to be the only possible way of doing it.

Mr. Nielsen: May I ask the hon. member a question?

Mr. Thompson: You may ask questions afterwards. We have listened to the hon. gentleman talking hour after hour for the last two days, and my remarks are short and to the point.

I plead with the Prime Minister, the Minister of Justice, the Solicitor General, who is directly involved by virtue of his responsibilities, and with the hon. member for Calgary North and others on the Conservative benches who are Privy Councillors and directly involved in the implications and innuendos now before the house, to consider this suggestion.

I cannot help but recall the remarks made last night by the Minister of Forestry in the previous government, who was speaking right from his heart on the matter before us. Can we not somehow come together and agree on terms of reference in order that the inquiry can go forward and dispose of this question? If we do not, the only other way to dispose of the matter is to forget about it and go on with our work. However, it seems that is asking too much in view of what has appeared in the press and been put on the record during today and yesterday.

My only reason for bringing this suggestion to your attention, Mr. Speaker, is to emphasize that nothing constructive will be gained if we continue on Monday as we have today. The only way we can resolve the matter now is to agree on a certain course. Surely, as men we can find some area of agreement so that we can move forward and let the matter be taken care of, in a satisfactory way. Actually, I do not think any way would be entirely satisfactory because the matter is too dirty and messy, but let us at least resolve the problem so that we can turn to other matters before us.

I plead with you, Mr. Speaker, to use your influence in this regard. You have let the debate go on and on and on today. At times I have wondered whether there is any basis for our carrying on in this way. I also plead with the Prime Minister, the Minister of Justice and members of the official opposition to get together and work out a basis on which we can move forward.

Mr. Nielsen: May I ask the hon. gentleman a question before he resumes his seat. Would he inform the members of the house how parliament can set up an inquiry based on unsupported allegations about unnamed people mentioned in an unseen report?

Mr. Thompson: Mr. Speaker, I do not claim to be an authority as far as the law is concerned. As I have listened to some of the arguments made today I have been rather happy that I do not belong to that particular profession. But I would say to the hon. member for Yukon there is no other way to resolve this matter, so let us get on with it. If the Minister of Justice is wrong in what he has said to the press or the house, then he has put his own political life at stake. If certain Privy Councillors, who are rightfully indignant and concerned about the matter, have been wronged, then the matter must be righted. We cannot keep a cloud hanging over them.

Mr. Churchill: May I ask the hon. gentleman a question in that connection. Is each member of the Privy Council to appear before this commission to prove his innocence? That would be a distortion of justice in this country.

Mr. Thompson: I do not profess to know the technical answer to that question, but my opinion would be no. This would not be necessary, providing the matter is being handled in the right way and in the right place.

Mr. Churchill: Then who appears before the commission?

Mr. Thompson: We can get together and work that out.

Mr. Knowles: Mr. Speaker, I do not wish to say anything provocative to any section of the house. I do not intend to move any motion at this time, but I am wondering whether we have not had enough for today. If we cannot hope that over the week end this matter will be resolved, would the house agree to letting Your Honour call it six o'clock?

[*Translation*]

Mr. J. R. Keays (Gaspé): Mr. Speaker, I am addressing myself to you at this time, not filled with high-strung emotions but with all the timidity that is in me.

I ask the Minister of Justice to please settle once and for all the matter that has been before us for two days.

The members of the Ralliement Créditiste and of the Social Credit party are asking the house to concern itself with the nation's business. Well, I want them to know that we think exactly the same thing. They have but one thing to do and that is to ask the Minister of Justice to make charges here in the house.

We do not want the charges to be levelled by proxy, through the press, but right here in the house because, for my part, I do not wish to sit in this house with anybody who might be a security risk. If there is such a person in the house, let the minister name him. After that, the other members and himself will be able to continue sitting here.

For years, the hon. members opposite and especially those from the province of Quebec have been accusing the Conservative party of scandal-mongering. Well, I ask them now, who is looking for scandal? We are trying by every possible means to find out if a scandal exists, and you do not even have the courage to rise and make charges.

Well, Mr. Speaker, if the Liberal party thinks this is the way to enhance the prestige of the province of Quebec in this country, they are mistaken. We, from the province of Quebec, have been accused throughout the nation for too long. Today we see before us a minister from our province who lacks the courage to stand up and make charges.

Mr. Speaker, I think it is high time that we put an end to this business. I beg the Minister of Justice to deal with this question once and for all by rising in this house and making direct charges instead of making allegations or other statements through the medium of the press.

• (5:30 p.m.)

[*English*]

An hon. Member: Six o'clock.

Mr. Knowles: Six o'clock; Come, come.

Mr. Speaker: Order; I should like to submit again to the consideration of hon. members that we might call it six o'clock if there is unanimous agreement.

Mr. Nielsen: We are quite prepared to call it six o'clock provided the question of privilege will not be prejudiced in its place on Monday.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member knows that the Chair can give no such assurance. It would be normal that this would be the procedure. But I do not think I should be required to give an assurance of any kind to the hon. member for Yukon.

Mr. Ian Wahn (St. Paul's): For two days, I and a number of other members have sat here quietly with mounting confusion and indignation about what has been going on here. For two days, attacks have been launched on the Minister of Justice for remarks he made outside the house at a press conference as well as inside the house. I should like to remind hon. members opposite that remarks made by the Minister of Justice outside the house are not privileged, and those who feel themselves damaged or injured by them have a perfect right to take the appropriate action in the courts. This course is open to them if they feel they have been slandered.

I appreciate that this is a serious matter and that in addition to this right in the courts they have the right to take appropriate action in this house. The fact remains that they do not want to take appropriate action.

Yesterday, three motions were presented, all obviously bad, and held to be bad by the Chair. I have a great respect for the knowledge of the rules possessed by some hon. members on the other side of the house. I am confident that some of them know full well what is the appropriate motion to put if they feel they have been libelled by the Minister of Justice. If hon. members opposite feel they have been libelled, let them put that motion and vote on it. If not, let them keep quiet.

An hon. Member: What motion?

Mr. Wahn: Turning for a moment to the remarks made by the minister in the house with regard to the Leader of the Opposition, let me say they were most specific. There can be no criticism of his remarks on that score. They were very much to the point. If they offend the privileges of this house, let a motion be made. All day we have sat here. The Chair has invited members of the opposition on a number of occasions to bring forward the appropriate motion. Not one of them has sought to do so. Yet, they cannot say they do not know what the proper motion would be.

Mr. Churchill: Would the hon. member permit a question? Is the hon. member of the opinion that there has been no breach of the rights and privileges of members of this house? What is his answer to that?

Mr. Wahn: I say: Put the motion which you know to be the appropriate motion and let the house decide. I am only one member of this house. This question will be decided by the house itself if members opposite have the courage to put the appropriate motion.

Mr. MacInnis (Cape Breton South): The hon. member referred to what he calls the appropriate motion. Is this an admission on his part that there is a breach of privilege?

Mr. Wahn: I cannot make any sense out of that question. If the hon. member wants to put it again when I have finished, I will be glad to listen to him.

Despite your request, Mr. Speaker, members opposite have not put the motion they ought to have put if they felt they had been libelled. Instead, they have prolonged this debate until we are all completely tired. Let them put the motion. They have had reasonable time. They cannot be permitted to prolong the debate indefinitely.

Mr. Peters: Who will stop them?

Mr. Wahn: Your Honour has cited the relevant extract from May. I should like to refer again to May's 17th edition at page 396 where it is stated:

> Certain matters cannot be debated save upon a substantive motion which admits of a distinct vote of the House.

Because we have not had such a motion we have been wasting hours of our time. The citation continues:

> Among these are the conduct of the sovereign, the heir to the throne or other members of the Royal Family, the Governors-General of the Independent Territories, the Lord Chancellor, the Speaker, the Chairman of Ways and Means, members of either house of Parliament and judges of the superior courts of the United Kingdom—

Attacks have been made on the Minister of Justice for two days, but no proper motion has been put. This is in violation of the citation I have just quoted. It goes on:

> These matters cannot, therefore, be questioned by way of amendment, or upon any motion for adjournment. For the same reason, no charge of a personal character can be raised, save upon a direct and substantive motion to that effect.

This ruling has been violated and I think it has been violated for far too long. May, at page 454, states to the same effect:

> Unless the discussion is based upon a substantive motion, drawn in proper terms, reflections must not be cast in debate upon the conduct of the sovereign, the heir to the throne, or other members of the royal family, the Lord Chancellor, the Governor-General of an independent territory, the Speaker, the Chairman of Ways and Means, Members of either House of Parliament—

The Minister of Justice is a member of this house. For two days he has been attacked and the opposition has not put forward a valid motion, despite repeated requests by the Chair. This cannot be permitted to go on indefinitely. This is a breach of privilege as far as the Minister of Justice is concerned, and it is also a breach of my privileges. We are sick and tired of continuous vindictive attacks by members of the opposition. The rules are not being respected. Will you not call on members of the opposition, Mr. Speaker, to put the appropriate motion? If they do not have the courage to do so, let them keep quiet.

Mr. Nielsen: I am glad to see the hon. member for Burnaby-Coquitlam in his seat as well as the Prime Minister who has suggested a separate judicial inquiry into the matters we are discussing. I should like the Prime Minister to answer this question: how can you base such an inquiry on allegations made by a Minister of the Crown about persons whom he will not name? How can you base such an inquiry on a report which the minister who has made these accusations has never seen?

It is in my submission utterly ridiculous that parliament should lend itself to such a procedure. There is no matter for an inquiry such as that suggested by the Prime Minister. There is a matter for an inquiry such as the Leader of the Opposition suggested when he took part in the debate—the second inquiry announced by the minister on Monday.

This question before the house is a question of privilege because of the unsupported slanders which the minister has made, and only the house can decide this matter. If the Prime Minister and the hon. member for Burnaby-Coquitlam want an inquiry, then the minister must rise in his place and make a specific charge, naming names. Upon that basis an inquiry might be possible, but not upon the basis of those allegations and accusations which have been made by the minister on information he has not even seen and on a file of whose existence, if it exists, we have no knowledge.

• (5:40 p.m.)

The minister nods his head that it does exist. We do not know this. The minister has not seen it. Parliament surely cannot set up an inquiry based on unsupported allegations, based on unnamed people, based on an unseen report. In any case, we have before us a

question of privilege which can only be dealt with by the minister getting on his feet.

I ask the minister, I ask him now, did he make the statements which appeared in the press? I ask him did he say that two or more former Conservative ministers were involved with a former East German spy? I ask him did he say—

Miss LaMarsh: Are you reading from a newspaper?

Mr. Nielsen: I am taking responsibility for the remarks I am making, which I always do in this house.

Did the minister say that he would ask the cabinet to reopen the case? Did he say there was an R.C.M.P. file? Did he say he had not seen it? Did he say he was briefed on it? Did he say that the opposition leader did not handle the case properly, and should explain? Did he say that the Opposition Leader never referred the matter to the law officers of the crown? Did he say that he learned about the case in another department?

These are the questions, the answers to which we must have before we can set up any kind of inquiry. Did he say that it was worse than the Profumo case?

I ask him now to rise in his place and answer. If he had done so at the outset, perhaps we could have come to grips and set up terms of reference, or enlarged the terms of reference of the second inquiry which the Prime Minister announced last Monday. But the minister has remained silent throughout and ignored the obligation which he has to substantiate the charges he made, the key to the whole issue.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Caouette: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order.

Can the hon. member for Yukon tell us whether the questions he is now asking the Minister of Justice are based on newspaper articles? Futhermore, does he take full responsibility for the questions which he is asking at this time?

A while ago, you told me that I should assume responsibility for my questions. Does the member for Yukon assume the same responsibility? Are the questions he is asking now derived from newspaper articles?

Should the member for Yukon be treated differently from another member?

Let the member for Yukon begin by practicing what he so vehemently preaches.

[Mr. Nielsen.]

[*English*]

Mr. Nielsen: Well, the hon. member obviously was not listening, because I said I was taking full responsibility for what I was saying, as I always do in the house. Did the Minister of Justice say that the Liberals were tired of hearing of—to use the phrase I saw in the press—

Mr. Caouette: Which press?

Mr. Nielsen: —of "Diefenbaker's" insinuating that the government was plunged in scandals? Did he say that the Liberals were going to fight back hard, using the same tactics? Did he say "We know she had been engaged in espionage prior to coming to Canada"? Did he say two or more ministers were involved? Did he say government action at the time was justified but it was too late now? Did he say that the girl was dead? Did he say he was not in a position to comment whether there was a security leak? That is an extremely important question, which he should answer in the house.

Did he say that his objective was to press the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Diefenbaker) to explain his conduct in not turning the case over to the law officers of the Crown? Did he say these things?

He can cut all of this debate short by rising in his place and making the accusations here and now. It is for this reason, sir, that the proposal of the Prime Minister (Mr. Pearson) does not and cannot meet the breach of privilege which has been established here.

The Prime Minister can set up an inquiry. He can set up as many inquiries as he pleases but this, sir, cannot remove from parliament parliament's right to deal with its own privileges and the breach of those privileges which has taken place. There is only one way in which this matter can be resolved. It must be resolved by the acceptance, by the Minister of Justice and by the government, of the time honoured, of the traditional, of the mandatory obligation upon any member of the house to back up in the house the charges which he makes. That is what the minister must do now. He has no option, sir.

He must rise in his place and make his charges, or withdraw them. If he does not do this, sir, he must resign. There is no other way in which parliament can be satisfied. To continue on the course adopted by the Minister of Justice and by the Prime Minister, is simply to set the Minister of Justice against parliament. It is to set this government

against parliament. To such a confrontation I suggest there can be only one end. Parliament must and will remain supreme in the adjudication of its own privileges. The minister has the obligation now to end the matter by rising in his place, specifying his charges, substantiating those charges, or he has an obligation under our time honoured practices to resign his seat.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Brand: Mr. Speaker, I feel as a new member of the house that I must make a few comments on the events of the last few days on this point of privilege. I must say that I have been amazed and shocked at what I have seen. The spectacle of a minister of the Crown, heading one of the most important portfolios in the government, making wild and unsubstantiated charges and refusing to stand up in his place and substantiate them, and as a result leaving every Privy Councillor of the former government and, indeed, every member of the house under a cloud is shocking.

I am sure, although I am not a member of the legal profession, that it would be very difficult indeed to lay any information in a court without specifying against whom you are laying the information. Yet here, in what is supposed the highest court in our land, we are faced with this incredible spectacle.

Mr. McIlraith: Lay a charge.

Mr. Brand: I wonder if the Minister of Justice (Mr. Cardin) realizes what he is doing to our country, to the house, and to the honour that this house has had over these many years in our history. I submit that the responsibility for what is happening falls on his shoulders.

This man, in a moment of petulance, brought the business of government and the affairs of a nation to a halt. Then, I hear some members to my left blaming it on the party which I represent. It is inconceivable to me that this sort of thing can happen in this country. I am sorry indeed to have to say that the minister has sowed the wind and not only this parliament but the people of Canada will reap the whirlwind. I say it is up to him now to stand up in his place like a man and make the specific accusations; make them now before the nation, before this parliament.

• (5:50 p.m.)

The idea of having a judicial inquiry which may drag on for a long time and leave a cloud of sexual involvement with this alleged spy over the Privy Councillors, is something which is incomprehensible to me. I think there is a very serious charge here that has to be abrogated by the minister. I think it is up to him now, not next week or next month, to stand up like a man, face his peers, and make his accusations.

Mr. Knowles: Six o'clock.

Mr. Nugent: Mr. Speaker, after listening to the hon. members for Villeneuve (Mr. Caouette) and Red Deer (Mr. Thompson) today, I do feel that members in this house perhaps were not listening very well when we had what I thought was a very good contribution to the debate from the hon. member for Regina City. Certainly, he gave us a complete rebuttal to the suggestion of the Prime Minister and the Minister of Public Works when they tried to tell the house that the inquiry is the answer.

I point out also to the hon. member for Burnaby-Coquitlam that he would not be so eager to hear about an inquiry if he had listened to the hon. member for Regina City. I believe there is more than one point of privilege in this case. I can well understand the minister wanting to investigate his own charge that the Leader of the Opposition, when Prime Minister, was guilty of improperly handling a case. Certainly, that is an allegation against one man, and the sort of thing, I suppose, which, if taken seriously, would be a proper subject for a board of inquiry. However, we also have the allegations that members of this house were involved. This is the question of privilege with which we have been dealing.

I have thought, Mr. Speaker, throughout the debate that perhaps the question of an inquiry was out of order really. What this house must deal with, and what we have been trying to deal with, is a question of privilege. It is true that two or three motions which we have presented have been ruled out of order. I had one more ready, but my colleagues advised me it was much the same as the others, and likely would be out of order too.

Merely because we are having a little procedural difficulty in finding the right motion to deal with the matter does not make it any less necessary for the house to deal with the question of privilege. I submit that the house now, if it wished to vote for the inquiry which the Prime Minister is talking about, would still be left with this question of

privilege on its hands. There is not one member in this house who can stand up and say it is not important. Certainly, the type of allegation made against these Privy Councillors is most serious. It is most improper, I submit, for the minister to make this charge.

The action and the attitude of the Liberal party in connection with these charges is most unjust. I am certain, if I were to make a suggestion that adultery had been committed by members of the Liberal party, and there was some outcry about it, some of the members opposite would not think an inquiry before which all the members would have to appear would be the right way to solve the problem.

However, apparently they have gone along with the Minister of Justice and his method of handling this matter. The Minister makes charges against hon. members here. When there is a legitimate complaint about those charges and we say substantiate them, the attitude of hon. members opposite is, let us inquire and find out. I would suggest to hon. members that they honestly and sincerely think about that. I suggest there are two separate questions. This inquiry into the handling of the matter is one thing, but the allegations and imputations against the persons and reputations of members in this house is a separate and distinct matter.

I invite the Prime Minister to get up and suggest to the house, since he appears to be so willing to have an inquiry, how he would handle the privilege part of this question. I really am a little amazed that this government is now so willing, anxious, and in such a hurry to investigate. I suppose they are anxious because of the security risk involved. The Minister of Justice sits there saying nothing. The indication is that he heard about the case two or three years ago, perhaps somewhat vaguely involving security risks, and he now brings it forward in this nebulous manner.

Mr. Speaker, obviously there is a question of privilege for the whole house involved in the manner in which the Minister of Justice carries out his duty in connection with questions of security in this country. If there is a security risk involved, and if the minister has had this information for two or three years, I suggest he should resign for being so delinquent in his duty that he did not bring it forward before this time. There has not been one reason put forward by the Prime Minister or by the Minister of Justice in respect of why the minister brings it forward now, and only now. If it was so serious, why let it lie quiet all this time? Could we have an answer to that?

It appears that this minister and the party over there are taking the attitude which I thought I had illustrated so well when I mentioned that were I or someone to make an allegation that someone over there was an adulterer, the best way to investigate this allegation would be to bring in every one in the party before a board of inquiry to ascertain the facts.

An hon. Member: Six o'clock.

At six o'clock the house adjourned, without question put, pursuant to standing order.

HOUSE OF COMMONS

Monday, March 14, 1966

The house met at 2.30 p.m.

ADMINISTRATION OF JUSTICE

MUNSINGER CASE—ANNOUNCEMENT OF JUDICIAL INQUIRY AND STATEMENTS BY MEMBERS

Right Hon. L. B. Pearson (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, on Thursday and Friday last, during the discussion on certain aspects of what has come to be known as the Munsinger case, I announced the willingness, indeed the desire of the government to set up a judicial inquiry which would go into this case, into the statements that had been made concerning it, into the allegations that had been made.

I did so believing this would be the best way to deal with this matter, and the house will recall that there was a good deal of support for this idea in principle. There was also strong opposition advanced to it in certain quarters. Those, Mr. Speaker, who supported this procedure as the best way to deal with this matter made as a qualification or a reservation to their support that the terms of reference of any order in council setting up a judicial inquiry should be wide enough to deal with all relevant aspects of the situation.

• (2:40 p.m.)

It also was urged that we should proceed as quickly as possible to deal with this matter, if the commission was to be set up. I can say, Mr. Speaker, that we have dealt with this matter as quickly as possible, that an order in council has been agreed on and I hope it can be tabled during the afternoon. We shall institute a judicial inquiry into the statements that have been made, and they are given in considerable detail in the order in council. I think they cover all the relevant facts, and I believe they meet the points which have been made by hon. gentlemen opposite, that the inquiry must be comprehensive. The inquiry, Mr. Speaker, will be conducted by Mr. Justice Spence of the Supreme Court of Canada.

Mr. Speaker, if I may say one word more, that we are in an unhappy and distressing situation was made apparent by some of the very moving speeches made last Thursday and Friday. Indeed I think it is accurate to say we are in a frightening position so far as parliament is concerned.

Mr. Speaker, this is no sudden development; it is the culmination, I believe, of a long period of sessions of this house carried on in an atmosphere of extreme partisanship, and at times of bitterness and tension or suspicion. This has been all the more difficult to change for the better because of a parliamentary situation where no party has had majority after three elections in four years—

An hon. Member: That has nothing to do with it.

Mr. Pearson: —and because of a national situation where forces of regionalism, nationalism and division, which were bound to make more difficult the position of any central government, have been strong in this country. Mr. Speaker, I make no attempt to assess the blame for this situation; but I state as solemnly as I can that if we cannot in this house do something effective, and do it well, to change an atmosphere and attitude which disgraces parliament and demeans democracy, we all will have betrayed the trust and hopes of those who sent us here.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Pearson: This parliamentary deterioration over the years has taken place at a time when our country, as it approaches the centennial anniversary which should be a time for pride and thanksgiving, is faced with less of confidence than anxiety, with social, constitutional, racial and economic problems of a difficulty and complexity unequalled in our history.

Mr. Speaker, I can only plead that we show our awareness of this by a new resolve to face up to our duties as parliamentarians and as Canadians, constructively and generously, by dealing now with the important matters that must be decided in this session of parliament, so we can serve the people of our country who have sent us here for that purpose, and for that purpose alone.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Hon. George Hees (Northumberland): Mr. Speaker, I rise on a question of personal privilege. On several occasions in the last ten days I have publicly stated that I did not

know a person by the name of Olga Munsinger. A person by that name is now reported to have said that she lunched with me twice, seven or eight years ago. She may well be right. Although I still do not recall knowing any person by that name, I have examined the pictures of that person in the Saturday newspapers and I believe I recognize the woman pictured there. I make this statement, Mr. Speaker, to prevent anyone from being misled by my previous statements, made without the benefit of information now available.

Mr. Speaker, I should like to make a further point abundantly clear. The real and only issue which arises from the charges made last week by the Minister of Justice both inside and outside this house, is the security of the nation. That is the overriding consideration, and I hasten to assure the house that at no time has my personal conduct jeopardized security. I defy the Prime Minister and the Minister of Justice to say that I ever did anything to jeopardize or affect the security of my country. I challenge them now to stand up and say that I did.

Subject always to the nation's security and welfare, who my acquaintances are or may have been, or who the acquaintances of any hon. member of this house are or may have been is not a public issue. Mr. Speaker, Canadians everywhere have viewed the recent debate in this house with grave concern. I hope this statement will assist in restoring public respect for and confidence in this house and its members.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

• (2:50 p.m.)

Hon. E. D. Fulton (Kamloops): Mr. Speaker, as has just been said, this parliament is at a crisis, a crisis which calls upon all its members to think first of the institution and not of their personal or partisan position. This I intend to be the guiding principle in what I have to say this afternoon. But I have some things to say which I think the house is entitled to hear and which may cast some light upon the situation, light which will help us to sort our way out of the situation on the one hand and avoid falling into such situations again on the other.

With the principles as stated by the Prime Minister a moment ago as to the position of parliament, I fully agree. With the approach stated a moment ago by my colleague the hon. member for Northumberland, we all agree. But it must be said, sir—I shall return to that theme at the close of my remarks—that one could have wished the Prime Minister had not given such belated recognition to that principle.

It must be said also that the situation in which we find ourselves today is clearly and entirely the result of its having been brought on deliberately, and by the deliberate policy and course of this government over the past week or 10 days. In some of the remarks I have to make I find myself in a distasteful position because they reflect upon the office of the Minister of Justice; but it is inevitable that the matter be put in its proper context. They reflect also upon the Prime Minister and his conduct; because not only, I assure you, do I realize that the government have placed themselves on trial but they have placed parliament on trial, and they have brought us close to the ruin of this institution.

What is happening? What are we seeing in the attempt that has been made and the attempt that it appears is still being made? I suggest to you, sir, that we are seeing something attempted which we have never seen before in the history of any major, successful democracy; a witch hunt against former governments and their leaders, a witch hunt which might be acceptable on the basis of some form of tribal rite but which one would have hoped was below and behind the stage to which this country of Canada has progressed; a witch hunt carried out on the basis of security matters.

Challenges have been hurled across the floor of this house: "If you don't be quiet about the matter you are speaking of now, I will expose the files." Sir, who can this help? It can help only the enemies of the state. It can only do damage to parliament and to the parties involved, who should be here on the basis of their desire to serve the state.

We see a witch hunt on the basis of evidence slim and shoddy. What is being asked but the trial of a former Prime Minister; "open up the files. Expose everything you can find and we will put him on trial and we will get him." That is what they said over there, and said deliberately and not accidentally; "Put him on trial, not in parliament. Put on trial all those who were members of the former government. Not in parliament, no. We will not answer in parliament, where charges should be substantiated. We will not even make the charges in parliament. We make them outside and then we put them on trial in another forum even while parliament

is sitting. We will not allow them to know what the charges are here. We will not allow them to see the files and the records upon which, if there is any basis, these charges must be based."

Sir, I find it difficult to find words to describe what has been attempted. This invitation for the next government elected, when we are that government, to hunt through the files to see whether we can find anything embarrassing to members of the former government, will be rejected by us. Who of us would be so conceited as to say that there could never be found anything to embarrass us? But democratic government will not work on that basis. As I say, if this course is persisted in we are facing the ruination of our system and of this institution.

Now, Mr. Speaker, what are the allegations that have been made? They involve the privileges especially of members of the former government, though of all members of the house. Are they allegations which are being made in the heat of the moment? Or are they being made as the result of a deliberate decision backed up by the whole government, and backed up with the authority of the Prime Minister? They are in that second category. The practice which is now being followed constitutes an invitation to reply to the threat, now being implemented, by saying that we will tell all we know. Sir, we will not. We will not follow this tactic. However, let me remind the Prime Minister that when we assumed office there were plenty of security files. Let me remind the Prime Minister that never once did we mention them, and we do not intend to do so now.

Mention of the Munsinger case by name was first made in this house on March 4 by the present Minister of Justice. Even then he used the wrong name. That mention, sir, was not accidental. It was not done in the heat of the moment as the result of a sudden provocation. All along a deliberate course has been followed, the background to which was revealed by the Prime Minister on Friday when he clearly proved that the government had long ago decided they were going, to paraphrase his words, "to teach the opposition a lesson no matter how disastrous the consequences".

Mr. Pearson: When did I say that? Would the hon. gentleman quote my words in that respect?

Mr. Fulton: Yes, Mr. Speaker. The words about provocation are to be found at page 2547 of *Hansard* for March 11. I have them before me. The Prime Minister said:

> I have before me a great many clippings of statements made by members opposite about cleaning up the mess, prosecuting wrongdoers and international crime getting into the office of the Prime Minister—all that kind of thing. Were names named then? Of course they were not. We have been subjected to this kind of treatment now, for too long over here. And reputations have been ruined over here.

Then he went on:

> Now those gentlemen on the other side of the house who have been so free with their accusations over the last few years are getting a little of it, and they don't like it.

Now, sir, I would ask whether words could more clearly establish that this course was deliberately embarked upon and that it had the approbation and support of the Prime Minister. Nothing, sir, could more clearly prove that accusation than the words he uttered on that occasion. Of course it has been deliberate.

It has been mentioned outside, and I will mention it here, that some eight days before, when the case was first mentioned on Friday, March 4 by the Minister of Justice, I was asked to go to the office of the President of the Privy Council to discuss the matter of the Spencer case. In the course of the conversation that ensued I was told in effect that if we persisted in discussing the Spencer case, and persisted in the course of asking for a judicial inquiry, members on that side of the house—on the government side would feel impelled to name the Munsinger case.

• (3:00 p.m.)

Some hon. Members: Shame.

Mr. Fulton: I said to him at that time that members of the government must accept responsibility for their own actions, and we would accept responsibility for our present and previous actions. I said at that time, "Surely this sort of thing must and should be ended by your following the proper course, the course of appointing a judicial inquiry to remove the cloud that hangs over the head of your own Minister of Justice, of whom it has been said by Mr. Spencer that the Minister of Justice, did not dare to prosecute because if he did, heads would roll."

I invited the President of the Privy Council to end the kind of discussion that had been going on—to end it and to end the possibility of this name-calling process by appointing a judicial inquiry that would end the discussion and remove the cloud. That, sir, was not done. The debate continued, and was followed up with the naming of the case in this

house by the Minister of Justice some eight days later.

I was invited to convey this information to my leader, the Leader of the Opposition. I did not do so for eight days, and I did not do so as a result of a deliberate decision, a decision that I would not be a purveyor of threats of that kind.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Fulton: I did not mention the matter to the Leader of the Opposition, until the morning of Friday, March 4. I told him then that because of the course the debate on the Spencer case was taking, and because of the mention of myself, in the position I had formerly occupied, I felt that I, too, must enter into the debate, that there were certain things that should be said. I told him then that I felt if the debate was to continue there was a possibility that the Munsinger case would be mentioned. But I also said that I felt the Spencer debate should continue; and if it did, we had nothing to be ashamed of.

The Leader of the Opposition agreed with me. The debate continued. The case was mentioned. After the case had been mentioned I then identified to the Leader of the Opposition personally the cabinet minister who had uttered the threat.

Now, sir, on that basis and on the basis of the fact that even after that, when the Spencer case was disposed of on the basis that it would be referred to a judicial commission of inquiry as we had been asking, one would have thought that matters would resume an even keel. We all thought and we all hoped that the atmosphere would be such that this parliament could carry out the business which it has met here to accomplish.

Instead of that, on Thursday or Wednesday of last week—

An hon. Member: Thursday.

Mr. Fulton: —the Minister of Justice resurrected the whole matter and went far beyond that situation by giving a press conference. The press conference was on Thursday of last week. Sir, press conferences do not take place by accident. They are arranged. There is some suggestion that the Prime Minister did not know about it and was astounded and appalled, but he has adopted it. He has adopted it and is backing up the tactics of his Minister of Justice, tactics which are bringing this parliament to the verge of ruin. And what is more important, sir, the Prime Minister in fact brought the matter to the level of partisan politics and issued a challenge to the opposition, as reported in *Hansard*, page 2547, to make the matter of the Munsinger case and the government's handling of this situation the subject matter of a vote of non-confidence on the supply motion that was to have come in today. The Prime Minister therefore has so far adopted and approved of everything that has been done in this connection on that side that he has invited us to make it the subject of a motion of non-confidence.

Sir, I am not going to attempt any prediction of what will be the outcome of that challenge, or of the supply motion when it comes. I think, however, I can properly say, as the Leader of the Opposition said and as I have said also in connection with the threat of exposure, the so-called threat of exposure, that this party does not succumb to threats of blackmail of that kind.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Fulton: We are not going to be trapped or forced or pushed in any way into any improper course by the threat the Prime Minister held out when he spoke of making this the subject matter of a vote of non-confidence. We are going to follow a course, a responsible course, of declining the temptation to reply in the same tactics. We are going to follow the responsible course of doing everything we can, faced though we are with a government whose tactics have deprived it of the respect of the members of the house, to make parliament work.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Fulton: Now, sir, what are the allegations that have been made. I have not seen the proposed terms of reference for the judicial inquiry into the Munsinger case. I do not know whether they will be satisfactory or not, if a judicial inquiry is to be set up at all. However, the fact of the matter is that allegations have been made and discussed in this house. In my view it is doubtful if the damage can be repaired simply by referring the matter to a judicial inquiry.

The Minister of Justice has alleged a breach of security in connection with the Munsinger case, a case in which I was involved, a case handled by the government of which I had the honour to be a member, and he has alleged breach of security in such a way as to place all former members of that government under suspicion, and to place myself as former minister of justice in a

position where, by inference, I have been careless and have been party to carelessness and mishandling of a security case.

I have read carefully the press reports of the press conference, and what the Minister of Justice has said since, mostly outside this house. I do not think anyone would disagree with me when I say that a careful examination of these reports establishes what his allegations are, what his insinuations are, and therefore establishes clearly and precisely what it is that he must prove in order to substantiate these charges.

I want to summarize the proof that he is called upon to give in order to substantiate these charges, and then deal with the file and the facts in order to show that he is completely incapable of substantiating any of them. Here is what he has to prove, sir. First, that "two or more ministers" were improperly involved with Mrs. Munsinger and that their actions in that involvement had been such as to be "definitely" a security risk to Canada.

Second, he must prove that the file turned over to the Minister of Justice by the R.C.M. Police in 1961 was "a bona fide security case".

Third, he must prove that a breach of the national security or some other offence was indicated in the file, thereby imposing a duty on the Minister of Justice to refer the file to the legal advisers in the Department of Justice.

Fourth, he must prove that Mrs. Munsinger was known to have been employed and to have been active in espionage work before coming to Canada.

• (3:10 p.m.)

Those are the things he has to prove with respect to the general allegations. I shall deal a little later with the proof he must bring with respect to his allegation against the Leader of the Opposition.

I shall deal now with the file and the facts as established by the file. I have asked to see the file—to see the file as it was when I dealt with it. This has been refused.

Some hon. Members: Shame.

Mr. Fulton: I would think, sir, the house is entitled to know the contents and the terms of the telegram which I sent to the Prime Minister on March 11 of this year. I was out in Kamloops at the time. The telegram is from Kamloops, addressed to Right Hon. Lester B. Pearson, Prime Minister of Canada, Ottawa, Ontario. The text is as follows:

> In the course of his comments on the Munsinger case your Justice Minister made certain statements and raised inferences which do not accord with my recollection of the facts. He admitted he has not seen the file. In the light of what he has said and what has developed I will necessarily be discussing the matter in the House of Commons on my return to Ottawa. I intend to keep my remarks within the confines both of the facts and of what it is proper to say in connection with such a matter. In order that what I say will be based upon an immediate review and not upon recollection of events and documents last seen some years ago I make formal demand that the R.C.M.P. file in the Munsinger case be made available to me. In making this demand let me remind you, first, that I am asking only for the opportunity to review documents which were before me when I was minister of justice; second, that I do not ask to see anything that may have been recorded between your advisers and the present government and, third, that as a Privy Councillor and subject to the oath taken in that office I am entitled to see documents and reports with which I was dealing when minister of justice. I shall be in touch with you immediately upon my return to arrange the details of time and place where I may review the file. I am sending an information copy of this telegram to your colleagues, the Minister of Justice and the Solicitor General, and in view of the publicity resulting from Mr. Cardin's press conference am also releasing a copy immediately to the press.

Now, sir, it will be appreciated that in making that demand I made it clear that I did not want to see anything on the file beyond what was there when I was dealing with it. I do not want to see anything that may have been placed on it by way of either advice or comment to the present government. Second, I was not asking for the file to be produced in public. I was merely asking for the right to review it myself. Third, I made it clear that in so doing and in my subsequent discussion thereof I would, of course, be bound by my oath as a Privy Councillor.

That request, sir, was refused in terms of a letter which I received at 1.50 p.m. today from the Prime Minister, dated Ottawa, March 14, 1966 and reading:

> Dear Mr. Fulton:
>
> Your telegram of March 11th concerning the Munsinger case was received in my office on Saturday morning and I have since given it most careful consideration.
>
> The files on the Munsinger case will, of course, be placed before the judicial commission that it is proposed to establish. It will be the responsibility of the commission to determine what measures should be taken to ensure fair treatment for all parties concerned, while at the same time protecting information that is classified and of a sensitive nature.

So, sir, this reasonable request that I be allowed access to the file so that I might speak from a recent, immediate review instead of a recollection of five years ago, is refused with no adequate reason assigned.

Some hon. Members: Shame.

Mr. Fulton: Of course if there is a judicial commission the file must go to it, but allowing me to inspect it for the matter of an hour is not going to interfere with that. The only inference to be drawn from the facts is that it is all right for the Minister of Justice to make charges and accusations and innuendos without ever looking at the file, but it is not all right for the member of the opposition most immediately involved in this aspect of the case to look at the file before he replies. We are not to see it. The only inference to be drawn, and I do draw it, sir, is the inference that the file, the facts contained on the file and the facts surrounding the file refute the charges made by the Minister of Justice, and the government opposite know it.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Fulton: I suggest, sir, that the course followed by the Prime Minister in that refusal is the course of a man deficient in courtesy and courage.

Mr. Pearson: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the hon. member would permit a question. Would he think it would be proper for me to use information gained from this file in support of any statements I might wish to make in the house concerning this matter?

Mr. Fulton: Mr. Speaker, I would expect, but apparently it is too much to expect, that the Prime Minister or any one undertaking to make statements about the Munsinger case would look at the file before he did so, so he would know whether his statements are accurate or not.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Fulton: I am not, of course, suggesting that facts which it is improper to reveal and information it is improper to give be given, but we are entitled to discuss this file and see what it establishes within the realm of protection of police procedures. This I am denied. I hope the Prime Minister has seen the file. Obviously the Minister of Justice has not although he, as Minister of Justice, had the full right and authority to call for that file at any time, and should have done so before he made these statements.

[Mr. Fulton.]

It is a sorry situation, sir, when we have it now revealed by the attitude and the words of the Prime Minister that they prefer to make charges based on ignorance, and to smear reputations without examining documents rather than take the normal precaution of seeing whether there is any foundation in fact for what they are saying.

I am, then, in the position, sir, where I have not been able to review the file as I would like to, but nevertheless I am clear in my recollection of certain salient points and, within the limits of what it is proper for me to disclose, I intend to state what I recall of the report and the circumstances under which it came before me.

My recollection establishes that the Minister of Justice cannot substantiate his charges and cannot prove things that he is called upon to prove. My statements are made on the basis of my recollection of a report which I have seen. The minister made his statements without ever having seen the file.

The report before me in 1961, on the basis of my recollection, contained no suggestion that there had been any breach of security. It did not suggest that any security information had been sought by Mrs. Munsinger or conveyed to her. It did not allege or suggest that any offence had been committed in connection with security or any other field within federal responsibility. It did not allege or suggest any offence by any member of the federal government.

It did not state that Mrs. Munsinger was or had been engaged in espionage activities. It did not allege or suggest that she had cultivated the acquaintance of anyone with a view to obtaining security information. It did not state that she was employed by any embassy, nor was she so employed.

The activities which led to the compiling of the report which came to me had not originated as the result of any concern with security. The police had not been investigating Mrs. Munsinger with respect to security. They knew of her in other connections and checked on her from time to time in that respect. It was as a result of one of those checks that the report in question arose. It did not suggest that any person in the federal government was involved in those other areas or connections. I repeat, it did not suggest that any offence had been committed by any member of the federal government.

• (3:20 p.m.)

With respect to the question of whether Mrs. Munsinger was ever engaged in espionage activities, I have said that my recollection of the file is that there was no such allegation. Certainly she never spied in Canada. I, of course, cannot prove of my own knowledge that she never spied before, but I can refer to press reports of investigations made since the Munsinger case came before the public. I refer to the Toronto *Telegram* of March 12 this year, page 19, which reads as follows:

Justice Minister Lucien Cardin said Thursday that Gerda Munsinger "had at one time been employed and worked in espionage work."

However official sources in Germany, the United States and Canada do not confirm this.

From Washington, Gordon Donaldson reports:

"Neither the CIA nor FBI would say they had any record of espionage involving Mrs. Munsinger."

From Bonn Alfred Schroeder cabled:

"German Central Counter Intelligence Agency does not have Munsinger record. They are emphatic that if Munsinger was engaged in espionage and later left Canada the German agency would have received advice from Canadian authorities if she returned to West Germany."

And this, to the consternation of the Minister of Justice who said she had died, is where she turned up.

From Ottawa, Ron Collister reports:

"The R.C.M.P. refuse to confirm that Mrs. Munsinger was a security risk nor will they even discuss the case—

Quite proper under the circumstances.

"However, Mrs. Munsinger was not considered a security case when she arrived in Canada in 1955 or she would not have been allowed to enter the country."

Now, sir, that is the statement of the facts based upon my recollection of the file, and it refutes absolutely the charges and innuendos with regard to security and the existence of any evidence of any offence so carelessly thrown out by the Minister of Justice. It is clear, then, that there being no breach of security or other offence reported upon or suggested, there was no obligation, occasion or common sense in my referring the report to the legal advisers in the Department of Justice for an opinion.

I may say, sir, that in any other case where it was proper to do so, whether or not the report included names of those near the government, I invariably did refer them for an official legal opinion and advice. But these were cases where offences existed or were alleged. That was not the case here.

Having concluded, as he obviously did, that he was and is unable to substantiate the slanderous security aspects of his charges, the Minister of Justice then sought to reduce the count. By his letter to the Prime Minister, read into *Hansard* by that gentleman, by the Prime Minister, on Friday last, he tries to confine the poison to an allegation that the Leader of the Opposition was guilty of improper conduct when Prime Minister in that he failed to lay the file on the case before the legal advisers in the Department of Justice for their advice and that this constituted mishandling of the case. He concluded his letter by saying:

"I have made and make no other charges."

Sir, that last sentence is just not true. His other charges stand, they have not been withdrawn nor has an apology been tendered for them, and he is convicted by his inability to prove them. But what are the charges now levelled against the Leader of the Opposition? I have given the reasons why it was not necessary, indeed was not appropriate, for me to refer the matter to the department. What possible reason was there for the then Prime Minister to do so? No offence was charged or suggested in the report. Was the Prime Minister under any possible obligation to ask the legal advisers to comment upon a report not involving any legal issue? I should think that responsible civil servants—this is the only kind we have in the Department of Justice, and I should think they are sick at heart right now as a result of the conduct of this minister and this government—would properly resent being asked to pry gratuitously into private lives.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Fulton: We can leave that sort of thing to the present Minister of Justice, who prefers to do it publicly and invites parliament —well, I say no more there.

Sir, that is the factual statement I wished to make to this house so far as my recollection of the file and the circumstances surrounding it are concerned. What is the situation with which we are left? Well, unless the minister withdraws and apologizes, then of course we are left with his allegations on the one hand and mine on the other. I have no hesitancy or fear with regard to what any examination of the file will establish in respect of the fairness or accuracy of my recollection.

There is one other thing I think I should say with regard to the file which I believe I omitted, and that is in respect of photographs. I have said that the aspects about the file which I have placed on the record I recall clearly. I do not recall any mention of photographs. If there were any I did not see them, nor was it suggested I should see them. I did not show any photographs to nor discuss photographs with any other person.

Now, Mr. Speaker, we are left in the position where the government has decided to set up a judicial inquiry. The judicial inquiry, I suggest, will be left—unless the minister apologizes—to examine the truth or otherwise about the minister's allegation with regard to two or more privy councillors and Mrs. Munsinger. It will also examine the truth or otherwise of the minister's accusation that the case was mishandled by the then Prime Minister, and will establish the accuracy of all the other specifications in the charges made by the minister.

But no judicial inquiry can do anything to repair the damage that has been done to parliament this past week. An anxious and worried country wants to see, and is entitled to demand, that parliament get on with the pressing business of the country. To do so, we have to restore to this house an atmosphere of reason.

I dislike quoting myself, but two years ago when I spoke on the subject of "Getting Things Done In Parliament" I said this:

> If parliament is to get things done, there is required, I believe, an atmosphere, a certain mental disposition on the part of parliamentarians and their leaders. This mental disposition will recognize that the institution will work only if there is mutual respect, and hardly at all if there is mutual contempt. The Canadian parliament has on occasion risen to great heights. Most of the time, despite the temptations and the frailties to which all humans and therefore all human institutions are subject, it has carried on the business of the country in a way that has done real credit to it and to Canada.

There will always be controversy in this house, sometimes heated controversy, and this is as it should be; but the ugly atmosphere which was created in this parliament last week must be purged if the effectiveness of the institution is to be restored. How is this to be done? The Minister of Justice has a great opportunity to act as the catalyst to restore such an atmosphere and to perform a service to the institution and the country. He can do so by resigning his office now.

In dealing with this question I am reminded of a statement by Walter Lippmann which I take the liberty of quoting:

> "—though public officials are selected by the voters, or are appointed by men who are elected, they owe their primary allegiance not to the opinions of the voters but to the law, to the criteria of their professions, to the integrity of the arts and sciences in which they work, to their own conscientious and responsible convictions of their duty within the rules and the frame of reference they have sworn to respect."

• (3:30 p.m.)

In other words the primary duty of an office holder is to the office he holds. I cannot see how the Minister of Justice can claim to have any respect for the office he holds in view of what he has done to it.

So far, he has made a blanket accusation of immorality and of a possible breach of security against two or more former ministers whom he refuses to identify, thereby placing a whole group of hon. men and hon. members under the shadow of suspicion. He steadfastly refuses to identify the men he has in mind, or to substantiate his charges. In such an atmosphere parliament cannot work effectively, no matter how many judicial inquiries may be appointed.

For the good of parliament, and to enable this institution to get on with its work in an atmosphere that is cleansed of the bitterness of the past week, the minister should now prove his willingness to put his personal feelings aside and resign his office.

In resigning he can add to his own stature and restore some of the stature that parliament has lost as a result of his conduct; and at the same time—and I say this because I feel very deeply indeed about the position of responsibility of the Minister of Justice—the Prime Minister should dissociate himself and the government from the conduct that has taken place during the past week.

I suggest that if the minister will not resign the Prime Minister should dismiss him from the cabinet. If the Prime Minister cannot bring himself to do this then I suggest—Mr. Speaker, I think the inference of what I have to say is obvious, and in order not to do anything further to exacerbate opinions here I will leave it to the Prime Minister to get the message I am implying.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

[*Translation*]

Hon. Guy Favreau (President of the Privy Council): Mr. Speaker, under the circumstances and in view of the days I spent in the

house, in a certain atmosphere, I would have preferred not to be called upon to take part in this debate. Unfortunately, a short while ago, the hon. member for Kamloops (Mr. Fulton), former Minister of Justice, dragged my name into the debate in a way which compels me to set the record straight and clear up any doubt with regard to the circumstances under which the Munsinger file was mentioned in the house by the Minister of Justice (Mr. Cardin).

I must say right away that, when the Minister of Justice challenged the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Diefenbaker) to put on the record in detail the way he handled the Munsinger affair, the atmosphere in the house then was such that the minister did so under such provocation that, under the circumstances, it was not humanly possible for him to hold back.

And the Minister of Justice cannot be blamed for having done so in the circumstances.

I was surprised this morning, and shocked also, in view of the past relationship which existed between the former Minister of Justice and myself, in view of the memories I still have about the years I had the pleasure of working with him; I must say that I was shocked to read in a newspaper this morning that he had allegedly stated, in Vancouver I think, that in the course of a conversation I had with him, I had tried to blackmail him and members of the official opposition.

I must say at this point that this is not true and that I never threatened the former Minister of Justice to drop the name Munsinger in Parliament if the manoeuvring and discussions surrounding the Spencer case did not stop.

It is true, Mr. Speaker, and I am not afraid to say it—I think that it is all to my credit to have done so—it is true that I suggested to the hon. member for Kamloops that we should have a conversation about the Spencer case. It is true and it took place about two weeks ago, as he said in his statement.

On the other hand, the circumstances which led me to do that are not those he indicated and it is the first time, I think, that I hear the hon. member for Kamloops speak in a manner that is reminiscent of the one sometimes used by an hon. member opposite.

I said at the beginning of our conversation—and that is one of the reasons why I was shocked and surprised—that, excluding the Leader of the Opposition, whom I did not want to see, he probably was the only member of the house with whom I could, as a member of the Privy Council—and I told him so very clearly, speak frankly.

He did not refuse to see me. In the circumstances, at no time did he ask that the discussion we were having be held any other way than under the seal of secrecy of the Privy Council.

This morning, I learned that he decided to betray the secret and make public, not the substance of our conversation, but the fact that we had had one. Substantially, my only comments were as follows, and here I shall say it in English:

[*English*]

"I want to see you to appeal to your sense of fairness and of justice."

[*Translation*]

I told him that himself, as former Minister of Justice, and the Leader of the Opposition, when he was Prime Minister of Canada, must have realized how difficult at times and fraught with responsibilities and consequences were the decisions a Minister of Justice and a Prime Minister had often to make about records involving the security of the state.

I reminded him that in the Spencer case, as in others, the good faith and the judgment of the Minister of Justice and the government had to be relied on with regard to the decisions called for.

I told him, it is true, to keep in mind that the Spencer case, in which the Leader of the Opposition seemed bent on destroying the Minister of Justice, was insignificant compared to other records with which himself and the former Prime Minister had to deal, among others, the Munsinger case. It is actually true. But there never was any question of revealing the record.

It is being suggested this afternoon that there was some kind of a plot or agreement between the present Minister of Justice and myself so that I should threaten the former Minister of Justice. I say once again that this is untrue.

I said that the opposition can attack the Minister of Justice by creating confusion as has often been done when we were held responsible for the St. Gilles murders, as it was almost done at a given time against the government.

But I said that to use a security case in an attempt to destroy a Minister of Justice was

extremely unfair and I reminded him that I was appealing to his sense of fairness to try and convince the Leader of the Opposition, if he deemed advisable not to resort to this type of tactics. But never, never was there any question of making public the Munsinger file. And then, I suggested an appeal also to the sense of justice of the Leader of the Opposition.

His last words—I remember that the door of my office was already ajar—were these:

• (3:40 p.m.)

[*English*]

"I'll talk to him if it can help."

[*Translation*]

He apparently did not feel the Leader of the Opposition could be convinced by an appeal to his sense and spirit of justice.

Mr. Speaker, when two contradictory versions of certain facts are given, other facts outside the conversations must be checked in order to determine which of the two accounts of such a conversation is in accordance with the facts.

The first thing I wish to say is that there was so little agreement, understanding or consultation between the present Minister of Justice and myself to bring about the conversation I had with the member for Kamloops, that the Minister of Justice was not informed that I wanted to have this conversation and I state before this house that he was still unaware of it on the very day the present Minister of Justice, under pressure from the Leader of the Opposition, said in the house—it was eight or ten days later, I think—that he called on the Leader of the Opposition to put on record his own handling of the Munsinger affair.

On that day, the Minister of Justice was not aware of the conversation I had had with the member for Kamloops. If that amounts to an attempt at blackmail, say there must be a lot of it, but not in this case.

Now, I have no wish to rehash the past, but I think that had I wished to use for blackmail the Munsinger affair, which seems to frighten so much the official opposition, I would have done so in other circumstances, a year and four months ago, when for a month I was crucified by the Leader of the Opposition and the member from the Yukon. It would have been easy, then, had I wished to use blackmail. And when would I have used it? Possibly before, possibly during and after the Dorion inquiry, had it been in my character either to seek vengeance or to blackmail the opponents, on the basis of facts I was aware of, for I was aware of them at the time.

Well, that is when I would have done it and I think, Mr. Speaker, it will be recognized that, in the first place, there were no discussions between the present Minister of Justice and myself concerning the conversation I intended to have with the hon. member for Kamloops and that, before this day, I never mentioned it. And I dare any member of the opposition to say that I might have mentioned it. Never did I refer to the Munsinger case and the truth is that when I saw the hon. member for Kamloops, it was, as I said before, to appeal to his sense of justice, in which I always believed until this afternoon, when he publicly distorted our conversation.

My intention was to speak to him as a member of the Privy Council. That was, in my opinion, another proof of the confidence which, as he knows, I never stopped having in him.

It was another proof of that feeling of loyalty which I had always kept for him, since I had left the Department of Justice, a loyalty which as a matter of fact brought upon me certain remarks from politicians who felt that I was making too many favourable comments about my old boss, the former Minister of Justice, the hon. member for Kamloops.

That being said, Mr. Speaker, I shall not let myself be dragged into a discussion on the merits of the case. The government's conscience in that regard is clear. I belong to a government which decided that a judicial inquiry would be held. The Prime Minister had just announced the institution of such an inquiry.

In fact, he has just announced the appointment of a prominent judge of the Supreme Court of Canada as chairman of this commission. In the circumstances, I am duty bound not to refer to the merits of the file, but, I repeat, I wished to correct the impression which may have been given, and I wish to tell the house again that I have never, but never, threatened the member for Kamloops. I repeat, I merely appealed to his sense of fairness.

[*English*]

Right Hon. J. G. Diefenbaker (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, I do not rise

for the purpose of going into detail in connection with this matter. This afternoon we have seen parliament at its best in the speech delivered by the former Minister of Justice.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Diefenbaker: In careful, measured tones the hon. member for Kamloops (Mr. Fulton) placed the facts before this house and the country. It is not for me, after almost 26 years in this chamber, to apologize for any action taken during the period I was Prime Minister or at any other time.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Diefenbaker: I love this institution and every thing it stands for. In the course of debate we often say things that in the light of subsequent events we might not have said. Those are the spontaneous ejaculations of strong men having strong opinions and I have never objected to that at any time. I, however, have had the experience that was had by Arthur Meighen and R. B. Bennett, who made it possible for the Prime Minister (Mr. Pearson) to be what he is today, and George Drew—

• (3:50 p.m.)

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh.

Mr. Diefenbaker: Oh, the Prime Minister was one of those who stood about the Bennett throne and received appointments. I have had their experience in campaigns of malice and destruction. Does, the Prime Minister (Mr. Pearson) say to me that when a Prime Minister finds any shortcomings amongst his ministers which are not offences against the state, he should turn the file over to the Department of Justice? This is not the way parliament works. We have had the answer today. The file has not been made available to the hon. member for Kamloops. Why did the Prime Minister not deliver it to a Privy Councillor, a Privy Councillor who had the responsibility for the Department of Justice and who says security was not violated?

However, these facts have been bandied about. The President of the Privy Council (Mr. Favreau) says that he knew about this a year and a half ago. If there was any offence against security, why was not something done? The other day, when the present Minister of Justice (Mr. Cardin) was speaking, he received from the President of the Privy Council a suggestion about the Munsinger case. I saw him turn and heard him say, tell him about that. Oh, yes, I did.

Mr. Favreau: That is not true.

Mr. Diefenbaker: I saw him and I heard him. On several occasions this sword of Damocles was held over my head. Then, I should like to contrast the attitude of the hon. member for Kamloops (Mr. Fulton), the former Minister of Justice with the attitude of the President of the Privy Council. You cannot build parliament that way. There has been a continuous course of attempting to expose and discredit me in a personal capacity, and when I say that I speak with the authority of the Prime Minister. I recall a speech he made on my birthday in 1962. After all, one does not forget these anniversaries as one gets older.

On that occasion, he said: We do not need to spend much time in the coming campaign in exposing and discrediting Mr. Diefenbaker and his government; that has been done. They have attempted to discredit, undermine and destroy. Finally, as a last resort, the President of the Privy Council came to the conclusion that they did not want this Spencer case dealt with because they knew that heads would roll, according to Mr. Spencer's statement as reported in the press. They thought there was only one way to do it, and that was to hold over my head the threat that I would be destroyed by something they had.

I was not here last week. I announced that I would be away on Thursday following the passage of the estimates. Thursday and Friday were going to be devoted to such noncontroversial subjects as the setting up of committees. I let everybody know I was going. Finally, when I arrived at a point on the north end of Vancouver Island from which there was no possibility of getting back—

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh.

Mr. Diefenbaker: They laugh. Last evening we heard one of the proponents of Liberalism, Mr. Fraser, say that I could have returned. He always turns up on the C.B.C. for the purpose of explaining, in a nice way, the government's position whenever the government is in difficulties. He did so again last night. As soon as I received this word, I did everything to get back. I was told I could not get back to Ottawa before Friday afternoon, and I thought that was too late. The parliamentary proceedings were under way. I did not know parliamentary life, and I did not know this sort of thing could continue for two days. It never had before.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh.

Mr. Diefenbaker: The voices indicate the guilt. They know. During the two days I was away parliament almost fell to pieces. I have an unfortunate failing, being unable to hear about 75 interjections at one time. The fact is, I have made myself perfectly clear. I unequivocally repeat now that there never was a question of security in connection with this matter. What did they do? They smeared. Today my colleagues look at one another and they say, is it you? Is it you? This is fascism, Mr. Speaker, at its worst.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Diefenbaker: In other words, they knew that they had something; for what reason were they keeping it? Was it something to use on a future occasion? This is the only possible explanation. If there had been any interference with the security of our country, they would have revealed it. However, they kept it in cold storage, in their hearts. Mind you, this statement does not cover all the Prime Minister's colleagues. The fact that a great diplomat is supporting this kind of thing surprises me beyond anything. Throughout all the years we have crossed one another, I would not have expected to see the time when he would stand up in the house and accept this kind of thing.

• (4:00 p.m.)

What was the explanation today when he opened his remarks? He said that we have difficulties in our country in connection with national unity. What has national unity got to do with this question of charging various members of the Privy Council indiscriminately with wrong-doing approaching treason? One of our colleagues has passed on. Today he has been mentioned as one of those two or more. He is referred to as one of them; and his son, an hon. member of this house, has no right of action. There is no action that a son, however honourable be his father, can take to preserve the reputation of his father. That was the situation in the Gladstone case.

What is the measure of the smear and innuendo? I am not going to talk about lack of courage in what they do. Instead of standing up in the house and saying "These are the people"—and I would admire him if he were to do that, though I have no reason to expect him to do so—the minister remains silent.

Then the government had to work out a way whereby they could get the matter before parliament, and they chose the letter way. As long as the Prime Minister has been in office he has followed the course of writing letters to people or having people write letters to him. He has these penpals, and there have been several of them. I can just imagine him, Mr. Speaker, sitting around the table with his cabinet, and saying: "Now, how about a letter? You tell me about it, and I will tell them in the house". I can imagine the Minister of Justice saying: "I cannot tell them myself because I would lose my hide, so I can write you and you can tell them".

The Minister of Justice gave a press conference. That must have been arranged beforehand; nobody ever produced a press conference like this one without some activation. Did the Prime Minister know of this press conference in advance? I was informed that the Minister of Justice left the cabinet meeting that morning before he called the press conference. I go away to the hinterland to enjoy the salubrious atmosphere of northern British Columbia, and suddenly I get a telegram.

Mr. Winch: Do not call that the hinterland.

Mr. Diefenbaker: If the Prime Minister knew about this—and there has been no denial—then it is one of the most terrible things in public life. If he did not know, then he should have fired the minister within 24 minutes of his finding out about it.

When this case was first mentioned I told him to go ahead and threaten. I said let us go into the whole field of security—and I will be dealing with that in a moment too. But the government did not institute an inquiry; they held off. According to Richard Jackson, they "dropped a bombshell".

The Ottawa *Journal* for March 10 outlines how serious the situation is, and indicates that the minister said that the Munsinger case was worse than the Profumo scandal. Possibly the Minister of Justice knows about that. Then the *Journal* goes on to report that the justice minister then said:

> In some ways it was worse.

The report asked whether there had been an actual security leak, to which the minister replied:

> I don't know—but there definitely was a security—
>
> —leak.

Mr. Favreau: You mean security risk.

Mr. Diefenbaker: Yes—a security risk. Then he said she was dead and buried. What a resurrection, Mr. Speaker? Within a matter of minutes she had turned up. Does this not indicate that there is something wrong in the Department of Justice if this person was in any way considered a risk? In West Germany, where they are naturally fearful of this kind of thing, she was able to continue working for several years without being identified until one of the stellar newspapers was able to locate her.

Just imagine, Mr. Speaker, smear, slime and insinuation against two or more former ministers. I believe that according to those in official circles they now number four. Did the minister dare stand up in the House of Commons to say this? Not he. He wrote a letter to the Prime Minister, in which he said:

My dear Prime Minister:

On Friday, March 4th, as recorded on page 2211 on *Hansard* I stated that the Leader of the Opposition "was accusing us of hiding the truth, of hiding evidence from the committee."

I added that he was "the very last person in the house"—

—and so on. The letter continued:

To this the right honourable gentleman replied "I am not worried. Have your commission look into it. Put it on the agenda".

I have subsequently indicated that the Leader of the Opposition had failed to place the file on this case before the law officers of the Department of Justice for their advice—

I would ask the Prime Minister whether he finds shortcomings in his ministers. Does he ever have any complaints about them? To those that write in slanderous terms, does he say "I think this is a slanderous suggestion and I will turn it over to the law officers of the crown"? If we are going to start this, Mr. Speaker, we will destroy democracy; because all of us know, human nature being what it is, that we have to meet face to face from day to day, and these things are never brought out.

Then the minister went on to say in the letter:

I have alleged that the Leader of the Opposition mishandled this case and that he failed to seek the advice of the law officers of the Department of Justice.

The hon. member for Kamloops (Mr. Fulton) has answered that once and for all. Then the letter concludes—is it a postscript?—in this way:

I have made and make no other charges.

What of his statement, Mr. Speaker? What of his two press conferences? What of his allegations, his smear, scuttlebutt, slander and smut?

Instead of coming before the house the minister writes a letter to the Prime Minister and says: "You are of age; tell them about me". This, Mr. Speaker, is the most unusual thing that has ever taken place in this house in all my years in public life. They have made their examinations under a microscope. I do not say that everything I did was right, but what I do say, Mr. Speaker, is that what I did was honest.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Diefenbaker: When we came into office, Mr. Speaker, it was immediately suggested that we might look over the records of the cabinet. After all, they had had their divisions in 1955 and 1956. But I said, not one look or one peek; not one file and not one examination. That is the British tradition, and I followed it 100 per cent. I do not say that I would not have liked to know some of the observations made by some hon. gentlemen sitting opposite when they were on the treasury benches in regard to some matters, but that is not the British tradition. We do not snoop.

Mr. Byrne: Except Nielsen.

Mr. Diefenbaker: We do not slither. Not one examination was made of one line, either indirectly or at all, by me or by anyone on my behalf. Nor was any report thereof given to me. To do otherwise is to undermine the very essence of our democracy.

• (4:10 p.m.)

Now, Mr. Speaker, had there been any evidence that the security of the state was undermined, what would be the proper course to follow? I go back to 1957. I am not going to refer to the case, because I do not want to resurrect the name, a tragic name which will affect the wife and family of the individual in question and exacerbate their natural feelings. However, I am going to read what the present Prime Minister said on page 3493 of *Hansard*, for April 12, 1957:

It has always been a principle and I think, a correct principle, of our security investigation that we would not deal publicly in connection with a security inquiry with the details of any allegations made, for the reason that the details of a man's private life should not be the subject of accusation and rebuttal in public. The reasons behind this principle are I think obvious; it might well do far more harm than good, to the man in question, and it might cause results which would be unfortunate to all concerned without being of any assistance whatever to security.

There was no security involved in this matter; that has been made clear and made abundantly clear by the hon. member for Kamloops. If there had been, the Prime Minister of Canada, a diplomat, Her Majesty's minister, Her Majesty's Secretary of State for External Affairs at the time in question, enunciated the proper course to be followed.

Mr. Speaker, I am not going to say more at this time. I do not know what the terms are, but I do point out this: This is a matter that cannot be shelved by the executive to the judicial, to get rid of a matter that affects the rights, the privileges and the prerogatives of members of parliament.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Diefenbaker: Not at all. What a court or what a judge might look at is not the criterion. The criterion is, so far as members of parliament are concerned, that we in the discharge of our responsibilities do these things; we bring about, in a continuity of discussion the preservation of freedom and the assurance of the preservation of the state. That is our responsibility.

The judicial inquiry is set up to do what? To try me on the basis of a letter written to the Prime Minister that the Minister of Justice did not have—well, I do not want to use the word that might be used to describe that. As a matter of fact, when I think of some of the statements made here I begin to think that we are living in a new age of palaeontology—political palaeontology—the invertebrate age, which is government without a backbone.

Instead of standing up and saying, "This is it" he writes the Prime Minister and says, "This is what I want you to look into. I do not want you to look into what I said, the allegations that I made, or the infamous suggestions I have spread about. I do not want you to look into that. I just want you to look after him. That is all."

Mr. Speaker, I shall have more to say when we have available to us this order in council.

Now I come to one concluding reference, and it has to do with parliament. I started off by saying that I love this institution. Our debates are not acrid. Eggshell sentimentalities in the House of Commons are foreign to the British house. I could give quotation after quotation to illustrate the power of invective. As a matter of fact, Lord Hailsham who gave up his title, who is now Mr. Quinton Hogg, said that invective was of the essence; it is the tool of debate.

Mr. Speaker, think of the great debates in the British House in the last 15 years between Aneurin Bevan and Sir Winston Churchill. They did not regard things said in the course of debate, things which were strong, powerful, and sometimes overwhelmingly unjust, as personal things. Those things did not interfere with their friendships. They had that sentiment for parliament; that creation of the English and the French, and for the first leader of our Mother of Parliaments, Simon de Montfort. What about that concept, Mr. Speaker? Think of the occasion, Mr. Speaker, when Sir Winston Churchill made his speech in the House of Commons, I think in the year 1951, when he was followed by Mr. Aneurin Bevan, when Mr. Bevan said, "Mr. Speaker, I shall puncture that bladder of falsehood with the poignard of truth." There were none of these eggshell sensitivities that we are starting to display.

Mr. Speaker, I think of an occasion that I have never forgotten. It was at a dinner at 10 Downing Street. A lady, Mrs. Chamberlain, was sitting beside me. My wife and I were the guests. My wife sat to the right of Prime Minister Macmillan and to her right sat Sir Winston Churchill. He was very happy that evening and I finally forgot myself to say to Mrs. Chamberlain, "He is very happy tonight. He does not usually come out any more." She said, "I am so glad. If it had not been for him we would not be here."

Of all the expressions of viewpoint, Mr. Speaker, after he had been driven from his position of Prime Minister, the one that sums it up best is a short speech by one of the most famous of British parliamentarians, Cromwell, who said, "In the name of God, go." Sir Winston Churchill had been driven out. He took his place in the opposition front benches and there were bitter words.

I visited that British House over and over again. I saw it in 1916, in the month of December, when Churchill got up to speak and the house emptied. They would not listen. I saw it again in 1936. It was an adverse house. Those were the times of the clashes between Baldwin and Churchill. But they maintained the one thing that is essential to the preservation of parliament and everything it stands for. What they maintained is that while one may disagree and strongly disagree, and while we have a responsibility as members of the opposition to bring out that which is wrong and have it cleared

away, at the same time it is not in a personal sense and it must not be. I think of the way in which Sir Winston Churchill behaved after the war, when he was driven from public life. That is what everybody thought. He was voted out. The crowds turned out in 1945 to see, but not to hear. They turned him out.

• (4:20 p.m.)

Attlee took his place, the man who had been deputy prime minister, and as leader of the opposition he said harsh things of Attlee.

I saw something of the grandeur of parliamentary life just a year ago when the Prime Minister and I were representatives for Canada at Sir Winston's funeral, outside St. Paul's cathedral. The Prime Minister indicates he saw it too. The little man Attlee, the man of courage, the pacifist who joined in 1914 and refused to carry a revolver, who used nothing but a cane and won the D.S.O. doing it, after all the bitterness, there he was sitting on the steps leading up to St. Paul's honouring his great political adversary in death. We have got to catch something of that in this country.

Mr. Speaker, I rue the future of our country if this kind of thing goes on. This parliament is dead unless we resuscitate it—dead. I remember the great debates when I first came here. The Minister of Public Works (Mr. McIlraith) and I are among the few still here who came in at that time, and may I say we are looking forward to years of further service. We came in at that time and there were tremendous debates, strong, powerful, often violent, but we did not lose a sense of proportion. We dared not do this.

Mr. Speaker, this institution must not fail. Without it there is no freedom. We are here today not only as the custodians of the present and the inheritors of the past but, Mr. Speaker, we are as well the hope of this institution's future. Let us get to work on the many issues facing Canada today.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Diefenbaker: Freedom comes first before economic welfare, and we fought the battle of freedom on the Spencer case, however much we disagreed. We have the terrible issue facing Canada today of the highest cost of living in our history. We have got to do something about it. We have an ever increasing adverse balance of payments situation. We have a Bank Act that has to be placed in effective shape if the economy of this nation is to be assured. We have to tackle redistribution. We don't want another election under the old system. We don't want the Prime Minister rushing out into the night saying, "I want a majority." We want none of that.

We want action and leadership from the Prime Minister of Canada. That is what we ask for, and that is the reason I point this fact out to him that, with all the respect I have for him and his contribution, it will always be a matter of wonder to me that, when mention was made of the Munsinger case, a large measure of applause came from him, not once but twice. I say to the Prime Minister that that to me was a revelation which from this moment on I will eradicate from my mind, but it is something that is indicative of a state of mind that is not in keeping with the traditional greatness of this chamber.

Mr. Speaker, let's go to work.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Hon. Lucien Cardin (Minister of Justice): Mr. Speaker, I will neither be as long nor as entertaining as the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Diefenbaker), but I think I shall be much more to the point.

I would like to tell hon. members of this house that I, and all the members on this side of the house as well as members on the other side of the house, are concerned, and very much concerned, about what is happening to parliament. However, what has occurred is that the hon. members opposite only today are beginning to wonder what has happened to parliament.

For the past several years there has been introduced into this House of Commons a procedure, a strategy which, in fact, is destroying parliament.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Cardin: The hon. member for Kamloops (Mr. Fulton) a little while ago spoke of trials by witch-hunt, accusations and insinuations. Well, Mr. Speaker, this is exactly what we have been fighting against. The right hon. Leader of the Opposition speaks of the resurrection of parliament. Before parliament can be resurrected we must rid ourselves of this type of insinuation and accusation.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Cardin: This type of thing was particularly evident, I think, in the debate on the

Spencer case. At that time there were provocations of all types which, in fact, brought out the word Monseignor, and it was not planned because, if I had planned it, I would have said Munsinger, not Monseignor. And, Mr. Speaker, I can give the house my word that this had not been a planned method of bringing out this case. I am not saying that I had not thought of it before or that I did not know of it before, but I had not intended to use it at that time.

There is also this point, Mr. Speaker. I have been accused of being a coward, afraid to get up, and of having chosen a moment when the Leader of the Opposition had gone out fishing, in order to make my statement. This is what the Leader of the Opposition stated I did. Well, Mr. Speaker, I had mentioned the Munsinger affair while the right hon. gentleman was sitting right in front of me.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Cardin: And how am I to know—I am not that much interested in the activities of the right hon. gentleman—how am I to know he is going fishing? How was I to know where he was that Thursday morning? I had what is called a press conference to explain my withdrawal and my resumption with the government, in connection with the Spencer case. The press asked many questions of me—

Mr. Diefenbaker: Did the Prime Minister know you were going to do this?

Mr. Cardin: No, Mr. Speaker, the real point at issue is this: I have charged the Leader of the Opposition with having mishandled this case, and he has stated today that there were no aspects of security in this case. I want that to be remembered. I actually charged him with this, and I also had the courage to put my seat on those allegations.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Cardin: And if the right hon. gentleman wishes to put his seat on the results of the judicial inquiry, then we will know who has courage, and who has not, in this country.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Cardin: I have also been accused of being afraid to name members of the house. Believe me, I was not afraid and, as a matter of fact, one of the members has already been mentioned. But I do not believe that is the right thing to do. I do not believe it is right to bring out in public the names of people such as this, and if there are other names involved in the file—and believe me, I can tell the hon. member for Kamloops there is such a file—if there are other names then let these names be given to the judges in a judicial inquiry. That is the best, the proper and the fairest way in order to deal with this matter.

The Leader of the Opposition, in a great gesture—and it was quite funny—was asking, "Is it you—is it you"? The right hon. gentleman knows who it was.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

• (4:30 p.m.)

Mr. Cardin: He has seen the file.

Mr. Diefenbaker: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a question of privilege, and ask the hon. minister to mention the two or more cabinet ministers here and let us have no more of these innuendos.

Mr. Cardin: The right hon. gentleman has seen the file; he knows the Privy Councillors. All he has to do is tell us which ones of these Privy Councillors had nothing to do with it. This is what he should have done in the first place.

Mr. Speaker, had the Leader of the Opposition acted properly in the first place, then the Privy Councillors would not have been put in the predicament in which they are. The Leader of the Opposition is the one who is solely responsible for that position of the Privy Councillors.

Mr. Nugent: Mr. Speaker, would the Minister of Justice repeat the rest of the charges he gave to the press, and we will find out how honest he is.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. I am just wondering whether hon. members would expect the Speaker, at this time, after the speeches which have been made and the very crucial or difficult moments we have lived through the last few days, and today, to remind hon. members that a number of motions were made on questions of privilege.

Mr. Fulton: Mr. Speaker, before you rule, something was said a moment ago which I simply do not think can go by. I am astounded, dismayed and sickened to hear a person who occupies the position of Minister of Justice assert the proposition that all he has to do—and still suggest that his conduct is perfectly right—is to issue a general smear affecting some 26 people, and that then the way to clear it up is for the Leader of the

Opposition to say who is not affected by that smear.

I never have heard such an appalling proposition, and I want to make clear my resentment and heartsickness in hearing a so-called Minister of Justice suggest such a thing.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

Mr. Cardin: The hon. member for Kamloops says he is sick of it all. Is he saying now he is sick of having a judicial inquiry into something?

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. May I suggest to hon. members that this is the type of exchange which led us to such serious difficulties last week.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Speaker: Last week I had before me a number of questions of privilege that were raised one after the other, all of them followed by motions which, after very serious consideration, were ruled out of order by the Chair. This afternoon hon. members raised questions of privilege which I consider very serious and on which I was not asked to rule because no motions were made.

The situation with which I think we are faced now is that there are these questions of privilege not followed by motions which were acceptable to the chair, and I think we should return to the normal business of the house.

Some hon. Members: No, no.

Mr. Nielsen: Mr. Speaker, since the matter of privilege before the house is one I raised, and since the suggestion of the government is one which we already have said we would go along with—dispose of the matter by a judicial inquiry, provided the terms of reference are acceptable—and since the government has indicated such an order in council is in existence, I think, with the unanimous consent of the house, we should have that order in council before us now, so that we can determine whether or not the terms of reference are indeed acceptable on the basis of the question of privilege that was raised.

Mr. Speaker: There is no difficulty about this. If there is unanimous agreement of the house that this order in council be tabled, it will be tabled. However, I am wondering whether we are going in the right direction if we ask the house to suspend its consideration of business while the order in council is being studied. May I suggest to all hon. members, after what has been said this afternoon and after the concern, so genuine I am sure, which has been expressed about the importance of resuming the normal business of the nation, that we should, not having given the right hon. Prime Minister an opportunity to table this order in council, resume the consideration of the normal business of this house.

Mr. Diefenbaker: Mr. Speaker, I would be the last to disagree with suggestions on your part, but on this matter the privileges of this parliament are at stake. The government, by executive order in council, has seen fit to prevent a discussion in the House of Commons of a privilege, which must be the privilege of parliament.

If we are going to give away some of these privileges for an order in council in respect of which we have no information, then we would be doing to parliament something which is retrograde and detrimental to the privileges and rights of members for this and future generations. I do not know whether it would be possible to go on with private members hour at five o'clock—

An hon. Member: Six o'clock.

Mr. Diefenbaker: —but I do wish to say—and I do not want to do anything to hold up the house—that I do not intend to rely on an order in council which I have not seen and in respect of which I have no idea concerning its contents, the only information being that with regard to the judge who will preside thereover. This is an order in council that is designed to destroy individuals who have held the prerogative rights of parliament. This matter is far more serious now than it was, in view of the last remarks made by the Minister of Justice.

Mr. Pearson: Mr. Speaker, perhaps I can help in this respect. I am extremely sorry I did not have the order in council to read when I made my first statement. I can appreciate the desire of hon. members to have an opportunity to study it. It could be tabled on motions, and then perhaps we could go on with the ordinary business and resume, if desired, at eight o'clock, a discussion of this matter after members have had a chance to study the order in council.

Mr. Nielsen: Your Honour, since I made the suggestion, you might permit me to make an observation. When Your Honour ruled, when I raised the matter of privilege a few days ago affecting a certain member of this house, Your Honour in your ruling observed that the house and the house alone is master of its own privilege and must dispose of it. That suggested to me, sir, that neither the executive, Your Honour, nor any other individual could do this, but only the house. Therefore, I believe that until the question of privilege is disposed of by the house, it does not lie within the prerogative of the executive to do so.

I suggest, to clarify the matter at once, that the house could give unanimous consent; and then I am sure the hon. member for Kamloops and the Leader of the Opposition, and others, knowing what they expect should appear in the terms of reference, would not take but a moment to examine them. I would suggest that perhaps we should have these terms of reference before the house now and dispose of the matter.

Hon. A. J. MacEachen (Minister of National Health and Welfare): Mr. Speaker, I wish to make an observation with regard to the procedural position before the house. As suggested by the hon. member for Yukon, it is correct that the house is master of its own privileges, and the traditional way in which privilege has been disposed of in this chamber is through a motion.

• (4:40 p.m.)

For various reasons it has been impossible for hon. members to formulate a motion which would dispose of this matter to the satisfaction of the house. We understand the reasons, and I agree that the traditional method is not appropriate here. The only point I am making is that while we admit the difficulty, it seems that at some point it will be necessary for the house to admit that we must go back to the ordinary business of the house, unless a motion is before us by which we can dispose of this matter.

I think the suggestion made by the Prime Minister, is a good one, that he table the order in council giving the house an opportunity to consider it while we are dealing with the ordinary business and, if necessary, resume the debate at eight o'clock this evening, at the point at which we now are. I agree to that suggestion, but I want to reserve my rights to point out, when we resume, that unless a motion is formulated by which the house can deal with this matter the Chair will be expected to direct us again to the business of the house.

Mr. Nugent: Mr. Speaker, on this point I should like to state that I gathered from the remarks of the Prime Minister, whenever he has risen to discuss this question of privilege and the motions, which were found to be out of order, that we were trying to find a solution to deal with the problem. The Prime Minister has referred to the setting up of an inquiry, but it is my thought that when the Prime Minister spoke this afternoon it was his contention that the proper method of dealing with this was by his putting forward a motion to set up an inquiry, which would be debated in the same way as any motion the house might find acceptable on this question of privilege. It is my understanding that the Prime Minister is suggesting that we are all interested in the terms of this inquiry and the terms of reference as suggested by the leader of the N.D.P. and other parties. I have heard nothing so far from the Prime Minister which would indicate that he has changed his feelings, as indicated by his remarks during the last couple of days. The suggestion is that he put forward a motion which the house will debate so that we can settle the question of privilege, as well as the motion, in a way satisfactory to the house.

Mr. Diefenbaker: Mr. Speaker, perhaps to bring this to a conclusion let me say that all we want to do is preserve our rights on the question of privilege. I suggest that the government proceed with orders of the day and then, without actually moving to go into supply, we adjourn until eight o'clock, and then return to this matter of the privileges of parliament at exactly the point we have now reached. It was very clearly stated by the leader of the N.D.P. that he insisted, as I insist with some right, on the fullest examination of the terms of reference, because in accepting them we want to protect our most precious and priceless right, the ancient prerogatives and privileges of parliament.

Mr. McIlraith: For the sake of clarity, Mr. Speaker, may I ask the Leader of the Opposition whether he envisages that when we come back to this matter of privilege at eight o'clock, if there is any further question of privilege then, after a study of the order in council, the matter of privilege would be regularized by some motion?

Mr. Diefenbaker: I have not given consideration to that matter. The hon. member is an

expert on the rules, but I personally do not know what the implications are, and the matter will have to be considered.

Mr. Nugent: Mr. Speaker, would the house leader answer my question? Is it the intention of the government that the motion now envisaged will be moved in respect of the question of privilege, so that we can discuss it at once when we return at eight o'clock? If the house leader would answer this question it would make this matter much more simple so far as we are concerned.

Mr. Speaker: Is it agreed by all hon. members that we will proceed with orders of the day, and that having completed the routine business the proceedings will be suspended until eight o'clock, with the understanding that we will proceed with private members business at six o'clock?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Mr. Speaker: At eight o'clock we will resume this debate at the point we have now reached. Is that agreed?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. It is my understanding, of course, that there is agreement that the order in council has been tabled by the Prime Minister in order that hon. members may have an opportunity to study it?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

CANADA SHIPPING ACT

AMENDMENT TO ENSURE PASSAGE IN CANADIAN SHIPS

Mr. Frank Howard (Skeena) moved for leave to introduce Bill No. C-142, to amend the Canada Shipping Act (Canadian ships in coasting trade).

Some hon. Members: Explain.

Mr. Howard: Mr. Speaker, very briefly let me say that the purpose of the bill is to provide that no passengers or goods will be transported by ship from one place in Canada to another place in Canada except by a Canadian ship. The secondary effect of this will be an incentive for our own shipbuilding industry.

Motion agreed to and bill read the first time.

[*Translation*]

ELECTORAL BOUNDARIES READJUSTMENT ACT

SUGGESTED CONSIDERATION BY COMMITTEE TO FORMULATE NEW MAPS

Mr. Réal Caouette (Villeneuve) moved for leave to introduce Bill No. C-143, to amend the Electoral Boundaries Readjustment Act.

Some hon. Members: Explain.

Mr. Caouette: Mr. Speaker, since 158 members of all parties in the house have filed objections to the passage of the Electoral Boundaries Readjustment Act, the purpose of this bill is to suggest that the matter be referred to a special committee of the House of Commons which will lay out new electoral boundaries and submit to Your Honour a report on the readjustment of boundaries of every constituency included in each of the provinces.

[*English*]

Mr. Speaker: It is the pleasure of the house to adopt the said motion?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Motion agreed to and bill read the first time.

SPORTS

PRIVILEGE—MR. ALKENBRACK—CONGRATULATIONS TO "BOBBY" HULL ON NEW SCORING RECORD

Mr. A. D. Alkenbrack (Prince Edward-Lennox): Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of privilege to point out—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. I am aware of the very important question of privilege the hon. member wishes to bring to the attention of the house, but I think he should first ask for leave to revert to motions. Knowing what the question is, I am sure hon. members will agree.

Mr. Alkenbrack: Thank you, Your Honour. I should like to ask for unanimous consent to revert to motions, sir.

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Mr. Alkenbrack: Thank you, sir. I rise on a question of privilege regarding a matter of national interest.

• (4:50 p.m.)

Saturday night in Chicago that great Canadian "Bobby" Hull of the Chicago Black Hawks scored his 51st goal of the current hockey season. In doing so he has established a new all-time record for total goals scored by any player in the playing season of the National Hockey League and has set other records supplementary thereto.

Questions

Mr. Speaker, I know that you and all hon. members of this house congratulate Mr. Hull, who is a resident of Sophiasburgh township in Prince Edward County and a constituent of mine in Prince Edward-Lennox, and we join with Mrs. Hull and their family in recognition of this great occasion.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. Does the hon. member propose to introduce a motion?

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh.

Mr. Speaker: I suggest to the hon. member that his question of privilege has been noted by the house and we all appreciate the interest that he takes in this matter.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. Now that we have reverted to motions we might hear from the Minister of Citizenship and Immigration (Mr. Marchand).

[*Translation*]

IMMIGRATION

REPORT ON CHANGES IN ACT AND REGULATIONS

Hon. Jean Marchand (Minister of Citizenship and Immigration): Mr. Speaker, I should like to table two copies, one in English and one in French, of the second report of Mr. Joseph Sedgwick on immigration. This report deals particularly with appeal courts, ministerial discretion and with a few other subjects of general interest concerning immigration.

This report had been requested by the Prime Minister last year, I believe, and has just been published.

[*English*]

Mr. Speaker: Does the hon. minister have the leave of the house to table the said document?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

QUESTIONS

(Questions answered orally are indicated by an asterisk.)

PENSIONS OF RETIRED C.N.R. EMPLOYEES

Question No. 11—**Mr. Knowles:**

1. How many retired employees of the Canadian National Railways are in receipt of pensions of less than $25.00 per month?

2. How many are in receipt of a pension of $25.00 per month?

3. How many are in receipt of pensions of (a) $25.01 to $29.99 per month (b) $30.00 to $39.99 per month (c) $40.00 to $49.99 per month (d) $50.00 to $59.99 per month (e) $60.00 to $69.99 per month (f) $70.00 to $79.99 per month (g) $80.00 to $89.99 per month (h) $90.00 to $99.99 per month (i) $100.00 to $124.99 per month (j) $125.00 to $149.99 per month (k) $150.00 to $199.99 per month (l) $200.00 per month and over?

Mr. J. A. Byrne (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Transport): The management of Canadian National Railways advise as follows:

1. 392.

2. 2,283.

3.

Amount of Pension	Number
$ 25.01 to $ 29.99	764
30.00 to 39.99	1,530
40.00 to 49.99	1,195
50.00 to 59.99	942
60.00 to 69.99	875
70.00 to 79.99	913
80.00 to 89.99	938
90.00 to 99.99	967
100.00 to 124.99	2,555
125.00 to 149.99	2,344
150.00 to 199.99	3,627
200.00 and over	4,808

In a number of cases the amounts of pensions paid by Canadian National Railways do not represent the total pensions payable to employees for railway service. Pensions payable by the C.N.R. to international employees (service in both Canada and the United States) relate to their service in Canada only. Such employees also receive annuities payable under the U.S. Railroad Retirement Act or the Social Security Act for service performed in the United States. For example, in the group receiving pensions of under $25 from the C.N.R., there are sixty-eight former international employees who also receive U.S. Railroad Retirement or Social Security annuities in respect of C.N.R. service rendered in the United States. The balance of this group consists of employees who elected early retirement (before age 65) with reduced basic ($25) pensions, and employees who had very short service and small contributions.

SPECIAL PLANNING SECRETARIAT, PRIVY COUNCIL

Question No. 104—**Mr. Ormiston:**

1. What are the names, classifications and salaries of all personnel working under the director of the special planning secretariat of the Privy Council?

2. Which of these positions were filled by C.S.C. competition?

3. Which of these positions were filled by order in council appointment?

4. Which of these positions are seconded and what were their salaries prior to secondment?

5. Did all positions and classifications in (1) above have C.S.C. and treasury board approval prior to appointment by governor in council?

Hon. Judy V. LaMarsh (Secretary of State): I am informed by the Privy Council office, the Civil Service Commission and the Department of Finance, Treasury Board, as follows:

1. Name	Classification	Salary*
J. R. Coulter	Administrative Officer 7	$13,038
W. A. Dyson	Welfare Administrator 5	11,978
P. F. Girard	Administrative Officer 6	9,508
D. R. Richmond	Privy Council Officer 5	13,038
R. I. P. Vachon	Industrial Development and Production Off. 3	11,342
Mrs. M. Coutu	Stenographer 3 (Secretary)	4,056
Miss C. D'Arcy	Principal Clerk	5,616
Miss H. Fortier	Stenographer 3 (Secretary)	4,524
Mrs. A. Roche	Stenographer 3 (Secretary)	4,056

*Salaries shown include recent Civil Service general salary revision.

2. The following positions were filled by competition: Administrative Officer 7, J. R. Coulter; Privy Council Officer 5, D. R. Richmond; Stenographer 3 (Secretary), Mrs. M. Coutu; Stenographer 3 (Secretary), Mrs. A. Roche.

In addition, the commission approved the transfer of the following: Administrative officer 6, P. F. Girard; Principal clerk, Miss C. D'Arcy; Stenographer 3 (secretary), Miss H. Fortier.

3. None.

4. W. A. Dyson and R. I. P. Vachon whose salaries were as shown in (1) above.

5. The classification of all positions in (1) above was approved by the Civil Service Commission prior to appointment.

The establishment of positions of personnel working under the Director of the Special Planning Secretariat of the Privy Council has been approved by the Treasury Board.

USE OF DIRECT TELEPHONE LINES FROM OTTAWA

Question No. 149—**Mr. McCleave:**

1. Does the government of Canada maintain a direct telephone line from Ottawa to Toronto and, if so, are members of Parliament permitted to use this telephone line free of charge?

2. Does the government of Canada maintain a direct telephone line from Ottawa to Montreal and, if so, are members of Parliament permitted to use this telephone line free of charge?

3. Does the government of Canada maintain direct telephone lines to other cities of Canada and, if so, which cities, and are members of Parliament permitted to use such lines free of charge?

4. If not, are there plans to give comparable advantages to members of Parliament enjoyed by Toronto area members of Parliament?

Mr. J. A. Byrne (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Transport): 1, 2 & 3. The government of Canada has arrangements entered into last year between the Department of Transport on behalf of the government as a whole and the Trans-Canada Telephone System, under which, in return for an over-all monthly payment apportioned among departments, special long distance telephone service is provided to all departments and agencies to all points in Canada available on the direct distance dialing system through leased circuits, without individual call charges being assessed.

The Speaker read and laid before the House on January 31st extracts from the minutes of a meeting of the Commissioners of Internal Economy held on January 25, 1966, as follows: (a) That this direct long distance telephone service will be available to all members of the House of Commons on a 24 hour basis for outgoing calls originating in Ottawa to points which are served by the direct distance dialing system, when such calls are made through the special operator over the leased circuits; (b) That, with a view to treating all members equitably, the members of the House of Commons will hereafter be reimbursed for charges in connection with their telephone calls originating in Ottawa to places

in their own constituencies which are not available on the direct distance dialing system.

4. Members of Parliament from all constituencies are placed at the same advantage as regards expenses of telephone calls to their constituencies. As regards the convenience of placing calls, this depends on the extent of automation of the telephone networks involved in the connection.

DYNAME CORPORATION

Question No. 191—**Mr. Keays:**

1. Did the government request Dyname Corporation to make a study and report on winter skiing at Mount Logan?

2. If so (a) what were the conditions of the request (b) who are the directors of Dyname Corporation (c) who are the major shareholders of Dyname Corporation (d) what amounts of moneys were paid or are to be paid to the said corporation (e) is their study and report completed?

Hon. Judy V. LaMarsh (Secretary of State): I am informed by the Department of Forestry and my department as follows:

1. Yes.

2. (a) To engage the contractor as a research consultant for the purpose of preparing an economic study and a program of development for a tourist resort area in the region of Mount Albert and Mount Logan. (b) Messrs. Claude Robillard, President, 51 Belvedere Rd., Westmount; Fernand Cadieux, Executive Vice-President, 5018 Victoria Avenue, Montreal; Marc Lalonde, Secretary, 425 St. Joseph Blvd., West, Montreal; Bartlett Morgan, 3466 Peel Avenue, Montreal; Peter M. Pitfield, 9432 Gouin Blvd., West, Pierrefonds; Germain Cadieux, 4047 Vendôme Avenue, Montreal. (c) The information is not available; (d) $48,000; (e) Yes.

FEDERAL AND PRIVATE DEBT INCREASE

Question No. 379—**Mr. Mather:**

1. What, in dollars, was the increase in the federal debt in the period 1960-1965?

2. What in the same period was the increase in private debt?

Hon. Mitchell Sharp (Minister of Finance): 1. Gross public debt as at March 31, 1965, $26,574.2 million; Gross public debt as at March 31, 1960, $20,986.4 million; Increase in gross public debt 1960-65, $5,587.8 million.

2. Figures showing changes in private debt from 1960-1965 are not available. The Royal Commission on Banking and Finance estimate private debt (business and personal debt) for 1961 and 1962 to be as follows:

	December 31st	
	1961	1962
	(Billions of Dollars)	
Business	13.1	14.5
Trade Debt	5.4	5.4
Mortgage Debt	12.4	14.0
Other Personal Debt	5.0	5.3
	35.9	39.2

The following statistics show changes in some of the major components of private debt during 1960-1965:

Source: Dominion Bureau of Statistics, Bank of Canada.

	As at December 31 (Billions of Dollars)					
	1960	1961	1962	1963	1964	1965
Consumer Credit	4.0	4.3	4.8	5.3	6.2	7.1
Corporate Bonds Outstanding	7.4	7.3	7.9	8.2	8.9	10.0
New mortgage loans approved by lending institutions on new non-farm residential construction	.7	1.1	1.0	1.3	1.5	1.7

*STAFF INCREASES FOLLOWING DEPARTMENTAL REORGANIZATION

Question No. 387—**Mr. Fulton:**

With respect to the program envisaged in the reorganization of the cabinet, the transfers of duties between ministers and departments, and the creation of new departments, all as effected and/or contemplated by the order in council in that regard passed on December 22, 1965 (a) was any estimate made of the increased numbers of positions in the public service of Canada which would

be created to implement the said program and, if so, what was the total number (b) what was the estimate of the total annual cost of filling such positions (c) what is the number of such additional positions for each new or reorganized department (d) what is the estimate of the cost of such new positions for each such new or reorganized department?

Mr. John R. Matheson (Parliamentary Secretary to Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, the answer to the question 387 is as follows:

The transfers and rearrangement of duties and functions made by orders in council passed on December 22, 1965, involved only existing duties and existing staff. As a result of the transfers, there are likely to be rearrangements of functions among personnel in the departments affected but the net effect of these adjustments cannot yet be foreseen. The same is true of future adjustments of establishments which may result from the future development of policies as a consequence of the reorganization. The answer to part (a) of the question is therefore no, and (b) is not applicable. The answers to (c) and (d) will not be available until new establishments have been devised and approved for the departments concerned.

CATEGORIES OF POOR PERSONS

Question No. 437—**Mr. Caouette:**

1. What distinction does the government make between a poor person, a destitute person, and an indigent person?

2. In what income categories does the government place a poor person, a destitute person, an indigent person, and a well to do person, respectively?

Mr. John R. Matheson (Parliamentary Secretary to Prime Minister): 1. The government does not make any official definitions distinguishing between persons who are poor, destitute or indigent.

2. The government does not assign income categories to degrees of poverty since many factors, in addition to income, determine whether a person is considered to be poor.

TRANSFER OF TELEVISION CHANNEL 3, BARRIE TO TORONTO

Question No. 467—**Mr. Rynard:**

Does the application made for moving channel 3 from Barrie to the Toronto area include an application for an increase in output power for the station if moved?

Mr. J. A. Byrne (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Transport): The application by Ralph Snelgrove Television Limited for authority to establish a television broadcasting station at Toronto on Channel 3 is predicated on an effective radiated power of 78,600 watts (video), 39,300 watts (audio). The present effective radiated power of Station CKVR-TV, Barrie is 100,000 watts (video), 50,000 watts (audio).

APPLICATION FOR TELEVISION CHANNEL 5

Question No. 469—**Mr. Rynard:**

1. Has any application been made by any person for television broadcasting on channel 5 in the following areas (a) Barrie (b) Orillia (c) Midland?

2. If so, by whom has such application been made?

Mr. J. A. Byrne (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Transport): 1. Yes.

2. The application has been submitted by Ralph Snelgrove Television Limited.

APPLICATION FOR SATELLITE TELEVISION TRANSMITTER, MUSKOKA DISTRICT

Question No. 471—**Mr. Rynard:**

Has any application been made for the operation of a satellite television transmitter in any of the following areas (a) Barrie (b) Orillia (c) Midland?

Mr. J. A. Byrne (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Transport): No.

RESTORATION OF LOUISBURG FORTRESS

Question No. 571—**Mr. Prittie:**

1. Was the chief architect of historical monuments from France invited to Ottawa recently to discuss the restoration of the fortress of Louisburg?

2. If so, did the Department of Northern Affairs and National Resources issue a press release on the occasion of the visit of the French architect?

3. What were the names of all archaeologists employed during 1965 in connection with the restoration of Louisburg?

4. Which of these archaeologists are no longer employed by the department?

5. In each case why was the employment terminated?

6. Of those archaeologists employed at Louisburg in 1965, and still on the staff of the department, which ones have been transferred to other duties?

7. Were the ovens in the basement of the chateau at Louisburg destroyed and, if so, on whose orders?

8. Have the UNESCO recommendations concerning the safeguarding of the beauty and characteristics of historical landscapes and sites been drawn to the attention of the persons carrying out the restoration?

9. What precautions are now being taken to ensure that no parts of the original structure will be destroyed in the course of restoration?

10. Are there description placards in both French and English on all artifacts displaced in the museum?

Questions

11. How many historians capable of writing brochures and historical reports in French will be employed at the Louisburg site during 1966?

Hon. Arthur Laing (Minister of Northern Affairs and National Resources): 1. Mr. Maurice Berry, Architect en chef des monuments historiques from Paris is retained under contract as the general architectural consultant of the Louisburg Restoration Project. In this capacity he was in Ottawa recently to discuss problems relating to the reconstruction of the Chateau St. Louis.

2. No.

3. E. McM. Larrabee, J. D. Swannack, Jr., B. W. Fry, I. C. Walker, J. O. Vogel, J. P. Marwitt, R. B. Lane.

4. E. McM. Larrabee.

5. The initial phase of the project's archaeological investigations called for an overall excavation of the Citadel complex. To coordinate the efforts of the professionals employed at this task, a senior archaeologist was attached to the project. The second phase of the archaeological work (which has now begun), entails excavations of specific areas best handled by small groups each under the direction of an archaeologist whose responsibility will include the elaboration of a final report relating to the specific area excavated. Since the present nature of archaeological effort does not require a co-ordinating senior archaeologist, the co-ordination now exercised is through the park superintendent, the need for the services covered by the contract with Mr. Larrabee no longer exists. His contract was therefore not renewed.

6. Mr. J. D. Swannack Jr. and Mr. I. C. Walker recently won promotional competitions and will be employed by the Canadian Historic Sites Division in Ottawa.

7. Research indicates that the so-called ovens were never fully functional and were abandoned by the French prior to the period to which the Chateau is being restored. While a comprehensive record was made of those remains of the structures deemed original, officers responsible for the management of the project decided that retaining them in the restored Chateau would not contribute to the interpretation of the site and would lead to substantial unnecessary expense.

8. The Natural and Historic Resources Branch is very much aware of these UNESCO recommendations and subscribes to them in the context of Canadian requirements.

[Mr. Prittie.]

9. The restoration is predicated on the principle that original parts of the structure will be retained and integrated into the reconstruction wherever such is consistent with public safety and long term conservation. This principle has been basic to the project since its inception and as a result precautionary measures, such as mortar stability tests and controlled exploration of key areas, are an integral part of the reconstruction procedure. The poor quality of the original mortar, centuries of frost action, and the British demolition in 1760 by gun powder, are factors which prevent retention in several instances.

10. A large number of the description placards are in both official languages but a shortage of competent staff to ensure translations has slowed down the process.

11. While the total complement of historians to be employed at the Louisburg site is dependent on recruitment now underway, the goal is to have a 50 per cent French language capability.

AIR CANADA SERVICE, OTTAWA TO NORTH BAY AND ROUYN

Question No. 581—**Mr. Lefebvre:**

1. Has the government studied the possibility of extending Air Canada service from Ottawa to North Bay, Ontario, and Rouyn, Quebec?

2. If a study has been made (a) when was it made, and (b) what were its findings?

Mr. J. A. Byrne (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Transport): 1. No. Air Canada provides a daily service between Ottawa and Rouyn, using Viscount Aircraft. Service between Ottawa and North Bay is via Toronto.

2. N/A.

FOREIGN BUILT VESSELS UNDER CANADIAN REGISTRY

Question No. 595—**Mr. Smith:**

From January 1, 1965 until January 31, 1966, how many foreign built vessels trading in Canadian waters were brought under Canadian registry, and of such vessels, what was (a) the date of Canadian registry (b) name of ship owner (c) vessel name (d) former port of registry (e) tonnage (f) country, and (g) year of building?

Mr. J. A. Byrne (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Transport): From January 1, 1965, to January 31, 1966, a total of 35 foreign built commercial vessels were registered in Canada, particulars of which under (a), (b), (c), (d), (e), (f) and (g) are as follows:

(a) Date Reg'd.	(b) Owner	(c) Vessel Name	(d) Former Port	(e) Tons Gross	(f) Country	(g) Year Built
1965						
8 Feb.	Canadian Dredge & Dock Co. Limited..	*Derrick No. 2*.....	U.S.A. (Unreg'd.).....	203	U.S.A.	1961
15 Feb.	Windsor Trading Company Limited.....	*Windsor Trader*.....	Dundee.....	706	U.K.	1951
15 Feb.	Gallantry Fisheries Ltd.....	*Zebrula*.....	The Hague.....	312	Holland	1958
23 Feb.	Fishery Products Limited.....	*Zurich*.....	Dutch (Unreg'd.).....	667	Holland	1965
18 Feb.	Vancouver Tug Boat Co. Ltd.....	*V.T. No. 152*.....	U.S.A. (Unreg'd.).....		U.S.A.	1945
1 Apr.	Alphonse Bouchard.....	*Nelson B*.....	Newcastle.....	553	U.K.	1949
15 Apr.	Fishery Products Limited.....	*Zaandam*.....	Dutch (Unreg'd.).....	667	Holland	1965
21 May	H.B. Dawe Ltd.....	*Cupids*.....	Grangemouth.....	681	U.K.	1940
13 July	Bonda Draggers III Ltd.....	*Bonda III*.....	Dutch (Unreg'd.).....	227	Holland	1962
7 Sept.	Misener Enterprises Ltd.....	*George M. Carl*.....	London.....	10,418	U.S.A.	1922
10 Sept.	Comet Enterprises, Bermuda.....	*Shelter Bay*.....	Hamilton (Bermuda).....	7,774	U.S.A.	1907
10 Sept.	Comet Enterprises, Bermuda.....	*Thorold*.....	Hamilton (Bermuda).....	7,841	U.S.A.	1917
13 Sept.	Comet Enterprises, Bermuda.....	*Outarde*.....	Hamilton (Bermuda).....	7,438	U.S.A.	1906
13 Sept.	Upper Lakes Shipping.....	*Goderich*.....	London.....	7,907	U.S.A.	1906
13 Sept.	Upper Lakes Shipping.....	*Ridgetown*.....	London.....	7,637	U.S.A.	1905
14 Sept.	Hindman Transportation Co.....	*Parker Evans*.....	London.....	7,815	U.S.A.	1908
14 Sept.	Hindman Transportation Co.....	*Howard Hindman*.....	London.....	6,966	U.S.A.	1909
15 Sept.	Hindman Transportation Co.....	*George Hindman*.....	London.....	6,962	U.S.A.	1914
15 Sept.	Hindman Transportation Co.....	*Ruth Hindman*.....	London.....	7,074	U.S.A.	1910
15 Sept.	Hindman Transportation Co.....	*Helen Evans*.....	London.....	7,534	U.S.A.	1906
28 Sept.	Tartan Seafoods Ltd.....	*Kpeshie*.....	U.K. (Unreg'd.).....	335	U.K.	1961
28 Sept.	Tartan Seafoods Ltd.....	*Pawnpawn*.....	U.K. (Unreg'd.).....	335	U.K.	1962
15 Oct.	Northland Shipping Ltd.....	*Island Prince*.....	Oslo.....	1,782	Norway	1958
25 Oct.	H.B. Dawe Ltd.....	*Domino Run*.....	Liverpool.....	857	U.K.	1946
28 Oct.	Fred Vey.....	*Laureen G*.....	Seattle.....	26	U.S.A.	1955
5 Nov.	Euclide Bouchard.....	*Conrad Marie*.....	Leith.....	749	U.K.	1953
25 Nov.	Norlake S.S. Co. Ltd.....	*Manitoba*.....	Wilmington.....	6,127	U.S.A.	1907
15 Dec.	Upper Lakes Shipping.....	*Wiarton*.....	New York.....	8,829	U.S.A.	1907
28 Dec.	Labrador S.S. Co. Ltd.....	*Pointe Noir*.....	Hamilton (Bermuda).....	9,171	U.S.A.	1926
1966						
6 Jan.	Evans McKiel.....	*Concrete Carrier*.....	U.S.A. (Unreg'd.).....	38	U.S.A.	1945
10 Jan.	Leadale Shipping Ltd.....	*Leadale*.....	Hamilton (Bermuda).....	7,073	U.S.A.	1910
24 Jan.	Winona Steamships Ltd.....	*Hillsdale*.....	Hamilton (Bermuda).....	6,866	U.S.A.	1908
24 Jan.	Redwood Enterprises Ltd.....	*Westdale*.....	Hamilton (Bermuda).....	7,584	U.S.A.	1905
26 Jan.	Redwood Enterprises Ltd.....	*Grovedale*.....	Hamilton (Bermuda).....	7,367	U.S.A.	1905
26 Jan.	Redwood Enterprises Ltd.....	*Parkdale*.....	Hamilton (Bermuda).....	8,947	U.S.A.	1910

Questions

C.M.H.C. REGULATIONS RESPECTING APARTMENT FINANCING

Question No. 609—**Mr. Smallwood:**

1. Did C.M.H.C., within the last year, direct any change in the regulations so as to provide funds for financing housing blocks or apartments and, if so, when?

2. Have any loans been made on the basis of such regulations and to whom?

3. Were any such funds loaned to the York Trust Company and, if so, how much and when?

Hon. J. R. Nicholson (Minister of Labour): 1. No.

2. Not applicable.

3. Not applicable.

FREE COPIES OF "HANSARD"

Question No. 614—**Mr. Caouette:**

Does the government intend to grant the request of every citizen who wishes to receive regularly a free copy (one per family) of the official report of the House of Commons *Hansard*, and (a) if not, for what reason (b) if so, when will the government do so?

Hon. Judy V. LaMarsh (Secretary of State): Under existing government regulations, authorized by TB 477983, dated April 6, 1955, and amended by TB 477983-1, dated May 6, 1955, no provision is made for the free distribution of government publications, including *Hansard*, to every Canadian family. These regulations do specify, however, that such material is provided free to a variety of institutions across the country, including all public libraries at which they are available to the general public.

Furthermore, pursuant to an Order of the House of Commons, dated May 28, 1948, each Member of Parliament may have as many as 16 copies of *Hansard* sent free of charge to residents of his constituency.

Above this free distribution, any citizen who so desires may subscribe to *Hansard* at an annual cost of $3.

The government is not at the present time giving consideration to possible changes in these regulations. Amendments such as suggested by the hon. member for Villeneuve could involve an additional cost to the public treasury of as much as $10 million per year.

DISMISSAL OF B. ANDRUNYK, FORT CHURCHILL

Question No. 636—**Mr. Brand:**

What were the circumstances surrounding the resignation or discharge of Mr. B. Andrunyk, a former employee of the public service of Canada at Fort Churchill?

[Mr. Byrne.]

Hon. G. J. McIlraith (Minister of Public Works): Mr. Andrunyk resigned voluntarily and registered as a reason on his notice of resignation: "For personal reasons".

DEMURRAGE ON BOX CARS, WEST COAST

Question No. 669—**Mr. McLelland:**

1. Are there demurrage charges leveled against the Canadian Wheat Board for grain that is on track waiting to be unloaded at west coast ports?

2. How much grain was on track waiting to be unloaded during the strike at the Vancouver ports which took place from June 2 to August 13, 1965?

3. Were the railway companies given remuneration or concessions of any kind for box cars loaded with grain waiting to be unloaded at the west coast ports from June 2 to August 13, 1965 and, if so, how much?

Hon. Judy V. LaMarsh (Secretary of State): I am informed by the Departments of Agriculture and Finance as follows: 1. No.

2. The Canadian Wheat Board does not have this information. Information not available as the Board of Grain Commissioners does not maintain specific statistics on quantities of grain awaiting unload at terminal positions.

3. Not in so far as the Canadian Wheat Board is concerned.

CIVIL SERVICE COMPETITION 66-T-609

Question No. 685—**Mr. Loney:**

1. What are the names and addresses of the candidates for Civil Service of Canada competition No. 66-T-609?

2. What are the names and addresses of the successful candidate or candidates?

Hon. Judy V. LaMarsh (Secretary of State): I have been given the following information by the Civil Service Commission:

1. Having regard for the right to privacy of candidates and the possibility that the release of information could prove not only embarrassing but prejudicial to them, the commission holds in confidence information concerning candidates whose names do not appear on the eligible list.

2. (1) Gazel, Janet Victoria (Mrs.), Kincardine, Ont.; (2) Bushell, Edbert Thompaon, Kincardine, Ont.; (3) Brocklebank, Kenneth James, Kincardine, Ont.; (4) Stewart, Anthony Duncan, Kincardine, Ont.

No appointment has yet been made. Competition was held to provide eligibles for future vacancies.

AIR CANADA—MEMBERSHIP IN INTERNATIONAL ASSOCIATION

Question No. 730—**Mr. Caouette:**

Is Air Canada a member of the International Air Transport Association and, if so, (a) what is the amount of the membership paid to this organization (b) how is that amount arrived at (c) how many representatives does Air Canada have in this organization and how many of them are French-speaking Canadians and how many are English-speaking Canadians (d) what are their respective functions and remuneration on the various committees or boards of this organization (e) what is the role played by Air Canada in this organization (f) what is the total cost to Air Canada of its participation in this organization (g) has Air Canada exerted any pressure with a view to giving a French name to this organization (h) what steps does Air Canada intend to take with a view to giving a French name to this organization?

Mr. J. A. Byrne (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Transport): Yes, Air Canada is a member of the International Air Transport Association. (a) For the year 1965 Air Canada paid $70,370 in dues; (b) Membership dues are calculated on the basis of a formula whereby the total budget of the International Air Transport Association is prorated among its members in proportion to their international operations, measured in terms of tonne-kilometres.

(c) No permanent representation is involved but special meetings are held from time to time. IATA has a number of specialized committees such as legal, technical, etc., the make up of which is reviewed annually. Serving on these committees, Air Canada has at this moment six people, all of whom speak English and one of whom speaks French. In addition designated personnel of Air Canada represent the company's interests at traffic conferences, and on various ad hoc committees.

(d) The function of personnel of Air Canada designated to one of the committees is to serve, as a committee-man, at the meetings of that committee, usually one per year; no remuneration is paid to these personnel with respect to their service on an IATA committee.

(e) The same as that of any other of the 99 member air carriers, i.e. to serve on functional committees, and convey its views to traffic conferences.

(f) The total cost to the company with respect to participation in IATA is $70,370 in membership dues, plus the travelling expenses of its personnel attending committee meetings and traffic conferences.

(g) and (h) The organization represents many countries and many languages and not just English or French although it has official names in French and Spanish as well as English.

C.M.H.C. LOANS FOR N.H.A. MORTGAGE BLOCKS

Question No. 731—**Mr. Coates:**

1. Has C.M.H.C. within the last year made any change in the regulations so as to provide funds for financing blocks of N.H.A. mortgages and, if so, when?

2. Have any loans been made on the basis of such regulations and to whom?

3. Were any of such funds loaned to the York Trust Company and, if so, how much and when?

Hon. J. R. Nicholson (Minister of Labour): 1, 2, and 3. No changes in the regulations were made by CMHC within the last year so as to provide funds for financing blocks of NHA mortgages. However, Section 11 of the National Housing Act permits CMHC to make loans to the holders of insured NHA mortgages taken in respect of loans made for housing. The purpose of this section of the Act is to encourage the banks, insurance companies, trust companies and other financial institutions to make NHA mortgage loans and to invest in existing mortgages, and to promote the development of a secondary market for NHA mortgages. To this end, those lending institutions and other dealers in mortgages which have made or purchased NHA mortgage loans are able to pledge them at any time with CMHC as security for short-term loans.

It would seriously inhibit the achievement of these purposes if any financial institution making use of the borrowing facilities provided in the Act had to expect that such information would be made public. Consequently, it is considered not to be in the public interest to provide information concerning any institution which may have borrowed under this legislation.

There can be no objection, of course, to making available information concerning the total amount of loans made under Section 11. During the year 1965 and up to the end of February, 1966, loans totalling $29.95 million have been made; repayments amount to $11.5 million, so that the total loan amount outstanding at February 28, 1966, was $18.45 million.

Questions

VISITORS TO HALIFAX CITADEL

Question No. 772—**Mr. Forrestall:**

How many visitors registered at the Halifax Citadel in each of the following years: 1955, 1956, 1957, 1958, 1959, 1960, 1961, 1962, 1963, 1964 and 1965?

Hon. Arthur Laing (Minister of Northern Affairs and National Resources): 1. 1955-56, 121,213; 1956-57, 213,860; 1957-58, 234,000; 1958-59, 137,259; 1959-60, 190,383; 1960-61, 204,677; 1961-62, 229,677; 1962-63, 243,609; 1963-64, 192,286; 1964-65, 213,212; 1965-66 (to January 31, 1966), 203,915.

AIR CANADA ROUTE, MARITIMES TO NEW YORK CITY

Question No. 779—**Mr. McCleave:**

Have attempts been made to extend the Air Canada direct routes between the maritimes and Boston to New York city and, if so, with what results?

Mr. J. A. Byrne (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Transport): The Air Transport Board advises as follows: Route No. 3 in Schedule II to the Canada-U.S. Air Transport Agreement provides for service by a Canadian Airline between Halifax and the co-terminals Boston and New York. Air Canada has been designated by the government of Canada to operate this service, but due to paucity of winter traffic will not be operating it again until mid-June.

C.B.C. COVERAGE OF LAGOS CONFERENCE

Question No. 788—**Mr. MacEwan:**

In regard to the answer to question No. 216 and the C.B.C.'s coverage of the commonwealth conference in Lagos, Nigeria, what was the total exposure and air time of the material used for the C.B.C.'s four radio and television networks, and what was the individual air time and exposure for each of the four networks?

Hon. Judy V. LaMarsh (Secretary of State): I am informed by the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation that 80 minutes and 32 seconds of program material was broadcast on the four CBC networks as follows: Radio: English Network, 38 minutes, 15 seconds; French Network, 15 minutes, 10 seconds. Television: English Network, 20 minutes, 25 seconds; French Network, 6 minutes, 42 seconds.

*ANTI-POLLUTION DEVICES FOR AUTOMOBILES

Question No. 799—**Mr. Grafftey:**

1. Is the government aware that a recent United States government order has directed that all cars by 1968 be equipped with smog control and anti-pollution exhaust features?

[Mr. Nicholson.]

2. If so, is the government considering similar action for all cars produced in or imported into Canada, and has it been in contact with representatives of the automobile industry in this regard?

Mrs. Margaret Rideout (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of National Health and Welfare): Mr. Speaker, the answer to starred question No. 799 is as follows:

1. Yes. The Department of National Health and Welfare is keeping in close touch with proposed United States federal standards for control of air pollution from vehicles. These standards are still subject to modification.

2. Officers of my department have been in contact with representatives of the automobile industry with a view to determining the feasibility of equipping Canadian cars with pollution control devices.

POST OFFICE SITE, CHRISTMAS ISLAND, N.S.

Question No. 804—**Mr. Muir (Cape Breton North and Victoria):**

With reference to securing the site for the Christmas Island post office, what owners of properties were interviewed and by whom?

Hon. G. J. McIlraith (Minister of Public Works): Departmental Representative R. H. Chislett interviewed the following property owners: Allen J. MacNeil; Neil D. MacNeil; Mrs. Margaret MacNeil.

ANNIVERSARY OF MIGRATORY BIRD TREATY

*Question No. 815—**Mr. Dinsdale:**

What steps is the government taking to suitably commemorate the fiftieth anniversary on August 16, 1966, of the signing of the migratory bird treaty between Canada and the U.S.A.?

Mr. Stanley Haidasz (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Northern Affairs and National Resources): Mr. Speaker, the answer to this question is as follows:

1. The occasion will be suitably marked by a special publication issued by the government.

In addition, the chief of the Canadian Wildlife Service will attend and participate in a special ceremony in commemoration of the 50th anniversary of the signing of the migratory birds treaty. The ceremony will be held on March 15, 1966, at the annual banquet of the North American Wildlife Conference to be held in Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania.

CHURCHILL, MAN.—DIVERSIONARY CHARGE ON GRAIN

Question No. 835—**Mr. Dinsdale:**

1. Is a diversionary charge made on all grain shipped through the port of Churchill?

2. If so (a) what is the reason for and amount of the charge (b) what has been the total amount of this charge each year since 1950?

Hon. Mitchell Sharp (Minister of Finance): 1. Under the terms of a handling agreement negotiated annually with all elevator companies a diversion charge is paid by the Canadian Wheat Board on wheat shipped by elevator companies from their country elevators directly to the Port of Churchill for export.

2. (a) The diversion charge paid by the Canadian Wheat Board since 1950 has been 1½ cents per bushel. A diversion charge is a charge assessed by an elevator company when grain shipped from one of its country elevators is diverted from that company's terminal elevator to another destination. Elevator companies consider that their country and terminal elevators operate as an entity, and terminal revenues are an important factor in determining the basis upon which country elevators can be operated. Therefore, it has been a long-established trade practice that when a company loses terminal handling on grain as a result of the diversion of a country elevator shipment to a destination other than the company's terminal, a diversion charge is assessed to compensate for the loss of terminal earnings. (b) The total amount of diversion charges paidby the Canadian Wheat Board in respect of grain shipped in each navigation season through Churchill is as follows:

Churchill Shipping Seasons	Diversion Charge on Country Shipments Direct to Churchill
1950	$101,615.48
1951	132,312.53
1952	129,560.76
1953	168,208.86
1954	185,490.29
1955	206,648.03
1956	247,816.37
1957	245,536.58
1958	282,259.25
1959	325,575.17
1960	269,310.28
1961	275,183.66
1962	302,032.29
1963	341,486.56
1964	323,259.98
1965	295,367.89

PUBLIC WORKS ACTIVITIES, CUMBERLAND COUNTY, N.S.

Question No. 843—**Mr. Coates:**

1. Does the Department of Public Works plan to construct any new wharfage facilities in Cumberland county during the fiscal year 1966-67?

2. Is it the plan of the Department of Public Works to carry out any repairs to existing facilities owned by the federal government in Cumberland in the fiscal year 1966-67 and, if so, at what location and of what will the repairs in question consist?

Hon. G. J. McIlraith (Minister of Public Works): 1. No.

2. No.

*PENSION PLAN DEDUCTIONS FROM MUNICIPAL OFFICIALS

Question No. 871—**Mr. Forbes:**

1. Are contributions made to the Canada Pension Plan from salaries of municipal councillors, reeves, deputy reeves, and mayors of small municipalities?

2. If so, has the government given consideration to the possibility that extra bookkeeping of relatively small salaries is involved?

3. If so, has the consideration been given to the exemption of such salaries from contributions to the Canada Pension Plan?

Mr. J. E. Walker (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of National Revenue): Mr. Speaker, the answer to starred question 871 is in three parts as follows:

1. Yes.

2. Yes.

3. Not specifically, but no contribution is required if the amount of salary does not exceed the basic minimum annual exemption of $600 prorated for the pay period.

AIR CANADA POLICY RESPECTING IATA

Question No. 874—**Mr. Caouette:**

What is the policy of Air Canada with respect to the International Air Transport Association?

Mr. J. A. Byrne (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Transport): The management of Air Canada advise as follows:

Air Canada's policy with respect to the International Air Transport Association is to participate as a member in good standing in the work of the association, and to honour the practices set up by agreement among its member airlines.

Questions

HEALTH RESEARCH AMONG ESKIMOS

Question No. 880—**Mr. Dinsdale:**

1. Has the Department of National Health and Welfare conducted any fudamental research among Canada's Eskimo population on diseases such as (a) cancer (b) multiple sclerosis (c) coronary?

2. Is the government considering expanding fundamental medical research among this ideal control group?

3. If so, what programs are contemplated?

Hon. A. J. MacEachen (Minister of National Health and Welfare): 1. Yes.

2. Yes.

3. By expansion of the Northern Medical Research Unit located at the Charles Camsell Hospital, Edmonton, Alberta.

FEDERAL BUILDING, AMHERST, N.S.— USE OF SANDSTONE

Question No. 882—**Mr. Coates:**

Is the Department of Public Works intending to have Wallace sandstone specified as a material in the construction of the new federal building in Amherst, N.S.?

Hon. G. J. McIlraith (Minister of Public Works): The consultant architect recommends the materials to be used on the project for which he is retained. No specifications have as yet been prepared for this building.

*RIDING MOUNTAIN PARK— ROAD RECONSTRUCTION

Question No. 885—**Mr. Forbes:**

1. Is it the intention of the government to rebuild and blacktop No. 10 highway through Riding Mountain national park from the north gate to Clear Lake?

2. Has provision been made for this in the 1966-67 estimates of the Department of Northern Affairs and National Resources?

3. If so, when will tenders be called?

Mr. Stanley Haidasz (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Northern Affairs and National Resources): Mr. Speaker, the answer to this question is as follows:

1. Provision for reconstruction is contained in long range planning for the park.

2. No.

3. Not applicable.

PRINTING DEPARTMENT—WAGES PAID

Question No. 886—**Mr. Ricard:**

1. What was the total amount of wages paid to all the employees of the Department of Public Printing and Stationery for each of the following years 1958, 1959, 1960, 1961, 1962, 1963, 1964 and 1965?

[Mr. Byrne.]

2. What was the total amount of wages paid to those among these employees who were working in production such as type-setting, printing press, bookbinding, during each of the years mentioned above?

3. What was the total amount of wages paid to the employees in administration, such as office workers, during each of the years mentioned above?

Hon. Judy V. LaMarsh (Secretary of State): 1. 1957-58, $5,990,523; 1958-59, $6,797,327; 1959-60, $7,076,674; 1960-61, $7,783,308; 1961-62, $8,131,234; 1962-63, $8,049,793; 1963-64*, $624,631; 1964-65, $880,032.

2. 1957-58, $4,757,056; 1958-59, $5,428,752; 1959-60, $5,661,538; 1960-61, $6,194,651; 1961-62, $6,443,266; 1962-63, $6,231,782; 1963-64*, N/A; 1964-65, N/A.

3. 1957-58, $464,189; 1958-59, $522,041; 1959-60, $539,207; 1960-61, $619,205; 1961-62, $641,-657; 1962-63, $659,556; 1963-64*, $137,115; 1964-65, $166,134.

* C.G.P.B. (Printing Bureau) placed under Defence Production.

PRINTING DEPARTMENT PERSONNEL

Question No. 887—**Mr. Ricard:**

1. What was the total number of employees in the Department of Printing and Stationery for each of the following years 1958, 1959, 1960, 1961, 1962, 1963, 1964 and 1965?

2. What number among these employees were working in production such as type-setting, printing press, book-binding, during each of the years mentioned above?

3. How many of these employees were in administration, such as office workers, during each of the years mentioned above?

Hon. Judy V. LaMarsh (Secretary of State): 1. 1957-58, 1,670; 1958-59, 1,735; 1959-60, 1,744; 1960-61, 1,818; 1961-62, 1,737; 1962-63, 1,686; 1963-64*, 168; 1964-65, 184.

2. 1957-58, 1,085; 1958-59; 1,127; 1959-60, 1,149; 1960-61, 1,385; 1961-62, 1,293; 1962-63, 1,247; 1963-64*, — 1964-65, —.

3. 1957-58, 585; 1958-59, 608; 1959-60, 595; 1960-61, 433; 1961-62, 444; 1962-63, 439; 1963-64*, 168; 1964-65, 184.

*CGPB (Canadian Government Printing Bureau) placed under the Department of Defence Production.

QUEEN'S PRINTER AND P.P. AND S.— COST OF PUBLICATIONS

Question No. 888—**Mr. Ricard:**

1. What is the estimated cost of all the work and publications done under the authority of the Queen's Printer for each of the following years 1958, 1959, 1960, 1961, 1962, 1963, 1964 and 1965?

2. What is the estimated cost of the work and publications done in the Department of Public Printing and Stationery during each of the years mentioned above?

Hon. Judy V. LaMarsh (Secretary of State): 1. 1957-58, $14,406,777; 1958-59, $14,561,177; 1959-60, $15,341,328; 1960-61, $15,762,600; 1961-62, $16,705,657; 1962-63, $16,481,746; 1963-64, $16,546,778; 1964-65, $13,930,783*.

*In addition to the above, there is an amount of $4,584,782 expended for forms, etc. which now comes under the authority of the Department of Defence Production.

2. 1957-58, $7,816,612; 1958-59, $9,029,271; 1959-60, $9,631,397; 1960-61, $9,874,928; 1961-62, $10,202,504; 1962-63, $9,709,872; 1963-64, $10,122,903; 1964-65, $11,177,181.

LABOUR CODE—APPLICATION TO FISHERIES DEPARTMENT VESSELS

Question No. 895—**Mr. Muir (Cape Breton North and Victoria):**

Does the Canada Labour (Standards) Code apply to employees on vessels operated by the Department of Fisheries?

Hon. H. J. Robichaud (Minister of Fisheries):

The act does not apply directly to employees of government departments. (See House of Commons Debates Oct. 13, 1964, p. 8999). However, standards similar to those contained in Part II (minimum wage) Part III (annual vacation) and Part IV (general holidays) of the Canada Labour (Standards) Code apply to the public service.

ARMED FORCES MARRIED QUARTERS

Question No. 904—**Mr. Howe (Hamilton South):**

1. How many units of (a) temporary and (b) permanent married quarters for Canadian armed forces personnel are there in Canada?

2. Of this number, how many were occupied as of March 1, 1966?

3. What is the average cost per month of accommodation, heat and electricity in one of these units?

4. What proportion of the Canadian armed forces occupy federal government subsidized housing in Canada?

5. On what basis are members of the Canadian armed forces selected to occupy federal government subsidized housing?

6. How many members of the Canadian armed forces are now on the waiting list for such housing?

Hon. Léo Cadieux (Associate Minister of National Defence): 1. (a) 261; (b) 24,501.

2. 24,391.

3. The estimated average recovery rate for all ranks is $96. per month. This is based on $80 for a private soldier to $130 for a Lieutenant Colonel.

4. Subsidized housing is presumed to mean all forms of married quarters including rental agreements. On this basis 26 percent of the forces are affected.

5. A qualifying point system based on years of service and number of children is used by the Canadian army and the R.C.A.F. The R.C.N. uses a first come, first served basis. However, as integration progresses, a common allocation policy will be instituted.

6. 8,254.

SALARY OF LEADING AIRCRAFTSMAN

Question No. 905—**Mr. Howe (Hamilton South):**

1. What is the salary, including allowances, of a leading aircraftsman radar technician with 12 years service?

2. What is the salary, including allowances, of a leading aircraftsman driver (chauffeur) with 12 years service?

Hon. Léo Cadieux (Associate Minister of National Defence):

Maximum Monthly Rates

	Married	Single	
	Without Quarters and Rations	With Quarters and Rations provided	Without Quarters and Rations
1. Leading Aircraftsman (radar technician) wth twelve years service	$408	$278	$343
2. Leading Aircraftsman (mobile support equipment operator) with twelve years service	$390	$260	$325

Questions

SALARY OF TRANSPORT DEPARTMENT VISCOUNT CAPTAIN

Question No. 906—**Mr. Howe (Hamilton South):**

What is the salary of a Department of Transport captain, flying Viscount aircraft, after 10 years experience in this department?

Mr. J. A. Byrne (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Transport): The salary of a Department of Transport Captain, flying Viscount aircraft, after 10 years experience in this Department would be the maximum of the Class-Executive Pilot 2—$15,370.

USE OF SAUSAGE FILLERS AND BINDERS

Question No. 915—**Mr. Enns:**

Is the use of cereals and legume products as binders or fillers in sausage and meat products regulated by the Department of National Health and Welfare and, if so (a) what is the nature of, and reason for, any such regulations (b) under what authority and when were such regulations adopted?

Hon. A. J. MacEachen (Minister of National Health and Welfare): Yes; (a) The Food and Drug Regulations of the Department of National Health and Welfare define a filler and a binder for use in certain meat products and state the type and quantity which may be used. Provision is made for cereal binders and fillers but there is no provision for legume products. The purpose of such regulations is to control the type and quantity of these substances in sausage and meat products; (b) The regulations were enacted under the authority of the Food and Drugs Act of the Department of National Health and Welfare and the present regulations date from December 8, 1954.

HOUSING PROGRAM FOR SASKATCHEWAN INDIANS

Question No. 916—**Mr. Korchinski:**

1. Under the joint federal-provincial low income housing program which was initiated in April, 1965, on behalf of Indians and Métis in Saskatchewan (a) what are the names of the 12 persons who took possession of these homes (b) where are these houses located (c) by whom were they constructed (d) where were they constructed?

2. Of the $35,000 loan provided for the construction of the 12 homes (a) what was the denomination of each loan (b) what was the amount in each case which was advanced by the federal government (c) what was the amortization period of the loans?

Hon. J. R. Nicholson (Minister of Labour): 1. (a) Of the 12 units at or nearing completion 10 are now occupied by persons of Indian ancestry for whom they were intended. The remaining two units are not yet occupied. The names of the borrowers are being omitted as it has been traditional in the public interest not to disclose the names of individual borrowers under the National Housing Act as such information is of a personal and confidential nature. (b) Three of the units are located at Cumberland House, five at Buffalo Narrows, three at Ile-a-la-Cross and one unit at La Ronge; (c) The units were constructed under the supervision of the Department of Natural Resources, Province of Saskatchewan, using local labour, (d) See answer to (b) above.

2. (a) Loan amounts are based on final construction costs which have not yet been determined. It is estimated that the loans will be in one case $2,000 and in the other eleven cases $3,000 each. (b) The federal-provincial agreement provides that the Province of Saskatchewan shall pay all charges relating to these projects and bill Central Mortgage and Housing Corporation for the 75 percent federal share. The Province of Saskatchewan has not yet requested payment of the federal share of expenditure incurred to date under this program; (c) The loans are to be amortized over a period of 15 years.

FEDERAL GRANT, KINCARDINE, ONT.

Question No. 922—**Mr. Loney:**

What amount of grant in lieu of taxes on federal property was paid to the municipality of Kincardine, Ontario, for the year 1965?

Hon. Mitchell Sharp (Minister of Finance): Annual Grant in lieu of taxes related to year 1965, $1,310.00; Grant in lieu of local improvement rates, $1,108.40; Total, $2,418.40.

GOVERNMENT ANNUITIES BRANCH

Question No. 940—**Mr. McCutcheon:**

1. How many persons are employed in the government annuities branch?

2. How many persons are employed in the administrative branch?

3. How many persons are employed in the sales branch?

4. Are sales department personnel paid by salary or by commission?

Mr. B. S. Mackasey (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Labour): 1. 208.

2. 139.

3. 69 persons engaged in the sale of government annuities—52 sales representatives and 17 sales office assistants.

4. The annuity sales representatives are paid by commission; their office assistants are paid a salary.

FEDERAL LAND PURCHASES, SOUTH SASKATCHEWAN PROJECT

Question No. 945—**Mr. McLelland:**

How many acres of land have been purchased by the federal government to date in connection with the building of the South Saskatchewan river dam and irrigation project?

Hon. J. J. Greene (Minister of Agriculture): 56,065 acres.

ALDRIN AND DIELDRIN—CHANGES IN REGULATIONS

Question No. 955—**Mr. Howe (Hamilton South):**

Since January 1, 1966, has the Canadian government changed the regulations governing the use of the agricultural chemicals aldrin and dieldrin and, if so, what have been the changes and for what reasons were they made?

Hon. J. J. Greene (Minister of Agriculture): Yes, as the regulations pertained to the acceptance of these in fertilizers under provisions of the Fertilizers Act. Acceptance of fertilizer mixes containing aldrin or dieldrin for farm use have been withdrawn because these mixes have been shown to be ineffective in controlling pest insects, and to increase the potential for residues in crops.

CANADIAN ASSISTANCE TO VIET NAM

Question No. 974—**Mr. Faulkner:**

1. What assistance has Canada rendered to Viet Nam by way of financial aid, capital projects or technical assistance?

2. Are there any Canadian medical personnel now serving in Viet Nam, and what plans does the government have toward contributing medical assistance to that country?

3. What participation has the Canadian Red Cross Society taken in any programs of assistance to Viet Nam?

Hon. Paul Martin (Secretary of State for External Affairs): 1. Canada has allocated $3,692,132 in assistance to Viet Nam since 1953 of which $1,694,632 has been made available during the past two years. Capital Assistance has been in the form of food aid, mainly flour, help with the construction of a sciences building at the University of Hué and laboratory equipment for the University of Dalat. Technical Assistance has involved the provision of five advisers in the medical and educational fields as well as the training in Canada of Vietnamese. Some 380 students from Vietnam have trained in Canada with 183 of this total presently undertaking studies in Canadian universities and technical institutions.

2. There are three Canadian doctors now serving in Viet Nam. Canada has also indicated to the Vietnamese authorities that it is prepared to establish and operate a Children's Rehabilitation Centre in Saigon; Canada is also undertaking the construction of an extension to T.B. treatment facilities at the provincial hospital in Quang Ngai.

3. On its own initiative, the Canadian Red Cross has provided significant amounts of clothing for the victims of the war in Viet Nam as well as making substantial cash donations through the International Committee of the Red Cross. The Canadian Red Cross has also indicated its willingness to cooperate in any appropriate way with medical assistance to Viet Nam financed by the Canadian Government.

HALIFAX—OBSERVATION OF NATAL DAY

Question No. 984—**Mr. Forrestall:**

1. Do any federal civil servants receive time off to observe either Halifax or Dartmouth Natal Day?

2. Do any hourly paid employees at H.M.C. *Dockyard* receive time off to observe either of these natal days?

Hon. Léo Cadieux (Associate Minister of National Defence): 1. Yes.

2. Yes.

H.M.C. "DOCKYARD", HALIFAX—APPRENTICES

Question No. 985—**Mr. Forrestall:**

1. How many apprentices have been trained in each of the several shops at H.M.C. Dockyard in Halifax during (a) the last twelve years (b) the last eight years (c) the last four years?

2. How many are presently "in training"?

3. How many apprentices have left the dockyard for employment elsewhere after having completed or more than half completed their training during (a) the past twelve years (b) the past eight years (c) the past four years (d) the past two years (e) the past year?

Hon. Léo Cadieux (Associate Minister of National Defence):

1. Shops	(a) 12 yrs	(b) 8 yrs	(c) 4 yrs
Plate & Boiler	26	19	10
Shipwright	16	10	5
Sheet Metal	2	1	1
Machine Weapons	56	38	20
Machine Mechanical	34	18	5
Pipe Fitter	3	3	2
Mechanical Fitting	10	10	4
Pattern Maker	1	1	0
Internal Combustion Engr	7	7	3
Electrical	89	62	35
	244	169	85

2. 90.

3. (a) 121 (b) 82 (c) 40 (d) 17 (e) 5.

H.M.C. "DOCKYARD", HALIFAX—JOURNEYMEN EMPLOYED

Question No. 989—**Mr. Forrestall:**

What is the average age of all journeymen now employed at H.M.C. Dockyard, Halifax?

Answer: 46.

PENSION PLAN DEDUCTIONS FROM MUNICIPAL OFFICIALS

Question No. 1010—**Mr. Hopkins:**

1. Are contributions made to the Canada pension plan from salaries of municipal councillors, reeves, deputy-reeves, and mayors of small municipalities?

2. If so, has the government given consideration to the possibility that extra bookkeeping of relatively small salaries is involved?

3. If so, has consideration been given to the exemption of such salaries from contributions to the Canadian pension plan?

Hon. E. J. Benson (Minister of National Revenue): 1. Yes.

2. Yes.

3. Not specifically, but no contribution is required if the amount of salary does not exceed the basic minimum annual exemption of $600 prorated for the pay period.

QUESTIONS PASSED AS ORDERS FOR RETURNS

EXPO '67—FEDERAL EXPENDITURE TO DATE

Question No. 5—**Mr. Coates:**

What is the total amount of expenditure of the federal government made as of this date, or undertaken, or planned directly or indirectly, in connection with Expo '67?

Return tabled.

DIRECTORSHIPS HELD BY MINISTERS

Question No. 51—**Mr. Knowles:**

1. Are any cabinet ministers directors of any companies, corporations, etc., and, if so, what ministers, of what companies or corporations are they directors, and at what date were any directorships presently held by such cabinet ministers assumed?

2. Did any cabinet ministers resign any directorships on being sworn of the Privy Council and, if so, which ministers, on what dates, and from what companies or corporations?

Return tabled.

[Mr. Cadieux (Terrebonne).]

CENTENNIAL PROJECTS, ONTARIO

Question No. 605—**Mr. Martin (Timmins):**

1. In which locations in Ontario have centennial projects been approved, and in each location, what is the nature of the project?

2. In each case, what is the total cost of the project, and the shares to be paid by the province of Ontario, the centennial commission, and the local sponsors?

Return tabled.

COAL

INQUIRY AS TO ASSISTANCE PROGRAM

On the orders of the day:

Mr. Donald MacInnis (Cape Breton South): Mr. Speaker, I have a question to direct to the Minister of National Health and Welfare as minister for Nova Scotia. I would ask him whether an alternative date has been set for a future meeting with the parties concerned in respect of the Nova Scotia coal industry.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. I have ruled before, and I should like to reaffirm the ruling, that ministers must be asked questions in their capacity as ministers of the Crown. They cannot be asked questions as ministers for a province or an area. I should like to reiterate that ruling at this time, which is based on precedent.

Mr. MacInnis (Cape Breton South): On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, the precedent has already been established on any number of occasions, and most recently during the consideration of the estimates of the department of mines, when the minister—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. I cannot hear an argument on this point. I have ruled on this matter and I can assure the hon. gentleman that there is no doubt in my mind that there is no way the business of the house can be conducted during the question period if questions can be asked of a minister because he is the minister representing Prince Edward Island, northern Ontario or eastern Ontario. It would lead to a very difficult situation. I can understand the position of the hon. gentleman, but during the question period at this time we cannot ask questions on this basis. The question the hon. member now has in mind should be asked of the minister who is responsible for the administration of that department.

AIR TRANSPORT

SYDNEY, N.S., CONTRACT FOR AIR TERMINAL

On the orders of the day:

Mr. Donald MacInnis (Cape Breton South): Then, Mr. Speaker, I have a further question for the Minister of National Health and Welfare. I ask whether he is responsible for this press release:

Cambrian Construction Limited, Montreal, has been awarded the contract to build a Department of Transport air terminal at Sydney, Nova Scotia, at a cost of $1,270,000—

I would ask, what has that to do with his department—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

Right Hon. J. G. Diefenbaker (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. The minister has issued a press release—oh, I see it is a press release of the Department of Transport, so it is better directed to the Minister of Transport.

An hon. Member: That is the whole point.

Mr. MacInnis (Cape Breton South): On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, I would put the Minister of Transport in the same position because I thought the Department of Public Works was responsible for these projects.

CANADIAN NATIONAL RAILWAYS

REQUEST FOR INCREASED PENSIONS FOR RETIRED EMPLOYEES

On the orders of the day:

Mr. Stanley Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Mr. Speaker, may I direct a question to the Minister of Transport. In view of the fact that an answer has been given today to question No. 11 on the order paper concerning pensions of C.N.R. employees, can the minister say whether the government is taking any steps to find ways and means to increase the pensions of retired C.N.R. employees?

Hon. J. W. Pickersgill (Minister of Transport): I think the hon. gentleman knows that is a matter which is within the scope of the management of the Canadian National Railways. It is the kind of question which, I feel, should be directed to the management when the committee undertakes the annual review of railway affairs.

Inquiries of the Ministry

Mr. Knowles: May I ask a supplementary question? I wonder if the minister is aware of the fact that the Prime Minister has been answering letters from retired C.N.R. employees indicating that this matter would be referred to the Minister of Transport for further consideration? Does he not give the consideration that the Prime Minister requests him to give?

Mr. Pickersgill: I am well aware of that and the Minister of Transport, in turn, refers them to the Canadian National.

[*Translation*]

EXTERNAL AFFAIRS

POSSIBLE VISIT OF CARDINAL WYSZYNSKI OF POLAND

On the orders of the day:

Mr. Gérard Laprise (Chapleau): Mr. Speaker, I wish to put a question to the Secretary of State for External Affairs. Is it his intention to make representations to the Polish government so that they permit Cardinal Wyszynski to visit Canada next May?

Mr. Speaker: Order. I suggest that the hon. member should put his question on the order paper.

[*English*]

NATO—REFERENCE TO POSSIBLE WITHDRAWAL OF FRANCE—REQUEST FOR BILATERAL MILITARY AGREEMENT

On the orders of the day:

Mr. R. N. Thompson (Red Deer): Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the Prime Minister, although it directly concerns the Secretary of State for External Affairs as well. It is a follow-up question and relates to NATO. Since press releases continue to appear indicating that France may withdraw from NATO, does the Prime Minister have some word for this house with regard to just what is happening to NATO in so far as the relationship with France is concerned?

Right Hon. L. B. Pearson (Prime Minister): We have received a communication from the French government on this matter. This communication is being studied by the Canadian government as well as by the other members of NATO who have received similar communications. We are concerting our consultations with the other members of NATO before we consider any further action. The matter is being considered by the NATO

council as well. Perhaps there will be something more to say about it in a day or two.

Hon. Marcel Lambert (Edmonton West): I have a related question for the Secretary of State for External Affairs, and a statement which he is reported to have made on Friday or Saturday night to the effect that Canada is seeking closer commercial and cultural relations with France. Does this statement presage a closer bilateral military alliance with France?

Hon. Paul Martin (Secretary of State for External Affairs): There is no connection, Mr. Speaker, between our desire to pursue a policy of closer cultural relations with France and other countries and any particular problem that we may have as a result of the position taken by the government of France regarding NATO arrangements.

Mr. Lambert: Is it not a fact that the French government has indicated to Canada, either formally or informally, its desire for bilateral military agreement to replace the present general NATO arrangement?

Mr. Martin (Essex East): There is no doubt about the position of Canada. We believe in collective security. We believe in the purposes and the objectives of the integrated structure of NATO. We have received a communication, as the Prime Minister has said, from the President of the French Republic. This communication has been addressed, either in the form of a letter or in the form of a note, to Canada and the other 13 NATO countries. We are in the process now of examining the note addressed to Canada. We are also consulting with the other countries on the NATO Council on this situation as it affects both them and us. We are studying the matter here, in Ottawa. When we are in a position to give a further report, it will of course be given to the house as early as possible.

Mr. Andrew Brewin (Greenwood): I should like to address a supplementary question either to the Secretary of State for External Affairs or to the Minister of National Defence, but it arises out of the same subject. Will the government use the opportunity provided by the French announcement of its decision to make a radical change in France's role in NATO, to reconsider and renegotiate the Canadian military contribution to NATO?

Hon. Paul Hellyer (Minister of National Defence): As I indicated during the debate on the estimates, the whole question of commitments for the next period is under consideration, and it will have to be considered in the light of developments now taking place.

Mr. Thompson: I have a further supplementary question for the Secretary of State for External Affairs. In view of reports that the 14 members of NATO other than France are planning to declare their own faith in NATO, what, if anything, is Canada doing about that?

Mr. Martin (Essex East): Consideration is being given by the other member countries in NATO to confirming our faith in the collective security aspects of NATO.

Right Hon. J. G. Diefenbaker (Leader of the Opposition): Surely, the minister is in a position to say whether Canada is giving any consideration to a bilateral agreement with France in connection with military affairs? I would think the answer would be an unequivocal no. I am surprised the minister is not more definite.

Mr. Martin (Essex East): If my hon. friend had before him the information I have before me, I am sure his reply would be the same as mine.

GRAIN

OATS AND BARLEY—INQUIRY AS TO FINAL PAYMENT

On the orders of the day:

Mr. E. Nasserden (Rosthern): I should like to direct a question to the Minister of Finance. Is he now in a position to announce the final payments for oats and barley?

Hon. Mitchell Sharp (Minister of Finance): I was informed, just before coming into the house, that the submissions to council approving the final payments have now arrived from Winnipeg. I expect they will be acted upon immediately and the Wheat Board will be making its announcement in the ordinary way.

Mr. Nasserden: May I ask a supplementary question of the Minister of Finance? May I take it he will be making a complementary statement here in the house with regard to these final payments?

Mr. Sharp: I intend to follow the same practice as I followed in connection with wheat. I shall ask permission to table the order in council and the Wheat Board announcement the day the announcement is made, so that members will know what the Wheat Board has announced.

HIGHWAY SAFETY

REQUEST FOR NOTICE TO AUTOMOTIVE INDUSTRY RESPECTING INVESTIGATORS

On the orders of the day:

Mr. Heward Grafftey (Brome-Missisquoi): Before I put my question to the Minister of Industry, I hope the house will allow me briefly to thank the Prime Minister for the kind words he directed to me in the house last week relating to automobile safety. I can only say that if we have made a little bit of progress in this regard it results from the fact the government has a real appreciation of the problem, and I have received at all times nothing less than sincere co-operation from the Minister of Industry, who is treating this subject in a bipartisan way. I should like to thank the Prime Minister for his kind remarks.

My question for the Minister of Industry is the following: In view of the fact senior spokesmen for General Motors a few days ago in the United States admitted putting investigators on the trail of one Ralph Nader, an outstanding spokesman for automobile safety, and in view of Mr. Nader's allegations that these investigators named by the industry harassed his private life, will the minister serve notice on the industry in Canada of an expression of the view of the government and this house, that such behaviour on the part of the industry in this nation will not be tolerated?

Hon. C. M. Drury (Minister of Industry): I think the house would agree that it would be highly inappropriate for this house, or indeed Canada, to comment on matters which are now I understand the subject of investigation by the United States Congress.

TELEVISION

PICTOU COUNTY, N.S.—REQUEST FOR ALTERNATIVE CHANNEL

On the orders of the day:

Mr. H. Russell MacEwan (Pictou): I have a question for the Minister of Transport. Has he received two telegrams containing 3,500 names of the residents of the County of Pictou, requesting that the regulations for alternative television be reviewed so that they can obtain C.T.V. coverage from Halifax? If so, can he give us any idea when the government will announce policy in this regard, after studying the Fowler Commission report?

Hon. J. W. Pickersgill (Minister of Transport): Mr. Speaker, I have not any doubt that I have received the telegram. I am not sure I have seen it, but, as the hon. gentleman knows, I do know about this situation. Perhaps it would be more appropriate for the hon. lady, the Secretary of State, to answer the question; but since the question was hypothetical, in perspective, I think the only answer I can give is that the government will make its announcement as soon as it has the opportunity to give the fullest consideration to the Fowler report, which we are seeking to do when we are not in this place.

Mr. MacEwan: A supplementary question. I think the minister said that he was not sure whether he had received the telegram. I understand that the C.P.R. telegram was 50 feet in length, so it must be somewhere in his office.

Mr. Pickersgill: It may be in the anteroom, because I am short of space.

POWER

COLUMBIA RIVER—SAFETY OF HIGH ARROW DAM

On the orders of the day:

Mr. H. W. Herridge (Kootenay West): Mr. Speaker, I take pleasure in addressing a question to the Secretary of State for External Affairs. In view of the fact that the members of the Standing Committee on External Affairs were assured that the High Arrow dam was a completely safe structure, would the minister inform the house why, in the report of the Columbia treaty permanent engineering board, which includes representatives of Canada and the United States, it is stated that the board does not accept direct or implied responsibility for the safety of the structures being built according to the Columbia River Treaty?

Mr. Speaker: Order. This question should be placed on the order paper.

Mr. Herridge: Mr. Speaker, I am sure the minister is anxious to answer it; it is quite an important question.

INDUSTRY

HEAVY WATER—REQUEST FOR STATEMENT ON SECOND PLANT

On the orders of the day:

Mr. R. R. Southam (Moose Mountain): Mr. Speaker, I should like to direct a question to

Inquiries of the Ministry

the Minister of Mines and Technical Surveys. My question is based on the fact that the 90-day survey period agreed on between Atomic Energy of Canada and General Electric with a view to establishing a second heavy water plant has now elapsed. Can the minister inform the house where this plant will be located and when construction will commence?

Hon. Jean-Luc Pepin (Minister of Mines and Technical Surveys): Mr. Speaker, the last time I inquired negotiations were still going on. I will inquire again today and will give an answer tomorrow.

NATIONAL DEFENCE

PAY INCREASES FOR AIR FORCE PERSONNEL

On the orders of the day:

Hon. Marcel Lambert (Edmonton West): I direct this question to the Minister of National Defence. In view of the rather numerous reports which are current about a special pay increase for pilots in the air sector of the defence forces, is the minister in a position to advise the house whether this is a fact and, if so, when he expects to make the announcement? I can assure the minister that this matter is causing a great deal of controversy and unrest in the forces.

Hon. Paul Hellyer (Minister of National Defence): Mr. Speaker, this question has been under study for some time. It is a matter of government policy and will be announced in the usual way.

Mr. Lambert: A supplementary question. In that case, will the minister explain to the house why certain commanding officers have held "O" groups and announced this to the personnel of their squadrons?

Mr. Hellyer: No, Mr. Speaker, I cannot explain that.

[*Translation*]

FINANCE

GUIDE LINES INSTRUCTIONS TO U.S. SUBSIDIARIES

On the orders of the day:

Mr. Maurice Allard (Sherbrooke): Mr. Speaker, may I put a question to the Minister of Finance?

Did the minister or the government issue counter-guide lines to Canadian subsidiaries of American firms, and does the minister plan to make them known to the house soon?

[Mr. Southam.]

[*English*]

Hon. Mitchell Sharp (Minister of Finance): Mr. Speaker, I am not sure I fully understand what the hon. member is asking. The whole question of policy with respect to the United States guide lines and their effects upon Canada and upon the sort of policies that Canadian subsidiaries ought to follow in these circumstances is being studied quite urgently by the government today. As the house knows, the United States made it quite clear that they do not expect Canadian subsidiaries to act as other than good citizens of Canada, and that will be the purpose of any instructions or guide lines which we ourselves would issue.

AIR TRANSPORT

REPORTED REDUCTION IN INTERCITY SERVICE IN WEST

On the orders of the day:

Right Hon. J. G. Diefenbaker (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, I ask this question because of the interest in it of people in Prince Albert, Saskatoon, Regina and so on. It is a question to which reference has already been made and is in connection with the termination of the air service between these various points in Saskatchewan and others.

Is consideration being given to having Air Canada provide this service? This area has had private air service and passenger air service over the years, so I am wondering what the minister has to say in this connection. The situation will be very serious if this service is removed.

Hon. J. W. Pickersgill (Minister of Transport): Mr. Speaker, I quite agree that this is a very serious problem. The right hon. gentleman probably knows that one route from Yorkton to Saskatoon has I think, ceased to operate, because there was virtually no traffic on it.

With regard to all the other routes now being flown by TransAir, until there has been a public hearing the Air Transport Board has declined to accept their view that they should terminate the service. As a result of that public hearing the board might or might not approve their application. I may say that the government is also giving the most urgent consideration possible to the problem, not only of the regional carrier on the prairies but of the regional carriers in Canada, because

all of them have problems that are not dissimilar from that of TransAir. The suggestion of the right hon. gentleman will certainly be taken into account in that consideration.

Hon. W. G. Dinsdale (Brandon-Souris): A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Can the minister inform the house where and when this public hearing will take place?

Mr. Pickersgill: Mr. Speaker, I would have to inquire of the Air Transport Board before I can do that. I will be glad to do that unless the hon. gentleman would prefer to do it himself.

NORTHERN AFFAIRS

REQUEST FOR EXTENSION OF ROADS TO RESOURCES PROGRAM

On the orders of the day:

Mr. Robert Simpson (Churchill): Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Prime Minister. I directed a question to him on February 18 which he said he would like to take as notice. My question asked the Prime Minister whether the government had given any further consideration to the possibility of extending or re-establishing the roads to resources program. I am wondering whether he could now answer the question.

Hon. Jean-Luc Pepin (Minister of Mines and Technical Surveys): Mr. Speaker, I myself have become very interested in this. A few days ago I received a report on the present state of the roads to resources program, and I will be submitting recommendations to cabinet very soon.

SHIPPING

DELAY IN ISSUING PERMITS TO U.S.S.R. VESSELS

On the orders of the day:

Mr. R. Gordon L. Fairweather (Royal): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Secretary of State for External Affairs. Has the minister seen press reports alleging that permits for U.S.S.R. vessels passing through the St. Lawrence Seaway have been subjected to unnecessary delay? I am wondering whether Canada has authorized the movement of these ships through this international waterway in the usual manner?

Hon. Paul Martin (Secretary of State for External Affairs): Mr. Speaker, I do not think there has been any unnecessary delay. The applications are being considered and I hope there will be a decision made very soon.

PUBLIC SERVICE

INTERDEPARTMENTAL COMMITTEE ON BILINGUALISM—REQUEST FOR STATEMENT

On the orders of the day:

Mr. R. W. Prittie (Burnaby-Richmond): Mr. Speaker, I have a two-part question to the Prime Minister on the subject of bilingualism in the public service. I wonder whether the Prime Minister could let the house know approximately when he will be making his statement on the subject.

The second part of my question is: Can the Prime Minister tell the house whether the interdepartmental committee studying this subject has received a report from the royal commission on bilingualism and biculturalism on the subject of bilingualism in the public service?

Right Hon. L. B. Pearson (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, I had expected to meet last Friday with my colleagues and representatives of the civil service organizations, at which meeting we were going to discuss some points arising out of the interdepartmental report, as well as our own views on this matter. Unfortunately, because of developments in the house we had to postpone that meeting, but we expect to have it very shortly. After that meeting I expect to be in a position to make a fairly complete statement to the house on this very important matter.

NATIONAL DEFENCE

RE-ENLISTMENT BONUS FOR FORMER PERSONNEL

On the orders of the day:

Mr. Robert McCleave (Halifax): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of National Defence or the Associate Minister. Would either minister, or both, consider requests by former servicemen who are now thinking of returning to the services that the re-enlistment bonus should apply to them, having in mind that they have already undergone considerable basic training and the taxpayers would have the advantage of such a saving?

Hon. Paul Hellyer (Minister of National Defence): This question was raised at the time the bonus was announced, Mr. Speaker. These things were not included in the proposal. The question is being reconsidered and studied. I am afraid I cannot at this time give my hon. friend any indication of what the outcome would be.

Inquiries of the Ministry

THE BUDGET

INQUIRY AS TO PROBABLE DATE OF PRESENTATION

On the orders of the day:

Mr. Eric A. Winkler (Grey-Bruce): I should like to ask the Minister of Finance, Mr. Speaker, if he could possibly give the house any date as to when he is going to present his budget to the house?

Hon. Mitchell Sharp (Minister of Finance): No, I regret I cannot give that date today, Mr. Speaker.

LABOUR RELATIONS

HALIFAX DOCKYARD—JOB EVALUATION WITHOUT CONSULTATION

On the orders of the day:

Mr. David Lewis (York South): Mr. Speaker, on two occasions I have asked the Associate Minister of National Defence certain questions with regard to Halifax dock workers. May I ask him whether he now has the answers or, if he has not, whether perhaps the Minister of National Revenue has the answers.

Hon. E. J. Benson (Minister of National Revenue): Mr. Speaker, a few days ago a number of questions were directed to the Associate Minister of National Defence as a result of telegrams received from the Halifax Dockyard Trades and Labour Council, telegrams expressing concern about a job evaluation program that was being instituted without consultation with representatives of the employees concerned.

In May, 1964, the preparatory committee on collective bargaining made recommendations to cabinet calling for major reforms in the systems of classification and pay applying to civil servants and prevailing rate employees. The recommendations urged that steps be taken to develop and introduce a new and improved system based on a relatively simple structure of occupational categories and groups, a system that might be expected to provide a suitable framework for the negotiation of pay rates in the contemplated collective bargaining regime.

The recommendations were approved in principle and referred to the Civil Service Commission, which was asked to undertake the very large and important task of implementation. In October, 1964, the Commission established for this purpose a new unit known as the bureau of classification revision.

[Mr. Hellyer.]

Since that time, the bureau, with the cooperation and assistance of all departments, has made a good deal of progress. Most of the required work on the administrative and administrative support categories has been completed. Planning work on the remaining categories, including the operational category to which dockyard employees will be assigned, is under way. It is expected that the whole program will be completed during 1967.

The major employee organizations in the Public Service have been consulted at every step in the development of this program. I am informed that, as soon as its tentative plans for the operational category have been formulated, the bureau intends to consult as well with organizations whose interests are limited to specific occupational groups in this category. These organizations will include the Dockyard Trades and Labour Councils in both Halifax and Esquimalt.

Mr. Lewis: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Can the minister assure the house, and through us the workers involved, that the plans will not be implemented until the bodies concerned have been consulted, as well as informed of the result?

Mr. Benson: Mr. Speaker, I indicated that the bodies concerned would be consulted at the appropriate stage.

[*Later:*]

Mr. J. M. Forrestall (Halifax): Mr. Speaker, may I direct a question to the Associate Minister of National Defence and ask him if he would consider, upon request from the Dockyard Trades and Labour Council, the facility of a meeting with him on the very urgent and important question being considered in Halifax.

Hon. Léo Cadieux (Associate Minister of National Defence): That I shall, sir.

TRADE

INCREASE IN COMMODITY EXPORTS TO OVERCOME TRADE DEFICIT

On the orders of the day:

Mr. S. J. Korchinski (Mackenzie): Mr. Speaker, I have a question to direct to the Minister of Trade and Commerce. On March 9, in reply to a question by the hon. member for Northumberland (Mr. Hees) the minister indicated that in his discussions with the United States authorities, he was aware

of Canada's payments deficit vis-à-vis the United States. The minister stated that Canada's sales last year increased by 13 per cent, to a point over the $5 billion mark. In view of Canada's imports reaching 17.1—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. The Chair has been very lenient this afternoon, but my leniency cannot extend to the point of allowing this question.

Mr. Korchinski: Mr. Speaker, might I finish the question and ask the minister what positive steps he had suggested at that meeting.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

ADMINISTRATION OF JUSTICE

SUGGESTED ACTION TO CONTROL ORGANIZED CRIME

On the orders of the day:

Mr. Andrew Brewin (Greenwood): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Justice, which would also perhaps concern the Solicitor General.

Has the attention of the minister been called to what has been described as a three stage national crack-down on organized crime in the United States, in which the President of that country outlined detailed proposals for a national strategy against organized crime, welding together the efforts of local, state and federal governments—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. The hon. gentleman is making a statement. He is not asking a question.

Mr. Brewin: With respect, Mr. Speaker, I will come to the question, by putting the basis for the question.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member knows that questions should not be preceded by speeches, however short.

Mr. Brewin: Mr. Speaker, I will come to the question. Will the Minister of Justice study the President's proposals and adapt what is relevant to a similar war on organized crime and its causes in Canada?

LABOUR RELATIONS

ONTARIO—REQUEST FOR STATEMENT ON TRUCKING STRIKE

On the orders of the day:

Mr. Eric A. Winkler (Grey-Bruce): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Labour. I should like to ask the minister if he can furnish the house with any information in relation to the truckers strike in the province of Ontario and the participation of this department, because I have learned of a very serious situation which may develop later on this fall in regard to rail users.

Hon. J. R. Nicholson (Minister of Labour): Mr. Speaker, that is a double barreled question. Perhaps it would be easier to deal with the second part first. The hon. member and the house will be glad to know that I have issued an order directing that a board of conciliation be set up to deal with the requests of the railway unions. A communication to that effect went off several days ago to the companies and to the unions concerned.

With regard to the first part of the question, I am happy to say that the reports that I received recently are a little more optimistic, and that the parties have again resumed negotiations in the truckers strike.

CAPITAL PUNISHMENT

REQUEST FOR INFORMATION ON DEBATING PROCEDURE

On the orders of the day:

Mr. Reid Scott (Danforth): Mr. Speaker, I wish to direct a question to the government house leader. Has the government yet reached a decision as to the manner in which the issue of capital punishment will be placed before the House of Commons, so as to ensure that a decision will be reached? If so, what is the decision, and when does the government intend to start the debate?

Hon. G. J. McIlraith (Minister of Public Works): Mr. Speaker, I think the answer to the first part of the question must be no, in its final form. In view of the breakdown of the business in the house for some days, I should like to withhold answering the second part of the question until tomorrow.

CANADIAN CENTENNIAL

INQUIRY CONCERNING ISSUE OF GOLD MINT SETS

On the orders of the day:

Mr. R. A. Webb (Hastings-Frontenac): Mr. Speaker, I should like to direct a question to the Minister of Finance. Because of a number of requests, would the Minister of Finance please advise the house and the country when and where one can obtain the $20 gold mint sets as proposed by the former minister of finance in honour of our one hundredth birthday.

Television Transmission Facilities

Hon. Mitchell Sharp (Minister of Finance): Mr. Speaker, I shall be glad to make inquiries and to inform the house or the hon. member.

BROADCASTING

SPONSORSHIP OF PROGRAMS BY FRENCH GOVERNMENT

On the orders of the day:

Mr. H. W. Herridge (Kootenay West): Mr. Speaker, I shall try the second time. I wish to ask the Secretary of State a question of which I gave her verbal notice five minutes ago. Would the minister inform the house if she considers it proper that the Government of France through its ownership of Air France should sponsor broadcasts to privately owned radio stations concerning the happenings in parliament?

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. I suggest that the question itself is not proper. It is not properly put or asked of the minister at this time.

May I suggest to hon. members as most questions have been answered this afternoon, we might move to private members business.

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Mr. Speaker: It being 5.30 p.m. the house will now proceed with the consideration of private members business listed on the order paper, namely notices of motions. It is my understanding of course that this will be an hour period, and that the house would adjourn, or suspend its sitting at 6.30 after private members business has been discussed for one hour.

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Mr. Knowles: To resume sitting at eight o'clock?

Mr. Speaker: To resume at eight o'clock.

• (5:30 p.m.)

CANADIAN BROADCASTING CORPORATION

REQUEST FOR TRANSMISSION IN NORTHERN SASKATCHEWAN

Mr. A. C. Cadieu (Meadow Lake) moved:

That, in the opinion of this house, the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation should take steps to carry out its duty to provide television coverage by immediately establishing transmission facilities in northwestern Saskatchewan, including Buffalo Narrows, Uranium City and on to Fort Smith, Hay River and Yellowknife.

[Mr. Webb.]

Mr. Speaker: Order. This motion was called for the first time on March 7, 1966.

Mr. Cadieu (Meadow Lake): Mr. Speaker, it is with a great deal of pleasure that I present this motion to the house at this time. The vast areas of northern Saskatchewan and the whole of the Northwest Territories have been neglected for years, so far as television service has been concerned, and no doubt the hon. member for the Northwest Territories (Mr. Orange) will also wish to speak on this motion.

It is well known that the C.B.C. was established to provide a national service, but it has not done so. We are taking far too long to obtain that national service, and a large proportion of our population has no television service whatsoever.

All Canadians, and the companies they work for, pay taxes which help finance the C.B.C. When one looks at the wealth that comes out of our northern mining areas, including the wealth from the fishing and farming sectors, he can certainly see a great injustice. Some Canadians have no T.V. service at all. The C.B.C. cannot claim to be national; it can only claim to be regional, until the majority of Canadians are given T.V. service.

Some 60 per cent of the Canadian people have access to at least two T.V. signals, and the government is giving the C.B.C. additional funds to provide colour service for areas which already have a choice of T.V. signals. Many people who live all along our southern border receive additional T.V. service from the United States. Yet, as I say, many Canadians have no service. The priority must be changed.

The recent Fowler Commission report gave top priority to the extension of C.B.C. television service in northern and remote regions of the country. Also recently, the Minister of Northern Affairs and National Resources (Mr. Laing) said he feels T.V. service to northern Canada is crucial if we are to attract people and investment into our northern regions. Television service is also necessary to help keep families in northern Canada as it relieves social isolation and puts them in touch with the rest of the country.

Although these northern regions are remote and sparsely settled, they have old established communities and have contributed

much to the settlement and development of Canada. I might mention many of these areas were settled long before the turn of the century, and I think it is high time we gave consideration to that part of the Fowler report which says people in the north should have television service.

At page 189, under the heading "The Northern Service" the Fowler Commission report states:

Reference is often made to "the frozen north" or "the silent north" but, from our experience in relation to broadcasting, it would be equally apt to speak of "the forgotten north." Out of fifty-five briefs submitted to the committee, not one made any mention of the northern regions of Canada and their broadcasting needs. Broadcasting can do much to compensate for the sense of isolation that besets Canadians who serve their country in these vast and remote regions, and can contribute substantially to the development of the north in this way, as well as by fostering wider knowledge and interest among audiences at large. The C.B.C. officials in charge of the northern service are acutely aware of the importance of broadcasting for those who live in the north, and their views are supported by several directors of the corporation who made personal inspection tours in 1963 and 1964.

Until 1958, the only service available in the north was provided by the armed forces and the Department of Transport, with program assistance from the C.B.C. In fact, the oldest continuous program on C.B.C. radio is "Northern Messenger," which began in 1932 and broadcasts, each week throughout the winter, personal messages from family and friends to men and women isolated in the Arctic regions. A C.B.C. plan for radio service to the north, which was commended by the Royal Commission on Broadcasting in 1957, was put into effect in 1958.

At page 194, under the heading "Financial Provision" it is stated:

It is obviously more expensive, per capita, to provide broadcast service to the sparsely settled north than to the much more densely populated areas of southern Canada. The same applies to all other northern services: for example, the annual expenditure for each pupil educated in the Northwest Territories is now about $700, and Eskimo health services cost almost $300 a head each year. The annual cost of broadcasting to the north amounts to only $16 a head for an audience to whom the importance of this service is pervasive. For a total operating cost of $1.2 million in 1964-65, the northern service is making an excellent contribution to the development of the Canadian north and the well-being of its residents, which should be strengthened and fortified in the future.

The additional operating cost arising from our recommendations is estimated at $500,000 a year, and the annual budget for the northern service should therefore be increased to at least $1.7 million as soon as possible.

I should now like to refer to a question that was placed on the order paper by the hon. member for Melville (Mr. Ormiston) and was answered recently by the Secretary of State (Miss LaMarsh). The question read:

What is the estimated cost to the C.B.C. of putting colour production and transmission facilities in place to provide for limited network programming and for full network programming (English network), assuming the 1965 proportions of network programs originating from Toronto and from regional centres are maintained?

I should like to read the answer in order to give some idea of what we are spending on this, though leaving people in the north without any service whatsoever. The answer reads:

A. The estimated capital cost of C.B.C. colour production and transmission facilities to provide limited network colour programming in both languages is expected to be $15,000,000 by the beginning of 1967.

• (5:40 p.m.)

B. The estimated share of capital cost for full colour programming (English network only) is of the order of $30 million. This is a planning figure only extended to 1971-72. It is necessarily a somewhat arbitrary estimate because most capital colour facilities will be shared by C.B.C.'s national, regional and local program services and by English and French services at some locations. The C.B.C. has not been authorized to enter colour to the foregoing extent but colour requirements have necessarily been estimated in all plans for consolidation and replacement of equipment. The English network's share of these proposals and of the $15 million in A is included in the estimate.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I do not have anything particularly against colour television, but I do think we would be greatly amiss were we to provide colour television to the 60 per cent of the population in that part of Canada which already has one to two or, as I said, more signals already available at the turn of a switch, when we think of this vast area which is fairly well populated, which has produced great wealth and where to a large extent these people are left without any effort being made whatever to bring television into these areas.

If we were to take a good hard look at the wealth which has been produced from the uranium mines in the Athabasca region alone and if we were to take a look at the amount of revenue that the Dominion of Canada has received in the form of corporation taxes, I think we would make a greater effort to make a start at least to bring television service to these people who are doing a great deal for Canada.

Thank you very much.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: The hon. member for Saint-Denis.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Marcel Prud'homme (Saint-Denis): Mr. Speaker, I fully share the views just expressed by the hon. member for Meadow Lake (Mr. Cadieu). However, having studied his notice of motion:

> That in the opinion of this house, the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation should take steps to provide television coverage by immediately establishing transmission facilities in northwestern Saskatchewan, etc.

and the localities mentioned, I would say that numerous representations have been made in this regard by the hon. member for Chapleau (Mr. Laprise), the hon. member for Churchill (Mr. Simpson), the hon. member for Saguenay (Mr. Blouin), the hon. member for Grand Falls-White Bay-Labrador (Mr. Granger), the hon. member for the Northwest Territories (Mr. Orange) as well as by the hon. member for Bonavista-Twillingate (Mr. Pickersgill).

I do hope that the hon. member for Meadow Lake will not hold it against me if I extend his resolution, which covers only part of the northern region of his province, to the whole northern region of the country. I listened very closely to the comments he made about his notice of motion and I fully agree with him, except for one thing—and I will undoubtedly have the occasion to talk about it at length following this debate—he said that before offering colour television to serve, as he said himself, 60 per cent of the population, we should begin by providing full radio and television coverage, particularly television coverage, to all the areas which are not getting it yet. Here is one of the main objections that come to my mind. If the C.B.C. does not take immediate steps, not to do any pioneering, but just to keep up to date, and spend a great proportion of its budget on research so that we might start today to have colour television, there is no doubt that, at that time, the majority of the Canadian people will become more and more Americanized, because if the C.B.C.—and these are his own words—does not keep abreast of new developments, the American television stations will surely outpace the C.B.C.

It is unfortunate that the C.B.C. is unable to extend its service to the farthest corners of our country, because I fully agree with the hon. member for Meadow Lake that the economic contribution that those remote areas make to Canada as a whole is to the advantage of Canada as a whole which should ask the C.B.C. to allocate a greater part of its budget, of its research, of its finance to give the regions he mentioned the television coverage they are requesting.

I should like to point out to him that Uranium City, Fort Smith, Hay River, Yellowknife, Buffalo Narrows are not the only centres not served by television. The hon. members for Chapleau and Saguenay, who are now in their seats, pointed out to me that in their regions the only television available was cable television and this was at an astronomical cost, as high as $200 payable in advance, for a community antenna and up to $7 per month, also payable in advance.

• (5:50 p.m.)

I think that here also the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation should extend its service. On the other hand, the Fowler commission is abundantly clear in this connection, for it says that the C.B.C. must tend inasmuch as possible to extension of radio and television services to regions not yet served. I do imagine that this part of the Fowler commission report meets the wish of the hon. member for Meadow Lake.

However, and I believe this is one of the government's responsibilities, in its recommendations concerning the financing of such a proposal, the committee does not provide for the steps necessary for achieving such a wish. It makes the wish—I believe it is a general wish—that the Canadian population as a whole must be served by television. However, in its conclusions unfortunately, it remains completely silent and does not say how the financing should be envisaged.

Besides, the C.B.C. has clearly reduced from 4,000 to 2,000 its requirement with regard to the population to be served. It is already a beginning toward implementing the wish of the hon. member for Meadow Lake and of other members I mentioned earlier, whether it be the members for Chapleau, Churchill, Saguenay, and whatever their political affiliation may be.

I found encouraging the statement made in the house by the minister responsible for the C.B.C., when she said, as reported on page 2418 of *Hansard* for March 8 last:

> I fully agree, as I am sure every hon. member does, that it should be extended to such regions as quickly as is humanly possible, if it is humanly possible.

And she refers in particular to the many pressures brought to bear on the minister by the hon. members for Chapleau, Churchill, Saguenay, etc. I believe it is the first time she

referred to those representations. I say this, without reflecting, of course, on her immediate predecessor, the hon. member for Outremont-Saint-Jean (Mr. Lamontagne), who devoted all his energies to the extension of cultural television broadcasts to every area of our country.

I should also like to point out to the hon. member that if the C.B.C. has not actually covered more of our country, it is often due —vulgar as it may seem—to the question of dollars and cents and not, I am deeply convinced, a question of ill-will as under previous administrations. It is purely and simply a financial matter. It is not the general policy of the C.B.C. to deprive certain areas of our country of the benefits of television. I am also sure it has not entered the mind of the hon. member from Meadow Lake that the C.B.C. is wilfully refusing to extend its services throughout Canada. It is purely a question of money.

I believe that C.B.C., in its efforts to extend its services, faces three main problems. First, there are the areas not currently served, then the improvements required to current services, and the replacement over a period of many years of current services now totally obsolete.

These three problems, my hon. friend will admit, are almost on the same level. It is a question of priority: Which is the most important? Is it to serve immediately 100 per cent of the population and to hold back on the development, for instance, of colour T.V.? Should the C.B.C. spend a fortune, considering the unfortunate sparsity of our population, and be left far behind by private industry?

As far as its financial means allow, is the C.B.C. not supposed to try at once to extend its services to areas which do not have them at present, to be always at the fore, never to let itself be outstripped with regard to the improvement of its present services, and never to let itself be outstripped by letting its facilities become obsolete?

I attach a great deal of importance to this problem. Being French speaking myself, and my friend English speaking, which in no way reflects upon our sound Canadianism, I believe that C.B.C. should extend from coast to coast, right across the country, and thus fulfill the wish made when it was founded.

I believe that the C.B.C., while admitting the grounds for the suggestion made by the member for Meadow Lake, should also—and the hon. member mentioned it in his remarks—assign part of its revenue to the development of bilingual television across the whole of Canada. I believe that, at the moment, this is as important as providing C.B.C. services to the remote regions at an exhorbitant price.

Thus, to summarize somewhat my observations, in answer to the hon. member for Meadow Lake who says that the C.B.C., rather than extending its network in areas not serviced at present, intends to assign part of this money to colour television, that the C.B.C. must compete immediately with those who are offering colour television if we want to promote our Canadian identity from coast to coast, be it French-speaking or English speaking. If we want to keep our Canadian identity, it is essential that the important field of television, the one which probably exerts the strongest influence on our young people, those young people who, as could easily be pointed out—

[*English*]

Are not born prejudiced, but could easily be made prejudiced.

[*Translation*]

Well, those young people, when watching television, be it in Vancouver, New Brunswick or in Quebec, will realize that a language different from their own is being spoken and they will immediately understand the bilingual character of their country. That should strike our young people.

That is why the C.B.C. should extend its bilingual service throughout Canada as much as possible. Now, that requires huge sums of money. The corporation must enter immediately into the field of colour television. I am repeating myself, but I feel this is important. The C.B.C. should not be criticized for spending tremendous sums on the development of colour television. My hon. friend knows very well what happened in Toronto recently. That is a striking example of what could take place elsewhere. Indeed, it is claimed that if the Toronto area had been provided with a new television station, people in Toronto and the surrounding area would be prevented from watching their favourite American programs as they are doing now.

If our people start watching American colour television, you can well imagine what might happen. I know that my hon. friend is as worried as I am about that. The C.B.C. must undertake research in the field of television and radio in Canada. If the C.B.C. does

not start competing right now with private American television, the situation will be deplorable. Therefore, it must spend the money it is planning to allocate for the development of colour television.

I do not think it can be blamed for that.

There is no doubt that if you examine the range of the C.B.C.—and it is a summary of the observations of the C.B.C.—it can be seen that it subscribes to the recommendations of the Fowler Committee, namely to extend as much as possible the television network throughout Canada.

But there again you must admit that it has become more and more impossible to reach some regions without spending a lot of money.

Each year, however, the C.B.C. spends larger sums of money—and I think that is what the hon. member for Meadow Lake wants—to serve those regions.

If you refer now to the remarks made by the minister responsible on Thursday night, March 8, as reported at page 2419 of *Hansard*, you will read this:

> I have asked the C.B.C.—and the C.B.C., as members of the committee can imagine, is eager to comply—to give the government and estimate of the cost of doing something similar to that suggested by the hon. member for Churchill, namely, to put aside a fund so that the last big step toward the outer limit of practicability can be reached in an orderly way.

And I would say that applies to the hon. members for Churchill and Meadow Lake and to all hon. members representing regions in the North.

> Then, the C.B.C. can lay out its priorities and make a start toward providing a national service which is received, if possible, in every Canadian home.

Of course, the minister said that unfortunately she could not tell hon. members when that will happen. The Cabinet is studying that matter which, of course, comes under general government policy and the conclusions of the Fowler report.

Personally, I succeeded in obtaining a seat on the committee on broadcasting, films and assistance to the arts. I do not know whether my hon. friend is a member of that committee. If not, like all other members of the house, he can appear before it, once it is set up, and voice his recommendations. I am sure he will find sympathetic people among its members. Naturally, I cannot speak for the other members of the committee, but he may rest assured that I myself shall be most

[Mr. Prud'homme.]

interested in hearing his views and recommendations, that is, I shall try to find with him, under present circumstances, what would be the ideal solution and the recommendations to bring before both the C.B.C. and the government.

Of course, those recommendations will always take into account questions which people most often refuse to mention, that is to say practical matters, realistic questions, in short, those having to do with financial possibilities.

Naturally, one could perhaps adopt the theory of a certain political party in this house and say that it is humanly possible to serve, as I am sure it is, all the northern regions of this country and all others which are not served. But that is a financial question and it would seem that, at the present time, that is the big problem. As soon as we find the solution to it, I am convinced that it will be more logical to put the said resolution on the order paper.

Then, the hon. member and other members who are interested in the matter will no longer have any reason to be dissatisfied.

• (6:00 p.m.)

[*English*]

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Rinfret): Order, please. I regret having to interrupt the debate on this topic but it is my duty to do so at this time.

PROCEEDINGS ON ADJOURNMENT MOTION

SUBJECT MATTER OF QUESTION TO BE DEBATED UNDER ADJOURNMENT MOTION

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Rinfret): It is my duty, pursuant to provisional standing order 39A, to inform the house that the question to be raised at the time of adjournment tonight is as follows: The hon. member for Springfield (Mr. Schreyer), Agriculture—feed grain —charging of unreasonable prices.

CANADIAN BROADCASTING CORPORATION

REQUEST FOR TRANSMISSION IN NORTHERN SASKATCHEWAN

The house resumed consideration of the motion of Mr. Cadieu (Meadow Lake):

> That, in the opinion of this house, the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation should take steps to carry out its duty to provide television coverage by immediately establishing transmission facilities in northwestern Saskatchewan, including Buffalo Narrows, Uranium City and on to Fort Smith, Hay River and Yellowknife.

Mr. Cadieu (Meadow Lake): Mr. Speaker, I would say to the hon. gentleman that I would be very happy to be a member of the broadcasting committee. I should like to ask him a couple of questions if I may. Does the hon. gentleman not think we are neglecting the population of the north and northern development in hesitating to bring television into the north?

Mr. Prud'homme: If I may answer, Mr. Speaker—

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Rinfret): Order, please. I hesitate to interrupt the hon. member for Saint-Denis (Mr. Prud'homme) but at this moment the time limit of 20 minutes has been exceeded in his case. It is not possible to recognize the hon. member unless there is unanimous consent of the house.

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Rinfret): I would ask whether the house gives unanimous consent to the hon. member for Saint-Denis replying to this question?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Mr. Prud'homme: Mr. Speaker, I do not pretend to be an expert on these matters as is the hon. gentleman. I try to find the best solution to a difficult problem and the answer is that this is exactly the difficulty of the C.B.C. I am sure the C.B.C. is faced with three difficult problems that appear to be of equal gravity, if I may say so. These problems are: Areas not yet served, improvements to existing services, the replacement of obsolete or inadequate facilities.

These are the problems of the C.B.C. and I think they serve as an answer to the question. It is a difficult situation. We need more money to extend services. It is just a question of money and it is not a question of desirability. We all agree it is desirable. We all agree that these services should be extended. However, if we go as far as to say that we should not have colour television in Canada but rather should use all the money for the development and extension of television to northern regions not yet served, I think we are not helping our country.

[*Translation*]

We do not help our country to remain in a competitive position with the country to the south which invades us more and more in every field, radio broadcasting, television, culture, and even the newspapers.

[*English*]

I have tried to give an honest answer to an honest question.

Mr. Cadieu (Meadow Lake): Mr. Speaker, has the hon. gentleman any idea of the wealth that has come out of the Athabasca region alone?

Mr. Prud'homme: I spoke about that a few minutes ago after listening very carefully to the hon. member. I said I agree that we do receive a great deal in the way of natural resources from this area and the C.B.C. should take this into consideration. I agree completely that the country as a whole receives much more than the country as a whole sometimes is giving back to the northern region.

[*Translation*]

The fact remains that it is a financial matter, that there are three main problems C.B.C. must face.

Mr. Gérard Laprise (Chapleau): Mr. Speaker, I should like to take a few minutes and add a few words to what I already said on this subject a few days ago, during consideration of the estimates of the Secretary of State.

I fully agree with the motion of the hon. member for Meadow Lake (Mr. Cadieu), to the effect that any area which does not yet receive C.B.C. television coverage, should get it as soon as possible.

The motion of the hon. member for Meadow Lake reads as follows:

> That, in the opinion of this House, the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation should take steps to carry out its duty to provide television coverage by immediately establishing transmission facilities in northwestern Saskatchewan, including Buffalo Narrows, Uranium City and on to Fort Smith, Hay River and Yellowknife.

Mr. Speaker, I am convinced—and we have seen again tonight—that no member in the house objects or would object to the passing of this motion. I assume that the member for Saint-Denis (Mr. Prud'homme) spoke on behalf of the Liberal party, and according to the answers given last Tuesday by the hon. Secretary of State (Miss LaMarsh), on that subject, I believe that the government would also agree to make this radio and television service available in every place where it is possible in Canada.

Television Transmission Facilities

I am a little surprised to hear the member for Saint-Denis tell us that the main difficulties at the moment are especially financial.

Well, Mr. Speaker, when it comes to sending funds anywhere in the world, for the development of underdeveloped areas, the question of whether or not we have the money is never asked. It can always be had.

I agree wholeheartedly with the hon. member for Meadow Lake when he says that all northern areas of all the Canadian provinces are underdeveloped regions.

What culture television can give them will be of great help, and will even contribute to developments right across Canada.

Southernmost regions have benefited far more from television. They have access to the C.B.C. network as well as to several private radio and television stations; they also have access to television from the United States.

Northern regions have no television whatsoever and C.B.C. reception is very poor.

Mr. Speaker, I am sure that if the present government wanted to go to the trouble of doing so, it would find a way of financing the expansion into the north of the C.B.C. network to enable it to serve all the regions which are inhabited to a certain extent.

We are told it is going to be very costly. Still, the citizens of northern areas, such as the people of Chibougamau-Chapais in my area, have contributed through their income tax and other taxes to the financing of television network developments in southerly regions. It would be proper, now, for the other citizens of the country to help finance that C.B.C. development.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I am convinced that no member would object if the government were to propose the allocation of the necessary funds for this development.

High-ranking officials of the C.B.C. tell us that it is physically possible to provide service in all areas of the north. Thus, the government need only make financially possible what is already physically possible and everyone will be satisfied.

• (6:10 p.m.)

[*English*]

Mr. Robert Simpson (Churchill): Mr. Speaker, I do not intend to take too much of the time of the house in debating this matter since the debate appears to be rapidly coming to a conclusion. I would be happy if the house would accept this resolution. I should like to add by wholehearted support to the motion of the hon. member for Meadow Lake (Mr. Cadieu). On numerous occasions I have spoken in the house of the need for extending C.B.C. television services into the northern parts of our provinces and indeed into the Northwest Territories.

I was interested and a little surprised at the remarks of the hon. member for Saint-Denis (Mr. Prud'homme). I really do feel he is interested in this problem. He said it was a matter of financing and in a way he is quite right. He appeared to be wondering if the financing of this project was justified at this time and mentioned that these things would be discussed during the meetings of the Committee on Broadcasting. I am not a member of that committee at this time. I am interested in becoming a member of the committee, and I hope that by the time the committee meets I will have succeeded in becoming a member of it.

I should like to say to all hon. members of the house, particularly those on the government side, that this is an extremely important matter. As I mentioned the other night, the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation has finally recommended to the government that parliament provide the money necessary to extend this service just as they recommended the expenditure on coloured television. This expenditure would allow the corporation to complete the extension of service into areas now unserviced. I feel that this is the crux of the matter and that parliament at this session should provide sufficient money to allow the corporation to do this job. Every member should impress upon the government the necessity for parliament providing this money.

The Secretary of State (Miss LaMarsh) has said she has asked the C.B.C. to provide the government with an estimate of the approximate cost of extending C.B.C. television service to these areas. In its annual statement last year the C.B.C. stated the cost would be somewhere in the neighbourhood of $15 million. This may seem like quite a sum of money but recently we passed estimates containing a subsidy of some $96 million or $97 million to the C.B.C. The estimates with which we are going to deal later this session contain an appropriation of $110 million for the C.B.C. or almost $15 million more than the amount we just voted. Although $15 million may seem like a large sum of money we should stop and think of the hundreds of millions of dollars which have been spent in

providing television to people who already enjoy it. I do not feel we should consider $15 million as an exorbitant sum to provide this service to the rest of the taxpayers of Canada.

I returned this week from a visit to my constituency. One of the purposes of my visit was to attend a meeting called by the chambers of commerce of northern Manitoba. The purpose of the meeting was to present further briefs to the government, the corporation and the B.B.G. requesting the extension of C.B.C. television services into these areas. At the meeting there were representatives of chambers of commerce in one constituency who live 500 to 600 miles apart. The meeting was well attended. These representatives met three weeks ago at another point in the constituency and in about two weeks they will be meeting again. A delegation will come to Ottawa—I do not know the size of the delegation but it will be about a dozen people—to try to impress upon the corporation, the government and the B.B.G. the necessity for this type of action.

In conclusion I should like to compliment the hon. member for Meadow Lake for bringing this resolution before the house. He has my full support. I hope all members on the government side will impress upon their colleagues the necessity for providing this money to the corporation to enable the corporation to do this job.

Mr. J. A. Byrne (Kootenay East): Mr. Speaker, I should like to compliment the hon. member for Meadow Lake (Mr. Cadieu) upon the introduction of this measure. I believe he is attempting, through public address, to do what I have been working earnestly to do more or less privately. I find there is not a large number of members of the House of Commons who are concerning themselves with this problem. During the past three years I have undertaken to communicate with the C.B.C., the Board of Broadcast Governors, the Prime Minister (Mr. Pearson) and the members of his cabinet in an endeavour to have a decision made to undertake immediately full television coverage for all taxpayers in Canada. I believe that I have met with some measure of success.

• (6:20 p.m.)

I should like also to compliment the hon. member for Churchill (Mr. Simpson) since he has been consistently bringing this matter before the house. As I said, I believe I have been somewhat successful in my representations. I must say that, knowing the members of the Fowler Committee, I made a practice of communicating rather frequently and asking them to make a recommendation to the government with regard to this matter. I believe my representations were somewhat successful because the Fowler Committee has made a recommendation that such coverage be undertaken by the C.B.C.

The hon. member's resolution requests that this parliament ask the C.B.C. to undertake this very expensive project. There is no question of course, that this means that over the next five years something like $15 million to $20 million will be required in order to provide television coverage only to communities of 2,000 people or more. This again falls far short of providing television coverage to all taxpayers of Canada but it is a step in the right direction.

This parliament and the government must make provision for the $15 million to $20 million that will be required. Much as we would like to, neither members of parliament nor the government can insist that the C.B.C. undertake this project. After all, it is an autonomous body which decides in its wisdom whether it will or will not provide the services demanded by the Canadian public. It seems to me it will require a special vote of the house to set aside a fund for this specific purpose, one not for the general use of the C.B.C.

I, too, felt some consternation when the C.B.C. said—I have not heard any announcement by the government—that there would be colour television in Canada by October this year. When I was pressing the former secretary of state some time ago for a statement on the part of the government as to the intentions in this regard, he said that colour television would not have priority over extension of television service to the outlying districts of Canada. Undoubtedly because of pressure of other matters we have not had a decision either on the part of the government or on the part of the C.B.C. whether they intend to process these areas before embarking upon colour television.

I suppose most hon. members who have concerned themselves with this matter know that the C.B.C. has a formula under which it operates with regard to providing television coverage to outlying communities. It determines the cost per capita and from there it determines which area will have priority. It may be that an area of 3,000 population will

have priority over an area with 15,000 to 20,000 people simply by virtue of the fact that the cost per capita to bring in television service is lower.

It is not entirely a question of money even if we do embark upon this undertaking over the next year or two. Technical difficulties have to be overcome. Apparently procurement is one serious problem. Even if at this session of parliament we do, and I hope we will provide the money required by the C.B.C. to undertake this coverage in its entirety, this does not mean that this operation will be completed within a year or two. It also does not mean that people in the far-flung areas are going to be provided with television even if we do spend up to $30 million.

It seems to me, Mr. Speaker, that what is required at this moment is a determination on the part of the C.B.C., perhaps with the authority of the government, to undertake some research. Technical developments are taking place at a rapid rate, yet not rapidly enough to provide television service across Canada. It seems to me that at a time when it is possible to send satellites into space which can relay television from Europe to Canada, and knowing that satellites can be kept stationary in the sky, it should also be possible to orbit a space satellite which could be suspended in space over the central part of Canada to provide C.B.C. coverage to all parts of the country, into the mountainous valleys of British Columbia and even to the north pole. If we can send satellites into space to reflect television from Europe or from any other part of the world, then it is not an insurmountable undertaking to reflect television broadcasts in Canada. This would not be nearly so costly as providing a microwave system, land lines and so on to give television coverage across the nation.

I believe we have been moving too slowly. We have been thinking in terms of microwave systems alone. It may be there would be some serious objection from microwave companies who are already in the business of providing services from central telecasting areas right across the nation. Perhaps they would find themselves with a great deal of unusable equipment, but such are the circumstances of modern technology. I believe we should investigate the situation and provide the sum of money required for immediate and serious research into this matter in order that we may provide television throughout the entire nation.

Mr. Knowles: Six thirty.

[Mr. Byrne.]

Mr. Byrne: In the meantime we should not stall any projects now being carried on to provide television coverage to smaller communities. I do not wish to talk out this measure, Mr. Speaker, so that is all I have to say at this time.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Albert Béchard (Bonaventure): Mr. Speaker, first I wish to—

[*English*]

Mr. Knowles: Six thirty.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Rinfret): Order. The time allotted to private members' hour is one hour and that time has not yet expired.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Béchard: Mr. Speaker, first I wish to congratulate the hon. member for Meadow Lake (Mr. Cadieu) for having introduced such a motion to give citizens in distant parts of the country who do not have television the advantages of this most important means of communication.

This motion reflects not only the wish of the hon. member and his fellow citizens in northwest Saskatchewan and others, but also that of several other hon. members and their constituents.

• (6:30 p.m.)

The hon. member sitting beside the hon. member for Meadow Lake would also have many things to say on this subject because, like myself, he comes from the Gaspé peninsula. The hon. member for Gaspé (Mr. Keays) could put on the order paper a motion written in exactly the same terms, except for the name of the place, since a large part of Gaspé riding is virtually deprived of television services.

A moment ago, the hon. member for Saint-Denis (Mr. Prud'homme) mentioned—

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Rinfret): Order. As it is now six thirty, it is my duty to leave the chair pursuant to an order passed by the house this afternoon.

Accordingly, the house will adjourn until eight o'clock tonight.

Mr. Knowles: Fine.

Mr. Grafftey: Have a good lunch.

[*English*]

SITTING RESUMED

The house resumed at 8 p.m.

ADMINISTRATION OF JUSTICE

MUNSINGER CASE—ANNOUNCEMENT OF JUDICIAL INQUIRY AND STATEMENTS BY MEMBERS

Hon. E. D. Fulton (Kamloops): Mr. Speaker, as I understand the position, we are at this moment back on the question of privilege and have before us what I call draft terms of reference, although the order in council has been passed.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. It is the understanding of the Chair that we are on a question of privilege raised by the hon. member for Kamloops and more particularly on the terms of reference mentioned by the right hon. Prime Minister this afternoon.

Mr. Fulton: That is my understanding, Mr. Speaker. I call them draft terms of reference because I do hope that the government will be prepared to consider some amendments to these terms of reference, although I appreciate that the order in council has been passed.

Therefore, what we have to discuss are two things, as I see it: First, whether there should be a judicial committee of inquiry and, if so, whether and to what extent the terms of reference proposed are satisfactory. It is our position, Mr. Speaker, that we are agreed to there being a judicial inquiry into the Munsinger case but we are not prepared to forgo any of the rights and privileges of this house and its members, nor are we prepared to forgo the rights of members to discuss these privileges here in so far as they have been brought into question by the course which has been followed so far.

We have said, and I repeat, that we have nothing to be ashamed of or to hide in our handling of this particular case. I want to make it perfectly clear that we are not opposing or seeking to delay the constitution of the judicial committee of inquiry. I merely wish to make it abundantly clear that we reserve the right to express our opinion on the terms of reference and we do not admit that any judicial inquiry or any body can determine in any way the rights and privileges of this house.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Fulton: This house is the only body that can do that.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Fulton: Subject to that understanding we are prepared to co-operate in expediting a satisfactory judicial inquiry. We are, however, very much concerned with the terms of reference embodied in this order in council.

Wishing also to expedite the day, the hour, the minute when this house will be restored to a position where it can deal with the business of the country, we suggest, subject to reservations I shall mention in a moment, that there be an all party committee to discuss the terms of reference which have been laid before us today to see if it is possible to arrive more closely, at any rate, to agreement than I regret to say is the case so far. I shall be outlining to the house this evening the reservations that we have with respect to the terms of reference and some of the things we think should be incorporated therein. Others in our party will wish to follow up in detail with respect to some of the matters I mention.

I wish to make it clear that we have decided that if the government is prepared to agree that there should be an all-party committee we will co-operate in that committee. I do not mean it to be implied that at the moment I sit down we shall have exhausted the matters that we at this stage wish to bring before this house as to the things that should be considered by that committee.

I want, next, to indicate some of the objections to the present terms of reference and the suggestions we have to make as to how they should be amended. First, Mr. Speaker, in our view the terms of reference proposed in the order in council are far too vague and do not reproduce in the least fully or accurately the full effects of the charges made and the innuendos raised by the Minister of Justice. It is our view that these charges and their accuracy should form the major portion of the investigation which the commission is asked to undertake, and with that in mind I want to refer to some of the specific terms which we think should be altered.

In the first place, we think that the reference to the letter from the Minister of Justice to the Prime Minister which was read into the record of the House of Commons on Friday last should be deleted from the terms of reference of the royal commission. We are of that view because the letter of the Minister of Justice was an exculpatory document, or an attempt at exculpation, and an attempt to deny that he had made far reaching and improper charges publicly into which this commission should inquire. We therefore object very much to the letter, and certainly the initial portion, being made part of the terms

of reference—especially being the initial or main portion. After all, Mr. Speaker, the letter seeks to narrow down the accusations of the Minister of Justice to an accusation that the former prime minister, the Leader of the Opposition, was derelict in his duty in not referring the matter to the legal advisers in the Department of Justice.

This is not really the issue before this house, nor should it be the issue before the commission at all. I have already dealt with the reasons the letter was not referred and I am not going to go into this again in detail tonight. I simply want to make clear one thing, that the former prime minister and I stand together in this matter. I received a report from the Royal Canadian Mounted Police. The same day I referred it to the then prime minister. I did not wait until I met him some weeks later on a plane trip and then refer to it casually.

• (8:10 p.m.)

An hon. Member: Smear.

Mr. Fulton: I told the then prime minister I wanted to see him. I said I had to see him on a serious matter. He said I was welcome to come to his office to discuss it, and to come right away. I went down with the file. We discussed the file and the surrounding circumstances. Those were the relationships that then characterized the administration of justice and the relationship between the minister and the prime minister. We did not operate in watertight compartments.

Mr. Macdonald (Rosedale): What about February, 1963?

Mr. Fulton: And that having been done—

Mr. Pearson: Why did you quit?

Mr. Fulton: I say that with respect to this matter we stand together, and it is not the former prime minister who is on trial here—

Mr. Macdonald (Rosedale): Oh, it is.

Mr. Fulton: "Oh, it is" I hear from over there. Now we have it. Now we know.

An hon. Member: That is the little boy from Rosedale.

Mr. Fulton: I am afraid I did not personally observe the source of the interruption but I am told it was the hon. member for Rosedale (Mr. Macdonald). Well, sir, that may be the intention of hon. members opposite but we do not intend to allow this parliament to be prostituted by that kind of conduct

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

[Mr. Fulton.]

Mr. Fulton: So I say that we object to the inclusion as the first portion, if indeed as any portion of the terms of reference, of the letter of the Minister of Justice.

Then, something that should be added to the terms of reference is a reference to the statements made in the House of Commons by the Prime Minister, as reported at pages 2521 and 2532 of *Hansard* for March 10, where the Prime Minister made it clear that in his view what was important in the inquiry was whether or not this was a bona fide security case. At page 2521 the Prime Minister said:

> I believe that there have been all sorts of statements made in the house this afternoon, and allegations made inside and outside the house. I ask the hon. member who was so very indignant a few moments ago because we would not do anything about it, if the government moved a motion in this parliament for the establishment of a judicial inquiry, which is what they wanted in the Spencer case and this is a matter which concerns security—would the opposition support it?

That statement, I submit, makes it clear that in the Prime Minister's view the important thing to be inquired into was whether the Munsinger case concerned security.

Mr. Pickersgill: Would the hon. member permit me to ask a question? Would the hon. gentleman tell us if the file to which he has made repeated reference was a security file in the usual acceptance of that term?

Mr. Fulton: It was a confidential file, so marked, and it dealt with matters which were secret and confidential as between myself and the R.C.M.P. reporting.

Mr. Pearson: Exactly.

Mr. Fulton: And I said this afternoon that there was no charge or suggestion therein that there had been a breach of security. If my hon. friend, who has been a minister long enough to know better, does not know there are a number of things that come from the R.C.M.P. to the minister of justice which are so categorized and under that cover, which do not deal with security in the sense hon. members opposite have been trying to represent it, then he does not know what goes on in the administration of justice in this country.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Pickersgill: If the hon. gentleman will permit me, I should like to repeat my question. I ask the hon. gentleman whether this file was what is normally referred to as a security file or did it refer to some other kind of thing that the R.C.M.P. was investigating?

Mr. Fulton: I have made my statement this afternoon. I would have liked very much to be able to see the file before speaking here today.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh.

Mr. Pickersgill: Evasion.

Mr. Fulton: I do not think my hon. friend has seen it, and I have made my statement. I am not going to go back on my statement, nor am I going to retreat from it, that the investigation which gave rise to the report I received was not initiated as the result of any security checkup in the proper sense of the word security.

Mr. Hellyer: What is the proper sense of the word?

Mr. Matheson: May I ask—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. The hon. member for Kamloops has the floor.

Mr. Lewis: May I ask the hon. member a question? I am not concerned with the politicking going on between the Minister of Transport and himself.

Some hon. Members: Oh, sit down.

Mr. Lewis: Mr. Speaker, I repeat what I said about the questions that were asked of the hon. member for Kamloops but I want to ask him a question relating to his suggestion. Does his suggestion for the inclusion of the statement made by the Prime Minister add anything in his view to the statement now in the terms of reference about the circumstances that may have constituted a risk to security? I am seeking information. I am not trying to do anything else.

Mr. Fulton: I appreciate the terms of the hon. member's question and I assure him I will deal with that as I outline my suggestion with respect to the changes that should be made in the terms of reference.

Mr. Matheson: Mr. Speaker, may I ask a question? Did the file come from the security and intelligence branch?

Mr. Fulton: I think, Mr. Speaker, it is obvious we are getting to the root of what has been going on here. It appears to me it becomes important for the Prime Minister to say what he means by security, in the context in which he used that word in relation to this case.

Mr. Pearson: That will be easy.

Mr. Fulton: All I want is the Prime Minister's statement of March 10, to which I have referred at page 2521, made part of the terms of reference, because that was an allegation made by the Prime Minister that this was a security case.

We would also wish to have the statement made by the Prime Minister, reported at page 2532 of *Hansard*, made a part of the terms of reference and subject to the commissioner's inquiry. At that stage the Prime Minister was indicating he was prepared to adopt the amendment proposed by the hon. member for Lapointe (Mr. Grégoire) and he said, referring to the amendment:

It is that we should:

—take such steps as are necessary to establish a judicial injuiry into the security case referred to by the Minister of Justice and by the Leader of the Opposition on March 4, 1966, at *Hansard* page 2211—

The Prime Minister was prepared to adopt that as part of the terms of reference for the inquiry. In other words, in his view this was a security case and this is a matter we think the commissioner should be instructed and required to look into.

Then we think the terms of reference should be further amended by deleting the whole clause beginning about the middle of the Order in Council with the words:

—and into all the statements of the Minister of Justice in a press conference on March 10, 1966—

And ending with the words:

—and that the case was not properly handled;

We think that sentence should be deleted—

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh.

Mr. Fulton: —and that there should be substituted therefor some words which I will outline in a moment. The reason we think that deletion should be made and a substitution inserted is that in our view the words included in the Order in Council do not in the least accurately reflect the charges made by the Minister of Justice, and what we have here are words which contain refinements and important omissions and inclusions which would prevent the commissioner from getting to the root of the matter.

After all, this thing arose out of the charges made by the Minister of Justice. He said, and I have the press clippings here to substantiate it, that the case concerned not just involvement. What was implicit in the minister's statement was improper involvement, something entirely improper—

Mr. Cardin: Quote it accurately.

Mr. Pearson: Quote it.

Mr. Fulton: —and also that included in the involvement were two or more ministers, not just involvement with the said Gerda Munsinger but involvement which, in the very direct implication of everything the minister said, was improper.

• (8:20 p.m.)

Mr. Cardin: Quote that.

Mr. Pearson: Quote that. Talk about smearing.

Mr. Fulton: Oh, yes, the minister said it was worse than the Profumo scandal. That is what he said, and there is no reference to that in the terms of the inquiry.

Mr. Cardin: Just quote what I said. That will be sufficient.

Mr. Fulton: I will come to that. I have the press clippings here. He implied there was a security risk involving former ministers. Is that not improper involvement? Is all that he was saying that somebody knew Gerda Munsinger? Is that what he was saying? Of course it is not and he knows it. The inquiry should examine whether that improper involvement he was alleging was an involvement such that the actions of those concerned were definitely a security risk to Canada. "Definitely" is the word he used, but we find in the terms of reference the words "may have constituted a risk to the security of Canada". That is not what he said. I have the clipping before me:

"I don't know—but there definitely was a security risk."

He tells me to quote him. He nods now. He said it definitely involved a security risk. So that sentence should be deleted, because that is not the charge the minister made.

There should be substituted words to the effect: "and into all statements by the Minister of Justice in a press conference on March 10, 1966, and the implications thereof, and to ascertain whether there was evidence in the R.C.M.P. file laid before the government in 1961 to support the following findings:

1. That 'two or more ministers' were improperly involved with Mrs. Munsinger and that their actions in that involvement had been such as to be 'definitely' a security risk to Canada."

That is what we want the commissioner to look into.

[Mr. Pearson.]

"2. That the file turned over to the minister of justice by the R.C.M.P. in 1961 was a 'bona fide security case'.

3. That a breach of the national security or some other offence was indicated in the file, thereby imposing a duty on the then minister of justice or prime minister to refer the file to the legal advisers in the Department of Justice.

4. That Mrs. Munsinger was known to have been employed and to have been active in espionage work before coming to Canada."

An hon. Member: Now we are getting to it.

Mr. Fulton: That is what we want the commissioner to look into, because that is what the Minister of Justice alleged outside the house. He apparently is nodding his head that these were the allegations he made.

Then, as I say, the word "may" is not acceptable. The word "may" must come out. His allegation was that the case was a definite security risk. The commissioner also should be asked to inquire into the question of whether the Munsinger case was worse than the Profumo scandal, another charge made by the Minister of Justice. He went down behind the desk for a moment but he has come up again.

Then there is another matter in respect of which it is essential that the commissioner inquire and which must be incorporated into the terms of reference if it is to be a fair and impartial inquiry and not a loaded one. That is the question—the Prime Minister laughs. Let him explain why this is omitted from the terms of reference. The terms of reference should also include a finding and report upon the conduct of the present Minister of Justice and his immediate predecessor who, although now asserting that the case involved a definite security risk, took no action in the case until it became a subject of political controversy.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Pickersgill: May I ask the hon. gentleman another question? Would the hon. gentleman tell us why he took this file to the Prime Minister so precipitately if there was no security risk involved?

Mr. Fulton: The minister who asked the question obviously does not appreciate the proper relationship between the Minister of Justice and his Prime Minister.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Pickersgill: Mr. Speaker—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

Mr. Fulton: And in the light of the attitude revealed there I am not surprised that the administration of justice has been degraded to the lowest level in the history of Canada.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

Mr. Fulton: I have seen too much of the results arising from the fact that the Minister of Justice and his Prime Minister operate in watertight compartments and wait until there is a casual reference made in the back seat of a plane in respect of something involving people next to government. I did not regard it as fulfilling my duty to my prime minister to leave him in the dark concerning things that were said.

An hon. Member: About what?

Mr. Fulton: I am waiting to hear the Minister of Justice tell us.

Mr. Pearson: You were the minister.

Mr. Fulton: There we have the same old implications.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. I suggested when the hon. member took the floor that the purpose of the discussion was to consider the terms of reference of the proposed inquiry. I would ask the hon. member who has the floor to limit his statements to that.

Mr. Fulton: Yes, sir; but I regret that I see the same implication as that raised by the Minister of Justice earlier this evening—"we make the smear; you do the explaining". What an appalling suggestion to come from the front bench of those opposite.

Then I think there should be included in the terms of reference of this commission the question of the circumstances surrounding the administration of Mrs.—

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh.

Mr. Fulton: The admission of Mrs. Munsinger.

Mr. Starr: She was a security risk and you let her in and paid her way over.

Mr. Churchill: Who was the minister of citizenship and immigration in 1955—the present Minister of Transport (Mr. Pickersgill).

Mr. Fulton: Let me fill in the ellipsis surrounding my words. The administration of the government of Canada at the time of the admission of Mrs. Munsinger was a Liberal administration and Mrs. Munsinger was admitted under the aegis of my hon. friends opposite; yet, we are now told by them that Mrs. Munsinger was a security risk before she came.

An hon. Member: In what year?

Mr. Fulton: In 1955, I understand. Who was the minister?

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Fulton: We are now told—and it is one of the implications in the charge—that she was a spy engaged in espionage activities and there were security reports about her long before she came. Who let her in?

An hon. Member: Let there be no mystery about that—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

Mr. Fulton: Whom the cap fits, let him wear it.

Mr. Pickersgill: On a question of personal privilege—

• (8:30 p.m.)

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. My understanding is that we are on the question of privilege. I have heard, during the last two or three days, members get up on questions of privilege. On Friday afternoon the hon. member for Winnipeg South Centre raised a question of personal privilege when we already had a question of privilege before the house.

Mr. Churchill: Am I being singled out for admonition?

Mr. Speaker: I suggest there is one question of privilege at the moment and that we should limit ourselves to that particular question. When we have settled that one perhaps we will go on to another, such as the one the Minister of Transport wishes to raise at this time.

I have given some thought to this and I suggest there is no basic difference between a question of privilege affecting hon. members of the house and a question of personal privilege. When the hon. member for Winnipeg South Centre raised his point the other day I asked whether there was any distinction which would allow the hon. member to interrupt the question of privilege then before the house. In this regard I suggested to him at that time that we should limit our discussion to the question then before us, and I suggest again that we now limit ourselves for the moment to the question raised by the hon. member for Kamloops.

Mr. Pickersgill: Mr. Speaker, I wonder whether the hon. member would—

Mr. Churchill: Mr. Speaker, I welcome your public admonition regarding something that happened the other day, but I hope you will add the name of the Minister of National Health and Welfare to this salutory admonition which you have uttered tonight.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. I did not admonish the hon. gentleman in any way. I made an admission of ignorance on the part of your Speaker in that I wondered at the time whether the procedure followed should have been allowed. During the intervening days I have had an opportunity to look into the matter and I have satisfied myself that we should discuss and consider one question of privilege at a time.

Mr. Fulton: Mr. Speaker, I will conclude in just a moment. I have raised certain matters which obviously are not welcomed by hon. gentlemen opposite. But I raise them in all seriousness as matters which we think should be included in the terms of reference or as alterations that should be made to those terms in order that we may have a thorough and impartial inquiry into this whole situation. We are anxious to have such an important and thorough inquiry made on a proper basis. We are prepared to join with members of other parties of this house in an attempt to work out such a set of terms of reference in order that an inquiry may proceed with all possible speed so that parliament may be allowed to get on with its business.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Pickersgill: Mr. Speaker, I am rising merely to give a personal explanation in respect of certain of the hon. member's statements.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. The hon. member can, of course, speak on the question of privilege which has been raised and I recognize him for that purpose.

Mr. Pickersgill: I will take only a few moments, sir. If this woman was admitted in 1955, as I am informed by the hon. gentleman she was, then I was the minister. I admit that at once as being a matter of record.

Mr. Fulton: I made no accusation against you in that regard. You are the one who is making the accusation.

[Mr. Speaker.]

Mr. Pickersgill: The hon. member thought I was embarrassed. I was not in the least embarrassed. What I really rose to do was to ask if the hon. gentleman when he was considering this file, discovered whether or not this woman, who if she was admitted in 1955, by 1960 would in the normal course have been eligible for citizenship, ever applied for citizenship, whether she got citizenship and, if she did not get citizenship, why she did not?

Mr. Fulton: I do not recall, Mr. Speaker. The answers to those questions are all available to the hon. gentleman at this stage. I am only appalled that he did not ask the questions and get the answers before hon. members on his side of the house unleashed this appalling campaign in this country.

Mr. Pickersgill: I wanted to know whether the hon. gentleman knew the answers to my questions.

Mr. Fulton: Yes, I did know. I satisfied myself as to the background of this matter before I dealt with the file, unlike hon. gentlemen opposite.

Mr. Matheson: Mr. Speaker, I want to ask the hon. member for Kamloops whether the Munsinger file in his hands—

An hon. Member: Who wrote your question out for you?

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

Mr. H. A. Olson (Medicine Hat): Mr. Speaker, I am not completely clear about the question of privilege we are discussing at this moment. I say that because there is now some kind of attempt being made to set up a judicial inquiry to settle a question of privilege affecting members, which is a new departure from the ordinary method of handling such a situation. There is no precedent for this action in this house or in the British house so far as I could ascertain by my research.

I am particularly concerned about the terms of reference contained in the Order in Council. Until and unless the house agrees to refer this question of privilege to a royal commission or judicial body outside the house or the extensions of this house, which has never occurred in a case of this type in the past, there is only one place where it can be settled. A question of personal privilege must be settled by this house or by an extension of this house, such as the Standing Committee on Privileges and Elections.

I know the difficult position you are in regarding this matter in deciding what is the correct action to take. As I understand the debate which has taken place during the last three days, and I have read those portions which I missed during the last part of last week, we have now reached a situation where by reason of events and the lapse of time there has been an acceptance of the fact that a prima facie case of privilege exists. If that were not so, surely we would not have spent three days on this subject.

It should not be necessary for any member to quote chapter and verse to other members of the house, but the burden falls squarely on the member or members who wish to raise a question of privilege to move a substantive motion if a prima facie case of privilege has been ruled to exist by the Chair. I should like to quote from page 134 of Erskine May's Parliamentary Practice, 17th edition, which states in part:

> It is irregular to make a complaint unless the member intends to follow it up with a substantive motion referring to the matter—

Mr. Speaker, the ministers of the former Conservative government have been complaining that they have a question of privilege; yet during the course of this entire debate respecting the question of privilege they have continued to prod—use whatever word you like—the Minister of Justice (Mr. Cardin) into naming names. The Minister of Justice did not raise the question of privilege. Whether he wants to name these names or chooses not to name them is his prerogative. The members of the former government are those who feel aggrieved or abused by something that was said outside this house and they in fact have a recourse. They do have a remedy. They can raise a question of privilege in this house and ask Your Honour whether or not there appears to be a prima facie case of privilege. If you decide there is a case of privilege, then those members so aggrieved or abused are bound to move a substantive motion. In doing so they have the right to name the Minister of Justice and to refer specifically to the charges he made outside this house.

• (8:40 p.m.)

At the stage we have now reached it is essential for any member, including the former prime minister, who feels he has been aggrieved or abused by the Minister of Justice in what he has said outside this house to get on his feet and move a substantive motion. In that motion they can, as I said, name the Minister of Justice as the person who has in fact abused their privileges. But it is not sufficient to suggest that the only way this can be done is by the Minister of Justice getting on his feet and naming names. What is more, we do not accept this completely new departure in dealing with a question of privilege, namely, to refer it to a judicial inquiry.

I suggest that it may be right and proper for the Governor in Council to pass a motion setting up a judicial inquiry to inquire into the matter of Canada's security, and if they wish they can confine it even more than that and set up this kind of an inquiry to inquire specifically into the matter of national security respecting the so-called Munsinger case. But I think we would be doing parliament a great disservice if we were to accept that this judicial inquiry is going to settle a question of privilege affecting one or more members of this house.

I am sure Your Honour has examined all the precedents and authorities, and I do not believe you can find any case where this has been done in the past. It must be settled in this house. Citation 107 of Beauchesne's fourth edition makes this fairly clear and there are also a number of other citations dealing with this point. Citation 107 says:

> "Whatever matter arises concerning either House of Parliament, ought to be discussed and adjudged in that House to which it relates, and not elsewhere. Judge ought not to give any opinion of a matter of Parliament, because it is not to be decided by the common law"—

And so on. I simply want to draw to your attention, Mr. Speaker, that we are deeply concerned whether the result of this action is going to transfer to a commission outside this house the business of hearing the evidence and making recommendations respecting a matter of personal privilege. We do not believe this should be done. There is no precedent for it and I think it would be transferring from this house a great deal of the authority, rights and privileges that most of us are very jealous to guard and protect.

I shall say no more except that perhaps there could be an inquiry into security and the Munsinger case. But if it is a question of personal privilege affecting one or more members of the house it should be settled by the house and the proper way is for those who feel aggrieved to make a motion now and for this house to consider it and to refer

it to the Standing Committee on Privileges and Elections to deal with it in the proper and correct way.

Mr. Greene: Mr. Speaker, would the hon. member permit a question?

Mr. Olson: Yes.

Mr. Greene: Inasmuch as this involves a security matter, or allegedly so, does the hon. member not feel it would be useful to have a finding of fact by a judicial inquiry, which would be one of the nature that hears security matters, and that the findings of fact by that judicial inquiry would then be the basis on which any action in respect of privilege is then taken by this house?

Mr. Olson: I agree that this is a possible subsequent action but I believe that the question of privilege should be referred to a committee of this house in the first instance. If that committee, in attempting to gather all the evidence and to assess it, finds it is unable to come to a conclusion without going into security files, it would then be right and proper for the committee to suggest that some evidence required to be given in camera before a judge who could look into the matter. But I do not believe that transferring it right from the floor of this house at this time to a judicial inquiry and asking the judge to decide on the matter laid out in the terms of reference is the correct procedure.

Mr. David Lewis (York South): Mr. Speaker, the understanding which was indicated by the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Greene) as to what is hoped for from the inquiry would be precisely my understanding and, I think, the understanding of most other hon. members. It seemed to me that the hon. member for Kamloops (Mr. Fulton) said that he reserved the right, and other members of his party reserved the right, to deal with the question of privilege. That was one of the things he was reserving, namely, the right to raise the question of privilege again if the finding of fact by the commissioner supported the contention that such a question of privilege existed.

I rise to say a very few words on behalf of those of us in this party. Like all other hon. members of this house we had hoped, by the tone that was set this afternoon by all those who spoke, that the matter which had occupied our attention for two days last week was going to come to an end and we would be able to proceed with the business of parliament.

I am distressed, as I am sure all other hon. members are, that we now appear to be again on the brink of another scrap of very much the same sort as we went through on Thursday and Friday, only in a different framework, dealing with slightly different words but essentially the same scrapping across the floor that we had last week. Surely every hon. member here will have found last week end, as I found, by the numerous phone calls I received and which all those who went home must have received, that our constituents, the people who sent us here, cannot quite understand what much of the fuss is about. What they are wondering about is when we are going to get down to work on the legislation and on the issues which face this country and this parliament.

I ask all of us, Mr. Speaker, to avoid getting into the scramble and the mess that we were in last week. It will not take much to get us into this sort of mess once again. Suggestions that certain words are intended to hide things, counter-suggestions that somebody is afraid of something, and away we go once again into exactly the same morass in which we found ourselves for two solid days last week and in which we are still.

I think the hon. member for Kamloops made a good suggestion. I believe the suggestion would be more valuable if he and others had not proceeded to deal with the subject matter of his suggestion on the floor of this house. That is precisely the way to invite the sort of exchange that may have no end this evening and may go on, because we are still on the question of privilege. It seems to me that the suggestion the hon. member for Kamloops dealt with has obvious good sense and fairness. It seems to me that what he suggested ought to be accepted by representatives of the government as being fair and sensible. Other things that he suggested, if he will forgive my saying so, obviously do not have very much sense.

• (8:50 p.m.)

For example, it does not make much sense to me to have a statement in the terms of reference to the effect that this was worse than the Profumo case. I should like to know by what criteria you decide the degree of the case between Profumo and somebody else—I was going to say the degree of odorousness of a certain situation. I do not know what the criteria are.

Similarly, it seems to me it is nonsense to talk about not very important words, if I may

say so with respect. They say they want to take out certain words and replace them by a statement the Prime Minister (Mr. Pearson) made. In fact, the words in the proposed Order in Council say exactly the same thing, except I suppose you have the satisfaction of placing them in the mouth of the Prime Minister. You are not really asking for anything more.

It seems to me, therefore, that if we could re-establish some mutual trust—I was going to say if we could re-establish civilized behaviour between civilized people, Mr. Speaker—it ought to be possible for a small committee representing at least the government side and the official opposition, as well as other parties if they desire to take part, to arrive at terms of reference.

What I am pleading for, Mr. Speaker, is that we not take the rest of this evening, with the danger of it going into tomorrow, in arguing about why something was left out and something should be put in or making accusations as to why something was left out and counter-accusations as to why things were put in. As I have said before, if that happens we will be back in the same undignified, unproductive, negative battle in which we found ourselves last week.

Mr. Churchill: That does not follow at all.

Mr. Lewis: The hon. member for Winnipeg South Centre (Mr. Churchill) says that does not follow at all. I have sat here so far this evening and I can say that has been the result. I have heard accusations hurled across the floor, and they will continue. I am in your hands, Mr. Speaker. Of course, the big parties here control the situation. I am asking whether we cannot be civilized enough to appoint a committee or to agree on a committee, if the Prime Minister will agree to have one. If he does not agree, if he rejects the idea, then hon. members on this side will be fully justified in criticizing anything they do not like in the terms of reference.

Some hon. Members: Oh, no.

Mr. Lewis: That is right. If the Prime Minister says these are the terms and I will not meet with anyone to discuss them, then obviously the people who disagree with those terms must have an opportunity to say so. If the right hon. gentleman does agree to a committee, surely that is the sensible thing. Let us reserve any further discussion on the floor of this house for the time when we have either an agreement or something upon which the parties definitely cannot agree.

I cannot sit down, Mr. Speaker, without saying something which I am sure all hon. members have felt and which I have felt as I watched these proceedings as a relatively new member. Some of us may have said things that we may regret at some later time, but there is one person, it seems to me, who stands out for the patience and leadership he has shown. I refer to Your Honour and the way you have carried through these very difficult days of debate.

Mr. Erik Nielsen (Yukon): Mr. Speaker, it should be remembered that the suggestion for the establishment of a committee to work out these terms of reference came from the hon. member for Kamloops (Mr. Fulton). I rather hoped the Prime Minister (Mr. Pearson) would rise after the last hon. gentleman spoke. However, I should like to remind the hon. member for York South (Mr. Lewis), in the event he may have forgotten, of the words of his colleague, the hon. member for Greenwood (Mr. Brewin), and of the words of his leader during the debate last Friday in this chamber. The hon. member for Greenwood said, as reported on page 2563 of *Hansard*:

> I want to make it perfectly clear that in my view no judicial inquiry would make sense unless the specific persons charged with offences were named in the terms of the inquiry. I know that no judge would want to hear a blanket charge against 15, 20, 30 or 100 people. Who is to appear? Who is to be called? The minister will have the obligation later, if such an inquiry is granted, of stating clearly and specifically whom he is charging.

The hon. member's own leader, who was just as disturbed as the rest of us in this house at the trend this debate had taken as a result of the injudicious statements of the Minister of Justice (Mr. Cardin) and the lack of judgment shown by the Prime Minister in dealing with this matter, said, as reported at page 2602 of *Hansard*:

> The reason this inquiry is being precipitated is that the Minister of Justice made certain charges outside the house. If there is going to be a proper inquiry, those charges must be contained in the terms of reference and the onus must be on the Minister of Justice to prove those charges—

For the benefit of the hon. member for Medicine Hat (Mr. Olson), who seems to have a warped sense of what is proper in connection with judicial procedure and matters affecting the fundamental rights of individuals called before judicial hearings, I emphasize these words:

> —the onus must be on the Minister of Justice to prove those charges, not on the other parties involved to prove their innocence.

The leader of the party, of which the hon. member for York South has the doubtful privilege of being deputy leader, went on to say:

> I am saying that the important thing in the terms of reference is whether or not there will be specific charges made by the minister, either by taking a transcript of his interview with the press and attaching it to the terms of reference contained in the Order in Council, or by having the minister rise in this house and repeat the statements he made at the press conference.

This is the hon. member's leader speaking. The leader of the hon. member's party is reported at page 2546 of *Hansard* as also saying:

> The terms of reference will have to set out the charges made by the minister, not only in this house but outside the house.

This is a proper stand to take.

Mr. Lewis: We still take that stand.

Mr. Nielsen: It is a proper stand to take. I continue quoting:

> The minister will then have to appear before such an inquiry and substantiate his charges, and place his seat and his portfolio at the disposition of that inquiry. The terms of reference of the inquiry must be such as to cover the charges which have been made, and the letter read by the Prime Minister from the Minister of Justice certainly does not cover the very serious allegations made by the Minister of Justice the other day—

Nor do these terms of reference cover those allegations. The leader of that party went on to say:

> I suggest that the Prime Minister agree to an inquiry of which the terms of reference include the charges made by the minister outside the house—

An hon. Member: They do.

Mr. Nielsen: They do not, and I will point out to hon. members opposite who say they do that they do not, if they will be patient. The hon. member for Rosedale (Mr. Macdonald) shouts across to the hon. member for Kamloops, "what about the time you quit"? These interjections do not throw any light on the debate at all. The hon. member for Vancouver Quadra (Mr. Deachman), interjected in the debate,—he is laughing now —"what about February, 1963", during the time the hon. member for Kamloops was speaking. Those were his words.

Mr. Deachman: I never said any such thing. You have nine other fellows in mind.

• (9:00 p.m.)

Mr. Nielsen: The leader of the New Democratic Party, after referring to the fact that the charges made outside the house by the Minister of Justice should be included in the terms of reference as well as the question of privilege raised by members inside the house, went on to say, as reported at page 2546 of *Hansard*:

> —that the terms of reference make it abundantly clear that it is the minister who has to accept responsibility for substantiating before the inquiry the charges which he has made.

There is what the terms of reference should include, Mr. Speaker. The terms of reference of a royal commission, for the benefit of the hon. member for Medicine Hat, must be subjected to the same tests as any other legal document dealing with the rights and liberties of any subject. One of the prime principles in the administration of justice in this country is that it is up to the accuser to prove the guilt of the accused, that a man remains innocent until he is proven guilty.

There are over 20 ex-ministers of the former administration who have been asked, by the policy adopted by the Prime Minister, the Minister of Justice and the government, to prove their innocence. What kind of twist to the administration of justice in this country is that, Mr. Speaker?

Mr. Olson: May I ask the hon. member a question? I would ask him whether or not the Minister of Justice has now named anyone or charged them with anything. Second, I wonder if he would tell the house whether or not he thinks that the Committee on Privileges and Elections could call the minister to ask him what he has to say about these press releases.

Mr. Nielsen: The Minister of Justice has named no names. So far as the committee on privileges and elections is concerned, I think it is the consensus of this house, including the feeling of one who seldom has a consensus, the Prime Minister, that the matter should not go to the Committee on Privileges and Elections, and for very good reasons.

In this case we are dealing with the terms of reference of a document purporting to set up an investigation into the conduct of various members of this house who are Privy Councillors, including the former prime minister of this country, as well as Privy Councillors no longer in the house, some of whom are alive and some of whom are dead. How in the world these latter can prove their

innocence I know not. That is precisely the effect of this document, and I would ask the hon. member for Medicine Hat how he would like to appear before the criminal courts of this country with the only allegation against him that he was charged, with nothing more being said.

An hon. Member: How would you?

Mr. Nielsen: I hear an hon. gentleman across the way asking how I would like to appear. I should not like to appear before any judicial inquiry on that kind of basis. I would want to know what it is the right of any subject to know, let alone a member sitting in this house who has had to suffer the blackening of his name in this kind of way, namely, what I am charged with. Otherwise how am I to answer?

I would submit, sir, that the tests dealing with the investigation of the conduct of a member are set down, as your Honour so rightly pointed out, by Speaker Michener in the ruling which was quoted by you both on Thursday and on Friday. What Your Honour and Speaker Michener said was this:

> In my view, simple justice requires that no hon. member should have to submit to investigation of his conduct by the house or a committee until he has been charged with an offence.

That is the situation. This is the principle which protects not only the rights of the members of this house but the rights of every subject of this country, indeed of any democratic country. It applies equally as well, sir, to the kind of device which has now been set up, as is set out, on the recommendation of the Prime Minister. This Order in Council constituting what the government purports to call the terms of reference of a judicial inquiry is a most incredible hodge-podge of vague generalization, disconnected and unattributed charges, unspecified allegations of deeds committed by unnamed persons and based upon hearsay, information which the minister says he has been briefed on and which came out of a file he has never seen.

Mr. Cardin: I have staked my seat on my allegations.

Mr. Nielsen: Surely the Minister of Justice cannot overlook the fact that in this country justice is not administered on the principle that any person can be charged on the basis of hearsay evidence.

Mr. Cardin: Just have the judicial inquiry and you will see what happens.

Mr. Nielsen: Are we establishing the principle that anyone can be called before the courts of this country on the basis of "Did you hear that so and so did such and such?"

Mr. Cardin: Just have the judicial inquiry and see what happens.

Mr. Nielsen: Or is it the basic fundamental requirement of justice in this country that before any accused person stands to answer for his conduct he must know exactly with what he is charged and by whom? I ask, is that not the principle? On these terms of reference one may as well ask a judge to inquire into the content of the wisps of cloud floating over the Peace Tower. The only name mentioned in this document which sets up the inquiry is Gerda Munsinger. Does the Minister of Justice want to try her? This was, no doubt, the only name which the government thought safe to mention. The word "minister" or "ministers" does not appear in the Order in Council at all.

There is reference in it to a statement made by the Minister of Justice in a letter dated March 11, 1966 to the Prime Minister with reference to a case involving one Gerda Munsinger. This letter was read to the House of Commons on March 11, 1966. The first paragraph of the letter has no bearing on the subject matter of this inquiry and is already in *Hansard*. The first half of the second paragraph of the letter has no bearing for the same reason. The last sentence is an exculpatory sentence and surely should be deleted from any terms of reference setting up an inquiry because it interferes with the very thing which the judge has to decide for himself.

• (9:10 p.m.)

That is the first head upon which this inquiry is to be set up. Yet nowhere in the letter referred to does the name "Gerda Munsinger" appear. It appears nowhere. There is a reference to a press conference which, as the terms of reference set out, included statements about involvement with the said Gerda Munsinger. It does not say whose involvement or what involvement or what was wrong in that involvement, assuming that any involvement took place. We do not even know that from the Minister of Justice.

The Minister of Justice starts out by saying, "among other things." What other things are those? What other things are going to be charged by the minister? The terms of reference contain the words "statements about

involvement". I think that we as members of this house, before we pass judgment on an Order in Council setting up such an inquiry, must expect answers to these questions.

Who was involved? Was it other women? Was it other men? What persons were involved? What were their names? What members of the house were there? What Privy Councillors? What Privy Councillors here? What Privy Councillors elsewhere? What ministers? Does it refer to ministers here or to ministers there? What Montreal underworld figures are meant, because they have been mentioned? What sports figures are meant, because they have been mentioned? Who else is there? What is the inquiry about? Whose conduct is the inquiry going to investigate? The Order in Council does not say. It contains a statement about failure to seek the advice of the law officers of the Department of Justice. It does not say who failed or why that advice should have been sought in the first place. It does not say why it was wrong not to seek advice because, of course, they cannot say that.

How were those unnamed persons involved? Everyone has the right to know with what he is charged. What about the hon. member for Northumberland (Mr. Hees)? He said he had lunch with Gerda Munsinger.

An hon. Member: Oh, no.

Mr. Nielsen: Yes, yes indeed. Do the minister and the government want to know what was on the menu?

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh.

Mr. Nielsen: Do the minister or the Prime Minister and the government want to call the bell captain to find out how large a tip was paid? What are we inquiring into?

An hon. Member: Gerda.

Mr. Nielsen: Any accused person has the right to know with what he is charged.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Nielsen: That is where the government is prostituting the basic concept of justice in its terms of inquiry. The terms of inquiry go on to say that there were circumstances that may have constituted a security risk to Canada and that the case was not properly handled. The minister said, "I think there was a security risk." The minister said that it is a bona fide security case. Why is not that same positiveness expressed in the terms of reference in the Order in Council? Why is there the use of the words "may have involved a security risk"?

The minister has made charges that there was a security risk involved. That is what he must answer to. The hon. member for Kamloops has said that there was no breach of security involved. It is upon that narrow issue that the minister must substantiate, as the leader of the New Democratic party and as we have said before, his charges before that inquiry. If the Minister of Justice fails to do so, then in keeping with his Prime Minister's own statement his seat is on the line.

Nothing could have been more categorical than those statements of the minister. Now they have been watered down to something which is hypothetical, to words such as "may"—"may have been a security risk."

How can a judicial inquiry investigate what might have been? How can any judicial body investigate a hypothetical situation? The inquiry has now invited us all to enter the never-never land of conjecture, hypothesis and imagination. How in the name of commonsense, I ask you, let alone in the name of justice, can an inquiry be set up on such a basis? There is not one hard, solid, factual proposition in the whole sorry mess which they like to call terms of reference.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Nielsen: Before I go on to discuss one or two terms in the terms of reference with which I take issue, I think it would be useful to read the terms of reference into the record:

March 14, 1966.

The Committee of the Privy Council, on the recommendation of the Prime Minister, advise that The Honourable Wishart Flett Spence, Ottawa, Ontario, be appointed a Commissioner under Part I of the Inquiries Act to inquire fully into a statement by the Minister of Justice in a letter dated March 11, 1966, to the Prime Minister, with reference to a case involving one Gerda Munsinger, which was read in the House of Commons on March 11, 1966; into all statements concerning the case in the House of Commons on March 4 and March 7, 1966—

What about the statements that were made on March 10?

An hon. Member: Read the next part.

Mr. Nielsen: It also contained matters—

An hon. Member: Read on.

Mr. Nielsen: I will continue reading:

—and into all statements by the Minister of Justice in a press conference on March 10, 1966,—

That does not cover the statements made by the minister on May 10.

An hon. Member: It does.

Mr. Nielsen: Does somebody over there to my left say it does?

An hon. Member: Yes.

Mr. Nielsen: Is that someone in the house?

Mr. Nicholson: Would the hon. member permit a question? Would the hon. member draw attention to any passage in *Hansard* on May 10 where the Minister of Justice is quoted.

Mr. Nielsen: I beg your pardon. I meant March 10. I apologize. I shall be referring the hon. member to those pages in the hope that those statements will be included in the amended terms of reference. I continue reading:

—which, among other things, included statements about involvement—

There is nothing about improper involvement; it is simply involvement.

—with the said Gerda Munsinger, about failure to seek the advice of the law officers of the Department of Justice—

There is no allegation that it was the right thing to do, that it was the right thing to seek the advice of the law officers of the Crown on the part of anyone.

Mr. Favreau: Ah, ah.

Mr. Nielsen: On the part of anyone at all. I hear the President of the Privy Council saying "ah, ah," This has no parallel whatsoever in connection with the matter which brought about his sorry downfall.

An hon. Member: Read.

Mr. Nielsen: It has no parallel whatsoever. I continue reading :

—that there were circumstances that may have constituted a risk to the security of Canada and that the case was not properly handled; and to enquire whether the case was handled in accordance with the rules and principles normally applicable to persons having access to classified information—

What rules, Mr. Speaker? What principles and where are they? Where do we find them?

He who accuses must prove what he alleges. Let us have an accusation. I continue reading:

—and into all the relevant circumstances connected therewith, and in particular but without limiting the generality of the foregoing to consider fully all reports submitted to the government or any member of the government of the day and any evidence laid before them in connection therewith and any further evidence elicited by or laid before the Commissioner and to consider such other matters as may appear to the Commissioner to be relevant and to report thereon.

There is a reference to the rules and principles normally applicable to persons having access to classified information, and whether the case was handled in accordance with those rules and principles. By whom, Mr. Speaker? By whom? By the Minister of Justice. By the existing Minister of Justice? There is some doubt about that. Or does it means by the former minister of justice or by some clerk in his office? The minister shakes his head as much as to say "no".

• (9:20 p.m.)

Let him say so in the terms of reference. Let him name the people who improperly handled this matter without having regard to the rules and principles applicable in this kind of case. Was it perhaps one or another of the deputy ministers of justice? Was it one of those individuals?

What about the rules and principles that are normally applicable? Where are they laid down? By whom are they set out. There is a further requirement in the terms of reference:

—to consider fully all reports submitted to the government or any member of the government of the day and any evidence laid before them in connection therewith—

Presumably "therewith" means any evidence in connection with the reports, but what reports? What reports are specified in the terms of reference? They say, "all reports submitted to the government or any member of the government". What reports about what? Reports by whom? Reports about whom?

Mr. Churchill: Reports on immigration in 1955 maybe.

Mr. Nielsen: There is also a requirement in the terms of reference to inquire into "all statements concerning the case in the House of Commons on March 4 and March 7, 1966." What about March 10? What about March 11? What about today? The minister made some very damaging statements in the house today.

Are the statements of the former minister of justice, the hon. member for Kamloops, not to be considered by the inquiry and only the statements of the Minister of Justice on March 4 and March 7? What of the statements about Privy Councillors made in the house and some outside it? Do they now appear before this inquiry? On what grounds? Does their appearance before this inquiry mean a confession or, to use the term in the terms of reference, an involvement?

That is precisely what it will be taken to mean.

Sir, I appeal to hon. members to accede to the suggestion of the hon. member for Kamloops because there is no one in this party, indeed in any quarter in the house according to my observation, who is opposed to an inquiry into this case. But is there to be no protection accorded to members of the house? Are they not to have the protection afforded under the ordinary law to the ordinary citizens of this country, because that is what is being denied by these terms of reference?

Are they to be summoned to prove their innocence of involvement, whatever that means, when there has been no specific statement that there was a security risk and when the Order in Council itself talks about a security risk that "may have been"? Is this a ground on which people can be summoned to appear and to defend themselves? This is merely a device by which members of the house, innocent or guilty, can be dragged down on unspecified charges, undefined allegations, and spurious and unfounded assertions. This is an action by the government to remove from parliament the disposal of the privileges of parliament and to use the machinery of justice to destroy the opposition.

This order is without parallel, sir, in the annals of any civilized country, in the annals of any democracy since the days of the star chamber, with no offences, not one single offence, being charged.

An hon. Member: Oh, quit.

Mr. Nielsen: An hon. member says "quit". That is his concept of justice.

Mr. Tremblay: What is yours?

Mr. Nielsen: The hon. member asks what is mine. I will tell hon. members opposite what my concept of justice is. It is that no subject of this country, member of this house or otherwise, shall be dragged before any judicial body in this country and required to prove his innocence.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Munro: May I ask the hon. member a question? At any time during his past behaviour in this house prior to the last election and during the conduct of the election has he ever dragged down the reputation of hon. members on unspecified and unfounded charges?

[Mr. Nielsen.]

Mr. Nielsen: Here we go again—

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh.

Mr. Nielsen: —with the deliberate misconstruction of hon. members opposite.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh.

Mr. Nielsen: And they laugh. I say they can take part in this discussion and read what I said into the record. On page 4 of the report of the commission which was set up for the purpose of inquiring into the charges that I made in the house there is set forth what I said in the house at that time, something which the Minister of Justice in this case did not have the courage to do. I said on that occasion:

> The executive assistant to the minister at that time, Mr. Raymond Denis, offered a bribe in the amount of $20,000 to counsel who was acting for the United States government on the bail application with the request that he would not oppose the bail proceedings—

That was a specific charge.

Mr. Munro: Now read page 10534 of the same *Hansard*.

Mr. Nielsen: The hon. member will have an opportunity to engage in this discussion. It was on the basis of the charges I made, the names I named, the dates and places I specified, and the sections of the Criminal Code I specified during those days of debate that that commission was struck, and also because of the questions of the leader of the N.D.P. There is no parallel between that case, where a member of the opposition was discharging his responsibility to expose what he had an obligation to expose, and this case where the Minister of Justice, a member of the treasury benches, makes unfounded charges against all Privy Councillors past and present, dead and alive. The terms of reference of this Order in Council do not specify. It does not say who is guilty or what they are guilty of or even whether there has been an offence of any kind or description.

It sets out in its own language the statements made by the minister at his press conference and alters the substance of those statements in order to remove responsibility from the minister. That is precisely what this Order in Council does. In its vagueness, its lack of specification, its failure to name names, to state any offence, and its deliberately vague and suggestive generalities, it represents the ultimate betrayal of every principle of human rights, the right of the

subject to know with what he is being charged, and it represents the perversion of justice to political ends. That is precisely what it does.

The hon. member for Kamloops has suggested an all-party committee to meet with representatives on the government side to consider these terms of reference, but one thing which we must not lose sight of, apart from all the other facets involved in this matter, is that it is a fundamental right of every individual in this country, of every individual in any democratic country, to have specified for him the charges which he must meet. Otherwise there can be no defence.

He must know. This group of Privy Councillors here and those absent, those with us in life and those not, must know by the accusations of those opposite who have made these charges, who it is that must stand trial. This is where the perversion of justice has taken place.

• (9:30 p.m.)

Mr. Drury: Would the hon. gentleman permit a question? I have been a little confused between his statements about respecting British justice in the conduct of a trial, with which we all agree, and his reference to other people having a relationship with Mrs. Munsinger, but surely he must distinguish between an inquiry and a trial. I do not think anyone is suggesting that a trial is being held here. Surely this is an inquiry to establish the facts to the satisfaction of all. I would be very glad if the hon. member could make this distinction between a judicial inquiry to ascertain facts and a trial, the nature of which he appears to have been describing.

An hon. Member: Hear, hear.

Mr. Nielsen: The applause the minister has received and the basis of his question indicates to me—

Mr. Tardif: Answer the question.

Mr. Nielsen: I will answer the question, and the hon. member for Ottawa or whatever district he comes from—Russell—should stand up and participate in the debate instead of interrupting.

An hon. Member: He has not said a word in five years.

Mr. Nielsen: I will answer the minister—

Mr. Tardif: Do not call me the member for Ottawa. I am the member for Russell.

An hon. Member: Nobody knows you.

Mr. Nielsen: I say in all seriousness to the minister that the terms of reference contained in this Order in Council, which sets up what purports to be a judicial inquiry, in effect set up an inquisition, because the minister surely must agree that before anyone is required to appear before any judicial tribunal—and there can be no argument about this being a judicial tribunal—rather than being required to appear on the basis of vague charges first of all the person has to know with what he is being charged.

An hon. Member: Who is being charged?

Mr. Nielsen: He is being charged, if you look at the terms of reference, in a very vague sort of way. Certainly he must know precisely with what he is being charged. That is fundamental. The President of the Privy Council adopts an expression as though to say it is here but it is not here. If he will recall the events leading up to other commissions and other orders in council which were drawn to inquire into specifics, into the conduct of specific ministers—

Mr. Pearson: No, it was not.

Mr. Nielsen: Into the conduct of a specific minister—

Mr. Pearson: No.

Mr. Nielsen: If you look at the order in council you will see it is there. That is the distinction.

Mr. Drury: Mr. Speaker, may I ask another question? I do not think the hon. member has quite met my point. Is the hon. member suggesting that no one can be called before Mr. Justice Spence to give information which would lead Mr. Justice Spence to ascertain what the facts are unless a formal charge is made against that man, that is, that no person can be called as a witness to give information unless there is a formal charge? Is that what he is saying?

Mr. Nielsen: Let us just refer to one other commission to draw an analogy to what I mean. I am suggesting to the minister and to the government which he represents that what must occur in these terms of reference is that persons against whom allegations are made must be named and that the allegations must be specific. The New Democratic party says the same thing.

If I might refer to the Order in Council setting up the Dorion inquiry, the minister will find that the conduct of a specific minister—and I will not name him for fear of

offending sensitivities—was the subject of the inquiry.

Mr. Pearson: Read the Order in Council.

Mr. Nielsen: That was part of the subject matter of that inquiry.

Mr. Pearson: Read the Order in Council.

Mr. Nielsen: There were two Orders in Council. It is there. The minister knows it is there.

An hon. Member: Try to sweep it under the rug.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order. I must advise the hon. member that the time allotted to him has expired. The hon. member for Lapointe.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Gilles Grégoire (Lapointe): Mr. Speaker, after listening to the master this afternoon, we have just heard the pupil tonight. The master still has some imagination, while the pupil has just repeated the speech he already made twice on Thursday and once on Friday.

Some hon. Member: Hear, hear.

Mr. Grégoire: However, it is by repeating that we learn Mr. Speaker. Boileau said.

A hundred times consider what you've said;
Polish, repolish, every colour lay.

This only makes four times but through practice, I am not suggesting that the pupil will become as great as his master—that is difficult, because the master is a champion—but with time, he will learn.

I heard this afternoon the Leader of the Opposition state: There is no security case as far as we are concerned today, because the member for Kamloops has just proved it.

He posed as a judge, as the jury, then as the executioner, and he became the prosecutor, exactly what he always took exception to when the government refused to have an investigation made.

He decided that there was no security risk, but that is what we want to know.

A question was put a few minutes ago to the former Minister of Justice, the hon. member for Kamloops (Mr. Fulton), but he left it unanswered. What type of file was involved?

Why did we not get an answer? Was it a security case, a theft, a murder, indecent acts, or what? The member for Kamloops did not provide an answer.

[Mr. Nielsen.]

• (9:40 p.m.)

Here is another question which has not been answered, Mr. Speaker. Why did the former Minister of Justice hasten to call the Prime Minister? The Prime Minister replied: immediately, in my office. I visualize the Justice Minister rushing down to the Prime Minister's office.

Mr. Speaker, I should like to call your attention to the fact that if the right hon. Leader of the Opposition is not here, he will not be able to say that he has gone fishing.

Hon. Théogène Ricard (St. Hyacinthe-Bagot): He has gone to the R.C.M.P. to pay for your parking tickets.

Mr. Grégoire: Mr. Speaker, he blames the hon. Minister of Justice for his absence. He has gone fishing; but now he is not here, he has left of his own accord regardless of Standing Order No. 5.

Mr. Ricard: He has gone to the R.C.M.P. to pay for your parking tickets.

Mr. Grégoire: Mr. Speaker, I can just see the Minister of Justice arriving at the Prime Minister's office. Everything is held up. The visitors will just have to wait. The door opens wide: come in, Mr. Minister of Justice. Really urgent, eh? Why all the rush?

Mr. Ricard: So you will not lose any time getting in the R.C.M.P.'s office.

Mr. Grégoire: What was the hurry, Mr. Speaker? A routine matter, we are told. Nothing urgent about it. We do not even know what was written in the file. We do not know the purpose of the file. They do not want to tell us. No inquiry was necessary.

Here, Mr. Speaker, are three thick volumes in which the Leader of the Opposition often asks: what are they trying to conceal? What are they hiding from us, Mr. Speaker?

And whoever analyses the gestures—and I noticed it this afternoon and that is why I say to the pupil that he has far to go before reaching the level of his master—whoever analyses the gestures of the Leader of the Opposition when he is speaking: he points out something with one finger only, not two, that is very good, and he says: We want an inquiry.

What is it hiding? What is hidden underneath all that? And notice the manner of speaking—I noticed it, and the pupil should also notice it—when there is a question, it is short and to the point; when there is an insinuation, it is long.

It goes this way and that way, Mr. Speaker, it never follows a straight line; it sails the dark waters of insinuation. It is masterful. The pupil should take note of that.

I think that for all of us, including the Liberals, the oratory of the Leader of the Opposition can be a lesson. I am sorry that we did not ask our students of "rhetoric" to come and hear a great orator.

Mr. Speaker, I heard the hon. member for Yukon (Mr. Nielsen) ask: But, who is mentioned? There is Mrs. Munsinger. But who else? Men? Women? Ministers? Former ministers? Members of parliament? Former members of parliament? Who?

There is one, Mr. Speaker, and there is no doubt in my mind, it is the former Prime Minister who acted improperly in a case concerning the security of the state. That is the heart of the matter. And in spite of efforts to hide and cover up the truth, it will always remain so for the one who blamed the government for acting improperly in other security cases. That will be the question. A man stands accused, the former Prime Minister, who would have acted improperly in a case concerning the security of the state. Nothing else is before Parliament at this time.

All devious means will be resorted to. Attempts will be made to divert our attention, as the member for Kamloops (Mr. Fulton) tried to do this afternoon by mentioning an incident no one knew about, namely the interview he claims to have had with the president of the Privy Council (Mr. Favreau).

My attention will not be diverted, Mr. Speaker, for a serious charge has been made. There has already been a case where the security of the State was not dealt with as it should have, and the accused, in this instance, is the former prime minister.

Some claim this is hypothetical. Well, if it is, I know someone's chair, that of the present Minister of Justice (Mr. Cardin), will be pulled out from under him. But, if it is true, then the seat of the present leader of the opposition will be thrown out into the river. It is as plain as that, Mr. Speaker.

Attempts were made to divert our attention. Was Mrs. Munsinger involved in spying activities before coming to Canada? That is not the question. Here is the question: is it a fact that the right hon. Leader of the Opposition mishandled a case where the security of the state was endangered?

Mr. Speaker, there are so many things that we are bound to get confused. The right hon. Leader of the Opposition said on February 28, 1966, as can be found on page 1878 of *Hansard*—

Mr. Speaker: Order. I hesitate to interrupt the hon. member for Lapointe, but may I point out to him that in the course of the speeches we just heard, hon. members tried to limit their remarks to the terms of reference of the Order in Council that has been proposed by the Prime Minister this afternoon. I, therefore, invite the hon. member, to limit, if possible, his comments to that particular subject.

Mr. Grégoire: Mr. Speaker, a while ago, the chair was occupied by someone else when the hon. member for Yukon spoke. I think that he did not dwell very long on the subject to which you would like me to limit my remarks. But what I would like to quote from *Hansard* is connected with the said matter.

The right hon. Leader of the Opposition, as recorded on page 1878, left hand column of *Hansard* of February 28, 1966 speaking about the Spencer case:

> I immediately add that when the government says security procedures might be revealed I accept that explanation, but—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. Can the hon. member connect his comments with the terms of reference. As he knows, we have had some difficulties these last days, precisely because it was very difficult to connect the members' comments to a specific question.

Quite happily, in my opinion, we have at this time something or a subject to which the hon. members may refer, that is the terms of reference contained in the order in council. I would, therefore, invite the hon. member to co-operate with his colleagues in the house, as well as with the Chair, to limit the discussions, at this time, to the main subject.

Mr. Grégoire: Mr. Speaker, very well. Now, the quotation I wanted to bring forward was a reference to a sentence of the former leader—the Leader of the Opposition who will be the former leader a little later—with reference to a judicial enquiry or terms of reference. However, I will be able to quote it later within the framework of the terms of reference under discussion at this time.

Mr. Speaker, I heard some people say that the terms of reference were not broad enough. I have here a certified copy, a true copy of the proceedings of a privy council

committee meeting, approved by His Excellency the Governor General, on March 14, 1966, which gives the terms of reference.

On reading it over again, I wonder how anyone could think that the terms are not broad enough.

It is mentioned among other things:

—into all statements by the Minister of Justice—

"into all—", it is not said into a part of them but "into all". If there is something broader than the word "all", meaning comprehensive, well I would like to know what it is.

Further on, the press conference is mentioned in the following words:

—all statements by the Minister of Justice in a press conference on March 10, 1966, which among other things included—

There is reference to what was included, but with no intention of limiting, it is said "among other things". "Among other things" is thus included in the terms of reference.

And further on, it says:

—statements about involvement—

This term of reference is not restricted, Mr. Speaker. On the contrary, it is made as general as possible: "concerning persons involved in this case". This wording is very general.

Further on it says:

—as well as circumstances that may have constituted—

As one can see, dates, persons, circumstances are mentioned—

—and into all the relevant circumstances connected therewith—

• (9:50 p.m.)

There again, it is said:

—and into all the relevant circumstances connected therewith, and in particular but without limiting the generality of the foregoing to consider fully all reports submitted to the government or any member of the government of the day and any evidence laid before them in connection therewith and any further evidence elicited by or laid before the Commissioner and to consider such other matters as may appear to the Commissioner to be relevant—

Mr. Speaker, it seems to me that if there are not enough words in all this to satisfy the official opposition, nothing would satisfy them.

Then, I should say: the order is perhaps too general or too broad for them. The terms of reference are formulated in such general terms that they are afraid.

[Mr. Grégoire.]

On the second page, the following is to be found:

The committee recommends further
1. That the commissioner avail himself of his absolute powers of appreciation—

This is not a relative power, Mr. Speaker, but an absolute power.

And, continuing:

—as to the procedure—

Mr. Speaker, is there a more general, a wider term than absolute? To my mind, there is none. Even absolute cannot exist on this earth, as is well known.

The order in council continues:

That the commissioner be authorized to exert all powers provided under section 11 of the Inquiries Act;

Once again the words "all powers" are used. This is a general, a wide term, and efforts are being made to restrict it, although it is provided for in an order in council passed March 14, 1966, today. And they refuse to accept those terms of reference.

Mr. Speaker, I should now like to read a quotation which illustrates my thought and shows also that arguments such as mine have already been used. As is shown on page 1878 of the official report of the Debates dated February 28, 1966, the Leader of the Opposition said:

I immediately add that when the government says security procedures might be revealed I accept that explanation, but that does not justify the refusal to call together an inquiry presided over by a judge or judges sitting in camera.

Mr. Speaker, that is exactly what we of the Ralliement créditiste have been asking for since the first day when this question of privilege was studied: a judicial inquiry.

On the same page, in the opposite column, the Leader of the Opposition said:

Who is hiding the facts here?

Today we can ask him the same question: Who is trying to conceal the facts? And that, when a judicial inquiry can determine the true facts and whether we are faced with an assumption or simply facts indicating that someone acted improperly in connection with the security of the state.

Earlier, Mr. Speaker, I heard the hon. member for Yukon ask the Minister of Justice to set down his charges clearly and substantiate his allegations.

The inquiry will prove that; charges will have to be made at the time of the inquiry. We have always understood that when there

is a judicial inquiry, complete charges must be made. That will be done then; the house is not the place for doing so. We were told there was no danger, there was nothing to fuss about, that it was looking for a needle in a haystack. Yet, Mr. Speaker, it becomes more and more obvious that an inquiry is a must.

We note that the R.C.M.P. have a file on Mrs. Munsinger, a file deemed important enough by the then Minister of Justice that he felt inpelled to make an urgent call on the then prime minister. It is to be noted also that the Montreal Police have a file on the same person. Also, that the same person—

Mr. Speaker: Order. Is the hon. member now discussing the terms of reference?

Mr. Grégoire: Mr. Speaker, like several members who thought well to speak on the judicial inquiry itself, I take the liberty of speaking on the inquiry and on the terms of reference and the question of privilege which are being discussed today.

Not only has she a record with the R.C.M.P. and the Montreal police department, but she is reported in the newspapers as having been refused entry into the United States many years ago already.

Mr. Speaker, surely there must be reasons for that. If there are any reasons, then why seek to hide them? If all this was hidden for a long time, why continue to hide it, when the person in question has just stated that high-ranking underworld figures would want to kill her. She has a record in the underworld, she has a record with the R.C.M.P., she has a record with the Montreal police department, she was refused entry into the United States and in spite of this, she had access to the highest governmental authorities of the country. She was even seated at the head table during a fund raising dinner given by the Conservative party, at which the Prime Minister was the guest speaker. Mr. Speaker, I admit—

Mr. Speaker: Order. Does the hon. member not feel that he is outside the scope of the terms of reference?

Mr. Grégoire: Mr. Speaker, you will agree with me just the same that I am trying to prove that an investigation is essential. If, after all this, an investigation is not essential and when I see some members trying, by camouflage and devious means, to prevent this investigation, I feel duty bound to prove that such an investigation is necessary.

Mr. Speaker, it was mentioned on many occasions that the respect of democratic traditions must be restored in this house. We agree with this. But first of all, some light will have to be thrown not only on some events outside this house, but also on certain events which took place in this house in the past two or three years.

I think that the inquiry which has been set up will allow to throw this light. Charges have been made. The main one deals with the part played by the former Prime Minister in a matter of security of the state. We must know the facts, and in full. This being done, about all the inquiries which have been requested—here I want to join the members for York South (Mr. Lewis) and for Medicine Hat (Mr. Olson), who mentioned it—we shall have to go back to the business of the house, to apply ourselves to legislate for the good of the Canadian people. Numerous pieces of legislation have to be passed, which have not yet been considered. This will have to be done and I believe that all the members must make it their duty to put an end to this as soon as possible, in order to go back to the business of the house. Mr. Speaker, may I call it ten o'clock.

[*English*]

Some hon. Members: Ten o'clock.

Right Hon. L. B. Pearson (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, I wonder whether I might have the indulgence of the house for one minute to make an appeal that we get back to our normal course of work tomorrow and deal with some of the business on the order paper. This order in council which has been passed and which has set up the commission, which is comprehensive in its terms, which is meant to be reasonable and not provocative or offensive in its language, will, we believe, because this not a trial but an inquiry, make it possible by its terms of reference for the commission to get to the root of the matter, and we believe that the commissioner should be given an opportunity to get to work as quickly as possible and complete his work as quickly as possible. I have not time to make the statement I would like to have made and to explain what I had in mind in drafting the Order in Council in the terms and in a way which we hoped would have met the points raised by hon. gentlemen opposite as well as other members of this house—

Some hon. Members: Yes, you have the time.

Mr. Pearson: —but I would hope that we would abandon this particular question of privilege, go ahead with the inquiry and above all get back to the work of this House of Commons.

Mr. Muir (Cape Breton North and Victoria): Who disrupted it?

Mr. Fulton: Mr. Speaker, I ask the Prime Minister whether he would accept the suggestion for an all-party committee to see if we can arrive at agreement.

Mr. Pearson: The Order in Council has been passed. We think it is a good and reasonable Order in Council and we think it should be carried out.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Churchill: A fixed position.

• (10:00 p.m.)

Mr. Starr: Mr. Speaker, I think the remarks the Prime Minister has just made point out the arrogance of this government in trying to force down the throats of members of the house the government's will. I think we should have an opportunity of discussing this matter. We want to hear what objections he has to the suggestions that have been made.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

Mr. Pearson: Perhaps we could take a supply motion tomorrow. Then we would be getting on with the business before us and my hon. friend would be allowed to discuss the matter on a supply motion to his heart's content and within the rules.

Mr. Starr: So far as I am concerned, the Prime Minister has lost the confidence of this house and any suggestion of his—

An hon. Member: Move that tomorrow.

Mr. Starr: —has no merit whatever.

Mr. Speaker: Order. According to the provisions of provisional standing order 39A, a motion to adjourn the house is deemed to have been moved at this time.

PROCEEDINGS ON ADJOURNMENT MOTION

A motion to adjourn the house under provisional standing order 39A deemed to have been moved.

AGRICULTURE—FEED GRAIN—CHARGING OF UNREASONABLE PRICES

Mr. E. R. Schreyer (Springfield): Mr. Speaker, when I asked my question of the Minister of Agriculture last Wednesday I was not satisfied with the reply. I gave notice of my intention to raise the subject after ten o'clock. Of course, between that day and today we have come through a very strange, esoteric kind of debate about the privileges of members of parliament. It seems a strange contrast now that we should be discussing as the first item of business after that debate the subject of feed grain supplies and feed grain prices in eastern Canada.

On Wednesday last the Minister of Agriculture, in reply to my question, stated he was aware of the fact certain areas in eastern Canada were suffering from a shortage of feed grain supplies. He seemed to indicate, although he did not say so directly, that he was aware of complaints about high prices being charged farmers of eastern Canada for their feed grain supplies. I have received information to the effect that in some instances farmers are being charged as high as $6 per hundredweight for screenings. Unless my information is incorrect, this seems to be an almost incredible price to charge for this commodity.

Without going into all the details, Mr. Speaker, I should like to hear from the minister just what information his department has on feed grain supplies in eastern Canada. Is the situation as bad as the price of $6 per hundredweight would seem to indicate? If it is, what immediate plans does the minister have in view for alleviating the situation? I know the minister said on Wednesday that the government had certain proposals under study and legislation to establish a feed agency for eastern Canada would be introduced.

This might be very effective in the long run, but what about the immediate situation? The minister's reply was not very satisfactory on that point. There is one other aspect of the matter of which the minister should be apprised. There have been offers from certain parts of western Canada to ship feed grain direct to the areas which are so short but apparently because of legal obstacles and laws and regulations having to do with the Canadian Wheat Board and the grain trade it is not possible for direct shipment to be made. Yet in some ways this would perhaps be the most expeditious way of dealing with the problem.

I would ask the minister whether it is so difficult to look into this matter with a view to waiving the legal and regulatory requirements. Surely a case can be made from time to time for waiving the requirements of the

law in order to take care of unusual and emergency circumstances. On that last point I hope the minister will have something specific to offer.

It is a fact that in the 1930's when western Canada, was going through the worst drought and grasshopper damage known, shipments of vegetables and other foodstuffs were made directly from the rural people in eastern Canada to the rural people in western Canada. This was greatly appreciated at the time, and I know that some people in western Canada have after all these years tried to reciprocate and have shown their concern and their willingness to help out. However, they have been prevented from doing so by red tape and the requirements of the law. They have asked why it is not possible for the government to waive these legal requirements to help farmers in eastern Canada to get out of the blind they are in so far as feed grain is concerned.

Mr. B. S. Beer (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Agriculture): Mr. Speaker, we are grateful to the hon. member for bringing forward this question at this time because it does provide the government with an opportunity to enunciate some of the programs which have been put into effect to alleviate the feed situation in eastern Canada.

The matter of feed grain prices is one which is regularly raised. As indicated by the minister and as stated in the Speech from the Throne, legislation is to be brought before the house for the purpose of establishing a feed grain agency which will be charged with the responsibility of acting in this area of federal interest.

Answers have been given to questions on feed grain prices. They are to be found on page 2278 of *Hansard* of March 7, 1966. These are the only official statistics available on the retail prices of feeds. They are reported by the Dominion Bureau of Statistics and illustrate the provincial average prices in Ontario and Quebec before the drought assistance program became operational, and the prices at January 1, 1966.

The question is asked, "Has the crop loss assistance program led to the increase in prices?" We know that there were crop losses in eastern Ontario, for example. The two governments are providing assistance in feed purchases. The rate of assistance is $30 per ton for grain and the expenditure could reach $12 million in Ontario. This would mean the purchase of 400,000 tons of grain in that area. Since there is this program there is a greater demand for feed, and to this extent there could be an upward pressure on prices.

However, if there had been no program it is likely that many cattle would have been sold and there would have been less demand for feed and less pressure on feed prices. One can readily judge which is preferable from the standpoint of maintaining herds and farmers' means of income.

• (10:10 p.m.)

The provinces administer this program and request the co-operation of feed dealers in the redeeming of coupons. They register those dealers who wish to co-operate and thus have control over them. Indeed, quite apart from this factor price control is in the hands of the provinces except in situations such as wartime.

The question has been asked: what is being done to meet the problem of feed grain prices? First, $21 million has been provided to pay freight and storage assistance. Second, $16 million is being provided to match $16 million from the provinces as assistance in the purchase of feed by eastern farmers. Third, action has been taken by officials in the feed grain administration in the Forestry Department which has resulted in reduced rail rates to large areas of the Maritimes and negotiations are continuing on other areas. Fourth, in addition we know that the supply of grain is quite good in the east and is about 11 per cent greater than a year ago, and last spring there were significant quantities left in the east after the opening of navigation.

[*Translation*]

Motion agreed to and the house adjourned at 10.16 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS

Tuesday, March 15, 1966

The house met at 2.30 p.m.

ADMINISTRATION OF JUSTICE

MUNSINGER CASE—CONTINUATION OF DEBATE ON QUESTION OF PRIVILEGE

Mr. Speaker: Order. I should bring to the attention of hon. members that I have received from the hon. member for Digby-Annapolis-Kings (Mr. Nowlan) a notice, as required by the standing orders, that he proposes to raise a question of privilege. I have also received notice that the right hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Diefenbaker) wants to speak to the question of privilege, and I have received notice also from the hon. member for Edmonton West (Mr. Lambert).

However, before calling first on the right hon. Leader of the Opposition I hope hon. members will allow me to restate very simply and very briefly what I have already said on a number of occasions since the debate now before the house began on Thursday last.

Hon. members know that according to long standing practice, as explained in citations 104, 105 and 113 of Beauchesne's fourth edition and in May's seventeenth edition at page 134, a motion has to follow a question of privilege. The house cannot carry on a debate unless there is question before it and, in the case of a question of privilege, the subject matter of the discussion has to be a motion of privilege.

I might also be allowed to mention that there can be only one question of privilege before the house at any time. On this point I might refer hon. members to a ruling made by Mr. Speaker Michener as recorded in *Hansard* for March 19, 1962 at page 1915. This position was reinforced by a similar ruling rendered by Mr. Speaker Lambert, as reported in *Hansard* of January 21, 1963 at page 2935, where Mr. Speaker Lambert declared:

> A matter of privilege cannot be raised when another one is already before the house.

• (2:40 p.m.)

The Chair would therefore at this time call on the right hon. Leader of the Opposition.

Right Hon. J. G. Diefenbaker (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, yesterday when speaking in the house, as reported at page 2624 of *Hansard* I used these words:

> What has national unity got to do with this question of charging various members of the Privy Council indiscriminately with wrongdoing approaching treason? One of our colleagues has passed on. Today he has been mentioned as one of those two or more. He is referred to as one of them; and his son, an hon. member of this house, has no right of action. There is no action that a son, however honourable be his father, can take to preserve the reputation of his father. That was the situation in the Gladstone case.

What I was dealing with at the time was the danger of smear and innuendo through failing to name alleged wrongdoers and making wrongdoing have general application to a class; in other words, branding by inference all in a class by failing to name the alleged wrongdoers. Today after looking at the press I rise to say how deeply shocked I am to learn that this statement of mine has been misinterpreted.

Before I came into the house yesterday afternoon I was informed that two different parties had called up and stated that it had been broadcast that a distinguished former colleague, now deceased, was among those believed to have been among the two or more. Desirous of doing good, I am sorry to say that what I said, not having been as clear as it should have been, has been misinterpreted. Instead of saying "Today he has been mentioned as one of those two or more. He is referred to as one of them", I should have said "He was mentioned outside of this house in a broadcast."

There was no intention, and it was furthest from my mind, to say anything that could cause any misunderstanding that in any way there was any foundation for what was being bruited around. That is one of the great dangers of witch hunting, that the brand of inference is placed on men and women without reason or justification.

I hope this explanation will be accepted. I have deep regret that the widow and family have suffered because of misrepresentations of a statement that I made with the best of intentions.

Administration of Justice

Mr. J. P. Nowlan (Digby-Annapolis-Kings): Mr. Speaker, on this question of privilege I would say that the right hon. Leader of the Opposition has perhaps explained and amplified his remarks of yesterday. He identified me and my family by referring to a former member of parliament whose son now sits in this house. That description fits no other person than my father. The right hon. gentleman's remarks were made in an attempt to show how insidious this blanket accusation of wrongdoing has become. But I do not think, and did not think at that time, that his statement was complete. He has made a complete and fuller statement today.

However, I thought I appreciated the context in which the remarks of the right hon. Leader of the Opposition were made until I saw the national television news last night, when the commentator said, amongst other things:

> As for today's debate, one big development was Mr. Diefenbaker's hint about the identity of one of the other former ministers mentioned in connection with the Munsinger case. He referred to one who is now dead, whose son is now an M.P., who cannot speak out because the government has not named names. Around here they know who he is talking about, but he did not elaborate for the record.

My fears in this respect were heightened when I received a distraught phone call from home early this morning advising me of the banner story in this morning's Halifax *Chronicle-Herald* which stated, amongst other things:

> Disclosure indirectly by Opposition Leader Diefenbaker that former Finance Minister George Nowlan was being "mentioned as one of those two or more" in the rumours linking former members of his cabinet with Mrs. Munsinger—

Without being political or partisan, Mr. Speaker, I make a personal appeal to the Minister of Justice or the Prime Minister to stand up in this house and at least clear the dead, even though they refuse to charge the living. There are three ministers so exposed, Mr. Speaker; the late Sidney Smith, the late Paul Comtois and my father. Surely this parliament is not going to delegate its responsibilities in this regard and be dependent upon a serialized story 4,000 miles away. Unless the Minister of Justice or the Prime Minister can show the good grace and compassion they have, I shall have to consider whether I care to sit in this house while my father's name is under such a cloud.

Right Hon. L. B. Pearson (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, George Nowlan was my friend, and a man for whom I had admiration and respect. Nothing I have read or seen in any report on anything has changed that admiration or respect, or modified in any way the high regard I have had and always will have for him.

[Mr. Diefenbaker.]

Hon. Marcel Lambert (Edmonton West): Mr. Speaker, I think in the context of the remarks which have now been addressed to this house, I must rise in order to deal with a situation arising out of yesterday's debate. It is not my intention to flog the Minister of Justice. I rise simply as a member of this house, as one who has occupied your position, as one who is conscious of the fundamental rights of this house and its members, as well as of the rules of this house and your responsibilities, Mr. Speaker, based upon those same rules and authorities that you, and your predecessors, have relied upon.

Today the situation is somewhat different. We have amended our rules from the day when I sat in your chair. There is no longer an appeal from your ruling. In this I heartily concur. However, in so doing I realize, having occupied that position, there is an even greater responsibility placed upon the Chair as the last repository of the rights of members, singly and collectively, against any undue action by a member, a group of members or the executive. In this regard we are all equal.

• (2:50 p.m.)

It is not my purpose to expound upon the policies of that new theory of justice that was propounded last night by the Minister of Justice, as reported at page 2628 of *Hansard*, in which he said that having made his charge it is then upon the Leader of the Opposition, who has seen the file, to indicate those persons who are not implicated in the charge. As a fellow lawyer, Mr. Speaker, I find that a strange theory indeed.

With these words, Mr. Speaker, I will close my remarks on this particular phase of the matter. The events of yesterday and the passage into today of this discussion have given us the opportunity of reviewing what the executive has proposed. The executive had Thursday, Friday, Saturday, Sunday and Monday morning to consider this question, and they disclosed their proposals to the opposition some time in mid-afternoon on Monday. Since the rights of the opposition were so seriously affected, is it strange, Mr. Speaker, that I and my colleagues should want more time to put forward our views? It is not only the rights of hon. gentlemen on this side who are privy councillors which are

in question in this case; it is also the rights of every member of the executive, who are our co-equals as members of the privy council.

These are the issues, Mr. Speaker. I make no apology to anyone, as I am sure neither do my colleagues, for exercising the right to consider just what is at issue and what is proposed by the executive in regard to this matter.

The hon. member for Medicine Hat last night raised a serious and important point in connection with the action being proposed by the executive. This point had been adverted to; but on mature reflection, and with the emphasis placed upon it by the hon. member for Medicine Hat, it has given me, Mr. Speaker, as a former Speaker, even greater pause, even though I too belonged for a brief period to the executive.

The question is simply this. Parliament was seized of a question which was deemed by Your Honour to be a prima facie question of privilege affecting the privacies of a certain number of members of this house. However, as I have indicated, in essence every member of this house, and equally the members of the executive, are also affected.

I say to the hon. member for Medicine Hat that it was a supreme contempt for the rights of this house for the executive to arrogate unto itself the authority to refer to another body not subject to the determination and control of this house a question involving the privileges of the members of this house.

What a precedent, Mr. Speaker. This is the beginning of the end of the privileges of this house; because if this is permitted with impunity or by default by hon. members in this house, any executive in the future faced with an abuse or an infringement of the privileges of this house will have a precedent. If any of us have any admiration and love for the institution of parliament, then we must subscribe to the principles that I am now advancing: that no executive, no executive may arrogate unto itself the right to deal with a question of privilege of this house without the full consent and reservation of this house.

I thank the hon. member for Medicine Hat for bringing forward the citations in support of my colleagues, when he advanced the same point. I thank him for drawing that to the attention of this house. I trust it will be brought to the attention of those people who sit in judgment upon us in a gallery a little higher, and that they will bring to the attention of the country that parliament is not a second rate institution to be trampled under foot by every long distance commentator whose knowledge of the traditions and the workings and the people and the issues in this house is but second hand.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Lambert: These are my words of sincere protest to this unseemly spectacle, this unholy situation that has been created from the outside, where the events, the pressures and the love of the libido seem to crowd out all else. I refer to sensation mongering and this is a sincere cry of protest on my part.

To return to the point made by the hon. member for Medicine Hat, it is a serious one, and he could get all sorts of citations from May and Beauchesne to support him. There is no question whatsoever, Mr. Speaker, about the validity of the assertion that only parliament can dispose of a question affecting the privileges of parliament. No outside body can usurp this function, and this includes the executive. I was a member of the executive.

Miss LaMarsh: Make your motion.

Mr. Lambert: The hon. lady is rather impatient. Perhaps she is not as conscious of the rights of this house as she should be, as a member of my profession; and if I repeated her exact language for this house I think she would not be very happy.

Miss LaMarsh: What is your motion?

• (3:00 p.m.)

Mr. Lambert: I say this. Nobody can usurp these rights. Yet this is precisely what has been proposed for us. The Prime Minister, in a conciliatory mood—I will concede this —introduced the motion yesterday afternoon. My hon. colleague from Kamloops surely had the right to make every point of criticism in regard to it. Did he at any point; did any one of us; did the hon. member for Yukon, ever say these were irreducible terms for consensus? Not one bit. Yet at ten o'clock, why, in all fairness and justice, did we find the Prime Minister saying to us "This is it. This is the word of the executive, and this is what will be done"? I trust those are not the right hon. gentleman's final words, because I will respect him all the more if they are not. The Prime Minister need not humpf and laugh when I say this; I say it in all sincerity, indeed in the greatest sincerity. What I intend to say in the motion I propose to place before this house is advanced with the same sincerity.

I am hoping that as a result of what I can do we shall be able to get out of the impasse in which this house now finds itself. I make no apology to anybody for taking this course—and I trust I can have a little more silence on the benches opposite.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh.

Mr. Lambert: Well, I find the continual mumbling and bumbling that is going on opposite me is not conducive to debate.

What I propose, in all sincerity, is to express a valid objection that cannot be passed over without serious damage to the right of parliament to deal with its own privileges. After all parliament is not the executive, and the executive is not parliament. This issue is of such importance that it should appeal especially to those who may feel they should not behave as rubber stamps, and their number includes many of those opposite who have been here long enough to have sat on the opposition benches. I am merely making myself an echo of the sentiments they expressed on many occasions, and I think they are more honourable men for having expressed such views. I also, having sat on the government side and then with the opposition, assert that self-same right.

It is an issue which concerns hon. members to my immediate left. When I consider the remarks made by the hon. member for York South (Mr. Lewis); when I consider the remarks made by the hon. member for Burnaby-Coquitlam (Mr. Douglas); and when, in particular, one recalls how a legislator of very respected memory in this house fought with force and courage along with the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Knowles) to protect the rights of parliament during the pipe line debate, I am just wondering what Mr. Coldwell would say now in the face of this executive order.

The hon. member for Medicine Hat dealing with this question yesterday pointed to the remedy open to the house, that is, the privilege of moving a motion once a prima facie case had been established. And he objected because no motion had been made. Well, Mr. Speaker, you and I know we had a long discussion over the nature of a motion which I put forward. You know there is an honest difference of opinion, a difference which is not all that broad. But efforts were made to put forward an acceptable amendment.

I would invite the hon. member for Medicine Hat to consult the record; he was not here during a large part of this debate. I will say this. Within the terms of the rules of this house governing questions of privilege; also within our amended rules, my hon. friend from Calgary North and others have done what they could to get a motion before the house so that we might make progress with this matter. If the hon. member would consider these efforts I think he would agree that every attempt was made to put forward a motion. I do not think anyone can be faulted because the motion he put forward was ruled out of order on procedural grounds. Now I intend to move a motion which I trust, Mr. Speaker, will be in order. I do not make any charge in my motion. It is a motion designed to deal with the objection raised by the hon. member for Medicine Hat, an objection which is in the minds of many members both on this side and on the other side of the house at the present time.

I think the hon. member for York South gave his approval to the course which will be the substance of my motion, one which is based on a suggestion made by my hon. friend from Kamloops. It is a motion designed to bring about a consensus between the course decided upon by the executive and that which this house may wish to take. As the hon. member for Medicine Hat pointed out, the terms of the order in council constitute a challenge to the rights of parliament and an invasion of its privileges. I say that we, individually and collectively, must always stand fast against such an infringement. We must always preserve our privileges.

I therefore move, seconded by the hon. member for Queens:

That the terms of reference of order in council P.C. 1966—482 dated March 14, 1966 and tabled in this house on March 14, 1966 be referred to a special committee to be composed of seven members of this house and that such special committee be empowered to sit at such times it deems necessary to examine the said terms of reference and to report what revisions and amendments it may recommend to this house for decision by 2:30 p.m. on Thursday, March 17th, 1966.

Mr. Speaker: Have hon. members any comments to make in connection with this proposed motion; principally on the point of order rather than on the admissibility of the proposal?

Hon. A. J. MacEachen (Minister of National Health and Welfare): I should like to confine my remarks exclusively to the regularity of the motion which has been put before the house by the hon. gentleman who has just resumed his seat, limiting my observations to

the point of order. I reserve the right to deal later with the arguments of substance which have been advanced by the hon. gentleman with respect to the alleged usurpation of the rights of parliament by the executive.

• (3:10 p.m.)

May I remind hon. gentlemen of the situation which exists. On Thursday last a question of privilege was raised against the Minister of Justice. It was raised initially by the hon. member for Calgary North (Mr. Harkness). Consideration was given to that matter by Your Honour, who had the responsibility to determine whether a prima facie question of privilege did exist. That decision was made; Your Honour declared that in your view there appeared to be a possible question of privilege. Then after your decision was made, Mr. Speaker, it was up to the house to take the next necessary step; that is, to propose a motion directed against the Minister of Justice, because the complaint had been lodged that he had breached the privileges of this house That is the situation which is confronting us today.

The Minister of Justice still is alleged to have committed a breach of the privileges of the house, and there is a traditional way by which his conduct can be subjected to question. You have declared, Mr. Speaker, supported by judgments made by previous Speakers, that any motion in order to meet the specifications at this time must first of all declare a special charge against the Minister of Justice. You have quoted a judgment by Mr. Speaker Michener to the effect that it is simple justice, prior to putting the conduct of an hon. member of this house under scrutiny, that a charge be preferred against him. That is the essential ingredient. It is open to hon. members to charge the Minister of Justice, to take the responsibility for making the charge, and to take the responsibility if the charge is proven to be unfounded.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. MacEachen: Hon. gentlemen have made several unsuccessful attempts to formulate a motion. Each motion has been declared defective by the Chair because it lacked this essential ingredient.

Some hon. Members: No, no.

Mr. MacEachen: Otherwise this motion makes no sense; it has no place within the house if it does not relate to the conduct of the Minister of Justice, because it is not open to the house at this particular time to make a motion referring an order in council to a committee. That is unheard of; it is a grotesque parliamentary device at this particular stage, but it would be completely proper and could be made later in the day in the ordinary way on a supply motion. It could be entertained then, and it would be perfectly proper; it would be a perfectly proper procedural effort on the part of the hon. member.

I suggest, however, Mr. Speaker, that when the conduct of the Minister of Justice is called into question a specific charge is necessary in the motion; but it is quite impossible under this particular guise to send an order in council to a committee for study. I respectfully suggest on this particular procedural point that the motion cannot be entertained by the Chair.

Mr. H. A. Olson (Medicine Hat): Mr. Speaker, I think we should bear in mind that we are dealing with at least two and probably three separate matters at the same time. One of the things which disturbs me, and I think you will agree, is that this discussion at this stage, except during the last few minutes, has been completely out of order because we have not even had a motion. We are dealing now, at least to some extent, with the order in council P.C. 1966/482. We are dealing with the whole matter of whether there should be a judicial inquiry, and the order in council; but I think, Mr. Speaker, we would be wise to consider the overriding matter that is before this house, and that is this matter of privilege. It is a question of privilege affecting certain members of the former Conservative government.

Whether or not this motion which has been moved by the hon. member for Edmonton West is in order, it may be a way in which we in fact can initiate some kind of action to deal with this question of privilege; because, Mr. Speaker, as I said last night, I think we would be making a serious mistake for a long time into the future if we were to accept the proposition that by an order in council a judicial inquiry can in fact deal with a question of privilege affecting members of this house.

I do not withdraw from that position. I am pleased to hear the opinion of the member for Edmonton West, and I know this is the opinion of the Leader of the Opposition and the Prime Minister, that this house is supreme and deals with its own questions of privilege. When I made this plea last night I think I was misunderstood by some of the

members of the house; because the Minister of Agriculture, for example, got up and asked me a question respecting the function of this judicial inquiry. He said—and I think I am quoting him correctly although I do not have his words before me—that this judicial inquiry should gather the information, get the facts, and that the question of privilege would be decided by this house, using this inquiry as a basis for getting the information; that the matter of separating that part of the file—or wherever the information is to be taken from—must not be made public because of the security nature.

I agree; but, Mr. Speaker, the reason I made the appeal last night is that all the changes and amendments laid down by the hon. member for Kamloops in respect of the terms of reference in the order in council to me appeared impossible to make; that is, it appeared to me impossible to make all those adjustments.

I am not saying that the argument of the hon. member for Kamloops is impossible. When I use the word "impossible" I mean that it seems to me there is no possibility of agreement on all sides of the house that the terms of reference in the order in council could be accepted. Well, Mr. Speaker, if we have reached the stage where there is a complete impasse as of today in respect of the situation in which the house finds itself, then I think we must go back to the authorities, the precedents and the traditions which we have. It is easy to quote chapter and verse, citation after citation with regard to what is necessary, if we have reached that stage. The rules which we use are spelled out in the standing orders, and we have the precedents and so on to give us guidance in respect of what to do when we cannot reach agreement on all sides of the house.

At this stage, Mr. Speaker, it appears to me that we cannot reach agreement. Therefore the next step that is clearly laid down in the rules is what I was asking should be done. It is easy to quote dozens of citations from Erskine May, Beauchesne and Bourinot as to what has to be done when a question of privilege is raised and once the Speaker has accepted that there is a prima facie case. But the most succinct one is that which you quoted this afternoon from page 134 of Erskine May's 17th edition where it says, with complete clarity, that a motion must be moved by the person making the complaint. That, Mr. Speaker, is open to any member who feels abused or aggrieved by the statements of the Minister of Justice.

[Mr. Olson.]

• (3:20 p.m.)

The Minister of Justice has not raised a question of privilege in the house. If he chooses not to name the names I cannot see any way, according to the rules or precedents, by which we can force him, or any other member, to say more than he wants to say. If he chooses not to name the names, then the only step that is open to those who feel they have been done wrong by his statements is to make a substantive motion outlining the charge.

Mr. Pickersgill: Exactly.

Mr. Olson: Further, Mr. Speaker, I want to say that there can be more than the charge because, at page 102 of Beauchesne's fourth edition, citation 113 says:

> Members often raise so-called "questions of privilege" on matters which should be dealt with as personal explanations or corrections, either in the debates or the proceedings of the house.

Then it says this, Mr. Speaker:

> A question of privilege ought rarely to come up in parliament.

We agree, but in our opinion this is a situation that is serious enough to justify a bona fide question of personal privilege. The citation also says this:

> It should be dealt with by a motion giving the house power to impose a reparation or apply a remedy.

Therefore within this motion they could lay out the charge as well as include the remedy.

Each of the motions that were made last Friday, and on Thursday when I was not here, although I have since read them, called for the resignation of the Minister of Justice. I suggest to you, Mr. Speaker, that that could be included in the motion I am speaking about. In other words that is the remedy that would satisfy this question of privilege, but that by itself is not sufficient. The charge against the Minister of Justice must also be in the motion, as well as the remedy.

I can quite understand Your Honour ruling the previous motions out of order. One moved by the hon. member for Yukon, for example, just simply said that the minister should resign. There was no charge there. All that was there was the remedy.

Mr. Starr: A good remedy.

Mr. Olson: So, Mr. Speaker, the reason I raise this matter about the propriety of anyone outside this house dealing with a question of privilege affecting the members of the

house, is that it seemed to me we had reached the stage yesterday, after hearing the speech made by the hon. member for Kamloops, where it was not possible to get agreement from all corners of the house on the terms of reference, or perhaps on anything else.

Let me make it abundantly clear that I think this judicial inquiry can serve a useful purpose in supplying the information that the committee on privileges and elections may need to deal with the question of privilege; but let us also be perfectly clear that no judicial inquiry, no matter how eminent, shall have the right to deal with a question of the privileges of the house. I also say there is a possibility something should be done with the motion moved by the hon. member for Edmonton West.

I am not going to repeat those things that the Prime Minister, the Leader of the Opposition and other hon. members said so well yesterday. We need to get this whole matter out of the house by having it investigated by the committee on privileges and elections, with whatever assistance that committee needs, so the house can get on with the job that its members were elected to do.

I think perhaps this motion could be accepted although it refers only to the terms of reference in the order in council; but I think it fails to recognize that the inquiry set up by this order in council is not going to deal with the question of privilege. So far as we are concerned the terms of reference set out in the order in council for the inquiry are broad enough, and they are not offensive; because they say the inquiry may look into all statements concerning the case in the House of Commons, all statements made by the Minister of Justice in press conferences, and into almost anything else.

If this judicial inquiry is to be but an inquiry to supply some information to the committee on privileges and elections I cannot see why there need to be any amendments moved to the terms of reference. Let us be clear, Mr. Speaker, that the judicial inquiry is not going to settle or even consider the question of privilege.

I would like to suggest to the hon. member for Edmonton West that we set up this committee of seven to deal with this matter that is before the house, no matter how difficult it may be to define that matter, but leaving out the terms of reference given in the order in council. I suggest that a committee of seven members be set up so we can have some discussions to see if we can find some kind of agreement on how we can deal with this whole matter and take it out of what the hon. member for Edmonton West suggested is this morass.

I agree with the Minister of National Health and Welfare that it would be difficult to accept the motion as it is because it does specifically set out that the terms of the order in council be referred to this committee. I think the executive has the authority to go ahead with the order in council and set up the inquiry, with or without the approval of this house, but that again does not satisfy the question of privilege that has been raised, I think quite properly.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, if we can have this committee of seven consider this matter for the next two or three days—the date is acceptable; I think the hon. member said 2.30 on Thursday, March 17—if we can have this committee try to find some way out of the impasse, I believe we should go ahead with it. If not, Mr. Speaker, then I suggest the burden is transferred back to your shoulders, and what you have to do now is to insist that any member who feels he has a question of privilege must get up and move the substantive motion that is required according to all the authorities. But, Mr. Speaker, I personally, and I think my party, would rather refer the whole matter to a committee of seven which would come back with some suggestions about what can be done about this question of privilege.

Mr. Stanley Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Mr. Speaker, the motion proposed by the hon. member from Edmonton West is a most unusual motion. However, we in this house are in a most unusual situation. I think we all agree that it is our responsibility to do something to resolve the situation in which we find ourselves.

• (3:30 p.m.)

I want to say at the outset that I do not find it possible to agree with all the things the hon. member for Edmonton West said. I do not wish to argue with him at this point but I think the record should be clear. I do not believe that the order in council that has been referred to transfers the question of privilege to the commissioner. There is no word anywhere in the order in council that does this. What is referred to the commissioner is the statement made by the Minister of Justice. The question of privilege remains

with this house—indeed, it apparently remains on the floor of this house—until we do something about it. Even though I find that flaw in the argument advanced by the hon. member for Edmonton West, I agree with him that we should do something about this situation, and do it quickly.

You have ruled, Mr. Speaker, and I agree with you completely, that the only kind of motion that is in order at the present time is a motion based on the question of privilege that is before us. I thought, until I saw yesterday's *Votes and Proceedings*, that we were still on the question of privilege raised last Thursday by the hon. member for Calgary North, but I take it that officially we are now on the question of privilege raised yesterday by the hon. member for Kamloops. In any event, it is the same general question.

I read again two sentences read just now by the hon. member for Medicine Hat from citation 113 of Beauchesne, fourth edition:

> A question of privilege ought rarely to come up in parliament. It should be dealt with by a motion giving the house power to impose a reparation or apply a remedy.

This confirms what you have said many times, Mr. Speaker, that we should not still be debating this matter unless there is placed before us a motion based on the question of privilege that has been raised. I submit, if I may quote just part of that sentence from Beauchesne, that what the hon. member for Edmonton West has proposed is a motion to "apply a remedy" to the question of privilege that has paralysed the business of this house. It is a proposal that it go off the floor to a special committee of seven to see whether that committee cannot agree on something that might be acceptable to all sections of the house.

Mr. MacEachen: Mr. Speaker, may I ask the hon. gentleman a question?

Mr. Knowles: Yes.

Mr. MacEachen: Is the hon. member suggesting that the matter of the order in council and the consideration of its terms of reference be sent to a committee or that the procedural impasse with which the house is gripped be sent to a committee for advice and recommendation? I should like his clarification on this particular aspect.

Mr. Knowles: I do not know whether the hon. member for Edmonton West intended to make this distinction, but I think he did when he used the phrase "terms of reference of the order in council" and not the phrase "the order in council" itself. It is something like the distinction that we make on second reading of a bill between the bill and the subject matter of the bill.

I submit that there is no challenge in this motion to the unquestioned authority of the executive to pass an order in council. The executive had the authority, it passed it and at the moment it is part of the law of this land. It is also possible, of course, for parliament to try to persuade the executive to change that order in council. I remind the government that this was done in the Rivard case. After certain appeals from this side of the house the government passed an order in council setting up the Dorion commission, but as a result of negotiations, the letter from my friend, the hon. member for Greenwood, to the Secretary of State for External Affairs, questions and debate on the floor of the house, the original order in council was amended by the passing of another order in council.

I would say to the Minister of National Health and Welfare that this is the course I see this matter taking. I do not think the house by a motion and decision, say on Thursday afternoon, can amend the order in council or tell the government what it must do. But this is a means by which we can make known to the government our general desire for a change as we did in the Rivard case, and the result of this could be an awareness on the part of the government that it would be a good idea to amend the order in council along the lines proposed by the seven-man committee.

I recognize that there are deficiencies in this amendment. I think the requirement that a recommendation be made back to this house for decision raises a very interesting point, especially the words "for decision". But surely the overriding fact is that for the fourth day in a row parliament is paralysed by an unusual situation, and if we are presented with a motion based on the question of privilege which seeks to apply a remedy to this situation I think Your Honour should allow the house to vote on the motion and say whether or not we accept this remedy.

Before I sit down, Mr. Speaker, I want to say something along the lines of the concluding remarks of the hon. member for Medicine Hat. I think we have reached one good point in this sorry mess in that we are now discussing a precise motion. Whatever happens from

now on, I hope the house will support Your Honour in insisting that there be no more discussion of this matter unless there is an actual motion before us.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Knowles: I hope Your Honour will allow this motion. I think the discussion on it can be very brief. Perhaps it might be voted on without any discussion at all. If it is passed, this matter will be off the floor of the house and Canada will rejoice. If it is defeated, I urge the house to support you, sir, in insisting that there be no further discussion of this question of privilege unless there is another motion based on it which is properly moved and accepted by Your Honour.

In the meantime I repeat what I said at the beginning. I think in this unusual situation we should realize we have a right to pass a motion that applies a remedy and should do our best to cope with this matter by accepting the motion and applying this remedy to this unusual situation so that we can get this whole matter off the floor of the house.

Mr. Pickersgill: Mr. Speaker, I wonder whether the hon. gentleman would permit me to ask him a question?

Mr. Knowles: Yes.

Mr. Pickersgill: The hon. gentleman is making an appeal to the Chair to accept a motion which he considers, in the circumstances, defective? Is that the correct interpretation?

Mr. Knowles: I am saying that it is an unusual motion. Mr. Speaker himself has pointed out that in the 99 years of this house there has been only one kind of motion based on privilege which has been accepted. But I do not know why we should not break some new ground. We have certainly broken some new ground in the last four days.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Knowles: I also say to the Minister of Transport that if I had been drafting the motion I would not have put in it the phrase "recommend to this house for decision", but I do not think that because there is something in it I do not like or do not approve of this throws the whole motion out. I think the general idea of the motion, based on the whole question of privilege, that we seek to apply a remedy is one that merits consideration.

The only motion that Your Honour has said up to this point would be in order is a motion to refer this matter to the Committee on Privileges and Elections. It is not a very far cry from referring the matter to the Committee on Privileges and Elections to referring it to a special committee that the house sets up for this particular purpose.

Hon. E. D. Fulton (Kamloops): Mr. Speaker, I wish to speak only very briefly on the point of order and then I shall make a plea to the house and especially to the government with respect to the point of order. With respect to the point of order the two branches of my remarks will be related. It is true that we have here an unusual motion, but the house is, of course, the master of its own procedure and, subject to your ruling, Mr. Speaker, the house can say that it will accept the motion even though it is not usual and would not apply in ordinary circumstances. I hope, therefore, that the house will bear with me if I suggest that this motion is very close to what could be described as a motion dealing with the business of the house, which as I understand it can be moved at any time without notice and taken under discussion at that time.

• (3:40 p.m.)

The terms of reference setting up a commission of inquiry were tabled in the house yesterday. Those terms of reference were discussed last evening. They were, therefore, dealt with in the process of the dispatch of business, if I may use that term, with respect to what was before us; they formed, in effect, the business of the house at that time. We have now introduced a motion suggesting that the matter be disposed of by reference to a select committee to be set up for that special purpose.

I am not going to press this point any further. I say, however, that there is a basis upon which the house may quite properly find that, although somewhat unusual, this is a proper motion and should be allowed to be put, by unanimous consent if necessary.

Having said that, sir, I should like to urge upon the house the reasons I trust the house will follow that course. I am not asking anyone in any part of the house to commit himself as to how he will vote on the motion, if hon. members agree to allow it to be put. I want to make that clear. All I am asking is that the house be allowed to deal with this motion. Naturally I hope it will be accepted because I think this would be the best way of

dealing with the impasse in which we are now. I want to say that very strenuous efforts have been made, by way of informal negotiations, to find what I would describe as an honourable means of disengagement from this really very damaging situation in which we are now.

Mr. Lewis: Of disinvolvment.

Mr. Fulton: I am not going to deal with those discussions. The discussions were informal and no one was committed. This, I understand, is the position. I am therefore not going to go into detail. I am simply pointing out to the house that there have been strenuous efforts made to devise means by which we could resolve our difficulty, at least for the time being, and get back to the Order Paper. Then our discussions would be at least within the ordinary routine of business.

As I said, I am not asking anyone to commit himself on how he will vote on the motion. What we have attempted to do, so far as the Conservative opposition is concerned, has been to find some means of expressing our desire for some modification of the terms of reference. We made certain proposals last evening but they were not accepted. We urge now that the matter be referred to a committee so that there can be some discussion. A 48 hour delay alone would be involved. It is possible there may be agreement. If there is not, then the government at least has the authority to go ahead.

I trust that the Prime Minister and hon. members opposite will appreciate, even although they may not agree with what we are requesting—I am not going to revive the debate so I want to choose my words carefully—that in a matter so unusual and so unprecedented, which nevertheless involves the process of making a report and passing judgment on the conduct of members of this house, surely those affected should be given the right to discuss the terms of reference under which that inquiry is going to take place and ascertain if they can be agreed upon. It is this for which we are asking.

We are asking also that we be given an opportunity now to vote on this proposal. We know—and I make no commitment, utter no threat or attach no conditions—as everyone does that this procedure cannot continue. However, we feel we must exhaust every proper means within our power of finding an acceptable method of getting out of the situation in which we now find ourselves. We think this is a proper and sensible proposal by which that can be accomplished.

Surely, Mr. Speaker, at least the opinion of the house or the sense of the house on the question should be ascertained by allowing the motion to come to a vote. I trust, therefore, that members opposite will withdraw their objections which require you to make a ruling. I have suggested a basis upon which you may rule the motion in order. Let us see if we can at least deal with this matter in an attempt to find some way of getting back to the Order Paper and getting on with our business.

Mr. Grégoire: I should like to ask the hon. member for Kamloops a question. Suppose the house gives unanimous consent to accepting this motion, will the hon. member undertake that after the vote has been taken and the motion approved or defeated the members of his party will not pursue the debate? Will he give that undertaking?

Mr. Starr: We cannot speak for you.

Mr. Fulton: I am not in a position to give that undertaking in those words. I have said that strenuous discussions have been carried on in an effort to find an honourable means of disengagement by which we might withdraw from this process. This statement was made in all sincerity. I think that assurance should be accepted for what it is. I am not the house leader and I am not in a position to commit this party. I am confident I have expressed the sense of this party and the desire of this party if we could be allowed to deal with this motion.

Mr. Grégoire: May I ask a supplementary question? I have confidence in the word of the hon. member for Kamloops. Could he ask his house leader to give an undertaking that immediately after the vote we will be through with the discussion and not have any more speeches?

Mr. Fulton: Mr. Speaker, it is my understanding that after the vote is taken we wish to get on with the Order Paper. I can go no further than that.

Mr. Turner: I rise on a point of order. I should like to address a few remarks to Your Honour. I want to suggest to you that if you find the motion moved by the hon. member for Edmonton West defective you will have achieved the same result by that decision. If the motion is defective and not admissible, then on the basis of the remarks made from

various quarters of the house, including those made by the hon. member for Medicine Hat, there is no question or business before the house. It would be within the discretion of the Chair to ask the house to return to the ordinary business. The undertaking suggested by the hon. member for Kamloops, even were he able to achieve it, could be as easily achieved by the Chair itself if the Chair were to decide that this motion was out of order.

Mr. Lambert: Oh, boy, what rationalization that is.

• (3:50 p.m.)

Mr. Turner: I am going to suggest to Your Honour that the motion is clearly out of order. I align myself with the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre who seemed to imply the motion was defective and yet invited Your Honour to accept it none the less. I believe it is defective for the reasons he suggested as well as other reasons. The argument advanced by the hon. member for Edmonton West was as follows: In approving the order in council the executive arrogated to itself a decision on privilege which properly lay within the confines of this house alone, that the right to deal with questions of privilege rests with parliament, and that the order in council was thereby a challenge to the rights of parliament. I hope I have not done the hon. member an injustice by that summary of his argument.

I want to say to Your Honour that I do not think the order in council is a derogation from the privileges and rights of parliament at all, and I will suggest why. The order in council merely sets up an inquiry. An inquiry is not a trial. It is not a criminal tribunal, as certain hon. members suggested last night. It is merely a fact-finding body.

Until the facts are established there can be no question of privilege at all. It will be on the basis of facts judicially weighed and determined by a judge of the Supreme Court of Canada, who is free from the pressures of this place, that the rights and privileges which apply to those facts will be determined—

Mr. Churchill: May I ask the hon. gentleman a question?

Mr. Turner: —but not until the facts are determined.

Mr. Churchill: I do not want to interrupt unnecessarily, but is not the hon. member now rather enlarging the debate? I thought we were keeping strictly to the point of order. The hon. member is now bringing out arguments which some of us would like to answer, but we are trying to restrain ourselves.

Mr. Turner: Mr. Speaker, an earlier inquiry, the Dorion inquiry, did not decide whether anyone was guilty or not guilty; it merely established facts. Following the ordinary criminal process charges might later be laid. Therefore under this fact-finding inquiry the rights and privileges of the house would not be affected. It would still be open to the House of Commons, on the basis of facts judicially determined by an impartial arbiter, to determine upon its rights and privileges.

[*Translation*]

Hon. Martial Asselin (Charlevoix): Mr. Speaker, may I put a question now to the Minister without Portfolio?

Mr. Turner: Mr. Speaker, when I have finished my statement, I shall accept the hon. member's question.

[*English*]

After those facts are established the rights and privileges of the house will remain intact. Therefore, since there is no question of privilege abrogated by the order in council, the motion of the hon. member for Edmonton West, not going to a question of privilege, should not properly be entertained by Your Honour.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Asselin (Charlevoix): Mr. Speaker, does the hon. member for St. Lawrence-St. George not feel that the statements made by the Minister of Justice, both outside and inside the house, are matters about which members may raise the question of privilege?

The statements made by the Minister of Justice, I repeat, both outside and inside the house, constitute a revelation of facts which, in my opinion, entitles any hon. member to rise on a question of privilege.

Mr. Speaker: Order, order.

[*English*]

Mr. Fairweather: Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister without Portfolio, if I may. I was interested in his argument but I am wondering whether he really believes that the result of the findings of a judicial inquiry or commission would not in fact have the same effect, as if a trial were held in a court

of law. In other words, the result of the findings for certain members of this house—I do not now ask where they sit—will be just as inexorable as if a judge had found them guilty or innocent.

Mr. Turner: In answer to that, Mr. Speaker, may I say that the inquiry will not determine rights. The inquiry will determine facts. In the same way the Dorion inquiry did not determine rights or declare people guilty or innocent but just determined facts.

Mr. Fairweather: But after the Dorion inquiry it was surely inexorable that action would be taken and in this case hon. members would be affected just as if a trial had been held.

Mr. Diefenbaker: Mr. Speaker, I refrained last evening from participating in the debate because I have no more than a passing interest in what is taking place in this Chamber. However, we are now endeavouring to bring about a measure of rapprochement, if you will, within this chamber so as to restore something of the loss of prestige and the grandeur of parliament within our country. We are trying to do something to get parliament back once more to the discharge of its responsibilities.

It has been said that there is no precedent for this motion. The hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre, with his vast knowledge of the subject, agreed that the motion before you could be accepted. The hon. member for Medicine Hat made a plea last evening which I must say had a tremendous appeal to me.

I speak as one who, as all of us do, loves this institution. We do not want to continue ad infinitum the arguments, the disputations, the invective of the last few days. We want to get on with the responsibility of parliament. May I say to you, sir, that in the occupancy of your office in the last few days you have added adornment to the greatness of your office by the way in which you conducted yourself.

Som hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Diefenbaker: I will say nothing in the course of my remarks that will in any way be provocative. Two of us in this house have a higher responsibility. All other members have an equal one but two of us have a higher responsibility, namely, the Prime Minister of Canada and the Leader of the Opposition.

[Mr. Fairweather.]

I want to see parliament back on the rails. If there is no precedent, then this is the supreme court of parliament and it makes its own rules. That was the way in which the common law was achieved. If today there is no statutory regulation about a certain matter, then the ordinary principles of equity apply. The whole basis of our parliamentary system is that we accept the traditions of the past and that from precedent to precedent we build for the future.

There is nothing in this motion of a nature to cause harm or hurt to any member of the house. Surely we are not going to be bound by the past and mummify the operations of parliament because never before has a situation such as the present one developed.

I make an appeal to the Prime Minister who I am sure, in his person and the power of the position he occupies, will join with me to forget the acrimonies and difficulties of the past and give support to this motion which has been placed before the house so that we will be doing something for Canada, something for parliament and something for freedom.

• (4:00 p.m.)

Mr. Pearson: Mr. Speaker, I recall someone on the other side of the house, I think it was the right hon. gentleman who has just sat down, being reported as saying the other day, "If we in the opposition stand steady, they will always give way."

Mr. Diefenbaker: No, no.

Mr. Pearson: "They will capitulate."

Mr. Diefenbaker: No, no. This is not capitulation.

Mr. Pearson: Mr. Speaker, I do not mind giving way in a good cause. I do not mind trying to find a compromise when compromise is desirable and necessary. But what have we here, Mr. Speaker? I do not want to go over old ground but I repeat that we have been out of order for three days. You have relaxed the rules, quite rightly, to permit a discussion in a situation which was unusual and which could not be brought under the rules because the opposition did not submit the kind of motion which would have been within the rules and could have been discussed.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Pearson: That is the situation we have been in. Now it is suggested, Mr. Speaker,

that to get back into order and get ahead with our business we should accept a motion which the greatest rules authority in this house has suggested is defective but which embodies a good idea.

Mr. Knowles: Mr. Speaker, would the right hon. Prime Minister permit a question? I wish to direct a question to him because I gather he was referring to me.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh.

Mr. Pearson: I was referring to the Minister of National Health and Welfare.

Mr. Knowles: I know how ridiculous my statement just sounded, because it seemed to refer to something that the Prime Minister said. However, he did refer to someone who had stated, in his words, that the motion was defective but that it contained a good idea. I do not think the Minister of National Health and Welfare said that.

I wonder whether the Prime Minister is aware of the provisions of citation 199 in Beauchesne, fourth edition, which give Mr. Speaker the authority to suggest any corrections that are necessary to make a motion conform with the usages of the house. I wonder therefore if it would not be possible for one to argue that the general purport of this motion is in order, that there may be a defect in it, and I think there is one defect in it, but that Mr. Speaker himself could suggest to the mover that it might be corrected.

Mr. Pearson: I realize I made a great mistake in making a reference that could be even interpreted by the hon. gentleman as referring to him because I knew that if I did that I should have Beauchesne thrown at me at once. I yield to his superior knowledge of Beauchesne but I do not think that that particular reference covers the point we are dealing with.

The precedent that we should be establishing if this motion were accepted would mean that if an order in council passed by a government in the future in the discharge of its responsibilities—and it alone has the responsibility of passing orders in council—if an order in council were passed and the terms of reference were considered not suitable by the opposition, then under the guise of a discussion on privilege a motion could be made submitting the terms of reference of that order in council to a committee for reconsideration. This would be the precedent we should be establishing and, Mr. Speaker, in this case to a committee of seven on which no doubt all five parties in this house would be represented.

That is the kind of proposal that is being made to the house. If, Mr. Speaker, you rule the motion out of order, then I hope, and I repeat the hope expressed a moment ago by the Leader of the Opposition, that we can get on with the business before us.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Pearson: If, Mr. Speaker, you take another decision which results in a vote, then at least we shall have decided the matter at once and can get on with the business before us. Naturally we will abide by whatever decision you make.

Mr. Terence Nugent (Edmonton-Strathcona): Mr. Speaker, the Minister of National Health and Welfare, the Minister without Portfolio and the Prime Minister made certain remarks on the point of order with which I should like to deal. First, I was a little puzzled by the remark made by the Minister of National Health and Welfare that there were no charges against the Minister of Justice. Certainly the essence of the question of privilege raised by the hon. member for Calgary North is a charge against the Minister of Justice that he has violated the privileges of this house.

Sir, there is nothing further that needs to be mentioned; there is nothing further that needs to be said. That is the specific charge with which the minister is charged and which the hon. member for Calgary North has brought before the house. The minister has been supplied with the particulars of the charge in that it is alleged that the statements he made inside the house and also outside the house on the Munsinger affair cast a shadow on his honour and on the integrity of members of this house. There is therefore a specific charge and I do not see why the Minister of National Health and Welfare is puzzled about a charge against the Minister of Justice.

Next, referring to a statement by the hon. Minister without Portfolio on a ruling by Your Honour respecting the question of privilege, I say that what he said does not follow. A motion based on a question of privilege is one method suggested by the hon. member who moves the motion of dealing with the question of privilege. In the present case the privilege of many members of the house is

affected by the question of privilege brought up by the hon. member for Calgary North. I submit, sir, that it is clear there is nothing in the rules suggesting that only one type of motion may be moved or that only one method of dealing with such a situation should be adopted.

I submit that if the motion based on the question of privilege were found in order and that motion or the substance of that motion were dealt with by the house, the question of privilege would be finished with. But if the motion itself is found out of order you cannot just by finding a particular motion out of order kill the substantive question. I only have to refer the minister to any piece of business dealt with by the house. If a motion were made to proceed with any substantive motion dealing with government business and the motion was then ruled out of order, on the minister's argument the government's business would be finished. I submit, sir, that in that context the argument of the minister does not stand up.

Next I wish to refer to the contention of the Prime Minister that for three days this house has been out of order. It is my contention, sir, that we have been in order throughout this time. On all occasions that members have been talking about the question of privilege they have been in order in that they have the right to talk on a matter of privilege. They have the right to raise it and to suggest methods of dealing with it. There is nothing out of order in our proceedings at this time except, as has been pointed out on several occasions, that the Chair has been lenient in that three or four different matters of privilege have been talked about at the same time.

Mr. Lambert: There is one point, Mr. Speaker, that I should like to mention. If it will assist the house to get out of the impasse it is in, which was the motivation of my motion, I am quite prepared, although I reserve my rights as to the correctness of my motion, to remove the words that might be offensive, "for decision," and I can speak as well for my seconder. If this is the matter that provides the stumbling block at this time, in the spirit of co-operation I am quite agreeable to removing those words. I am sure Your Honour would agree that the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre was quite correct in setting forth the authority of the Chair with regard to correcting a motion in this way.

[Mr. Nugent.]

• (4:10 p.m.)

Mr. Lewis: Mr. Speaker, I rise merely for a moment to say that those of us who discussed the possibility of getting this matter off the floor of this house and getting down to business expressed the hope that any procedural debate which might take place would be a relatively short one. I suggest to you, Mr. Speaker, that the debate on whether or not this motion is in order has already gone on for well over an hour and, with the greatest of respect, I wonder whether Your Honour is now prepared to make a ruling instead of this debate continuing any longer and the whole purpose of the discussion being destroyed.

Mr. Olson: Could I be permitted to make a suggestion?

Mr. Speaker: It is certainly true that with the consent of the house a number of speakers have been speaking more than once on the point of order. Again, I have been lenient, possibly too lenient. But the house might wish to allow the hon. member an opportunity to add a word or two to what he has already said on this point of order.

Mr. Olson: It is not on the point of order. I wish to make a suggestion. I have a wording prepared as a substitute motion. Perhaps the hon. member for Edmonton West would be prepared to listen to it.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh.

Mr. Speaker: There was a suggestion made by the hon. member for Edmonton West that if he were allowed to do so by unanimous consent he would amend his motion. I wonder whether this should be considered by the Chair at the present time. It would, of course, require unanimous consent.

Mr. Nielsen: You can do it.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Yukon says I can do it. Perhaps I am starting my comments at the wrong end, but if that is the suggestion made to the Chair—order, please. I suggest to hon. members that they allow me to put my views before the house. With a great deal of patience during the last few days I have listened to hon. members, every one of them, including those who have spoken more than once when perhaps they should have spoken only once on a question of privilege. But we all agree that things got somewhat complicated. One of our difficulties last week was that we had three questions of privilege before the house at the same time.

The reason was that each was followed by a motion, each of them unusual to the extent that the Chair thought there might be something so unusual about these motions that they might be in order. But they were not. We eventually came back to one question of privilege which was raised subsequently, that is, yesterday afternoon, by the hon. member for Kamloops, and I suggest this is the question which was before us until today although, as the hon. member knows, no motion was made as required by the rules. The hon. member for Digby-Annapolis-Kings also brought up a question of privilege this afternoon on which no motion was moved.

So we are left with the motion moved by the hon. member for Edmonton West of which he has kindly given me notice and which we have now discussed together at length. As he says, there is a degree of disagreement whether or not it should be accepted.

Perhaps I may restate the views I have expressed on Thursday, Friday, yesterday and again today as to the general rules on a question of privilege. I do not think it should be necessary for me to repeat the citations, Nos. 104, 105 and 113 of Beauchesne, except for the one which has been quoted by a number of hon. members and which says:

> A question of privilege ought rarely to come up in Parliament. It should be dealt with by a motion giving the House power to impose a reparation or apply a remedy.

That is citation No. 113. Now I am doing what I said I would not do. I am quoting from both Beauchesne and May.

> It is irregular to make a complaint unless the hon. member intends to follow it up with a substantive motion referring to the matter which he has introduced to the notice of the House—

That is from May's 17th edition, page 134. I would also remind hon. members that the house cannot carry on a debate unless there is a motion before it, and in the case of a question of privilege the subject matter of discussion has to be a question of privilege; in other words, not another substantive motion but a motion of privilege.

Here I express a view which is shared by many hon. members who have had considerably more experience than I have had in this matter. I may say, as an aside, that when I try to go back in *Hansard* to look for precedents I am always impressed to see that so many hon. members who are still in the house today have contributed the precedents upon which the Chair must rely at this time. This includes the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh.

Mr. Speaker: I may say, if it will make him feel better, that when the Prime Minister referred to the "authority on the rules", I found he was referring to the Chair.

Mr. Knowles: Touché.

Mr. Speaker: It has been said, of course, that the house is master of its own rules. That is obvious. The house can at any time change the rules and decide that it will accept a motion or not accept it. It can decide to change the Standing Orders under which the Chair has to operate. But this is not the task of the Chair.

For instance, Standing Order 41 says that the setting up of a committee is something which must be done by a substantive motion with notice. This Standing Order is before the Chair. The Chair cannot change it unless hon. members tell the Speaker that they do not want him to respect it, or any number of other Standing Orders. This is a rule I am faced with. I am faced with this practice and unless hon. members can give me a list of the Standing Orders which I should disregard I am bound by it. If they give me such a list, I will be guided by it because I am the servant of the house. But as long as I am not told there are specific Standing Orders which I have to disregard I am afraid the Chair is bound to rule according to the standing Orders which are given to me to respect and obey and which I ask hon. members to respect and obey along with me.

The hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre quoted citation 199 and said I have the power in the Chair to suggest changes to a motion. My answer to this is that certainly the Chair can do so when there is only a question of form to be considered. But the Chair cannot take it upon its own initiative to alter the substance of a motion moved by an hon. member and suggest in what way it could be made acceptable to the Chair and to the house.

I am sure I am forgetting many of the things on which I wanted to comment, because there were such excellent contributions made by all hon. members. I know that these comments were made not so as to be obstructive in any way but so as to be helpful to the Chair, and if there was ever a Chair which needed help it is this one.

With all due respect, I believe the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre, the Leader of the Opposition and the hon. member for Kamloops, as, indeed, most of the hon. members who have taken part in this debate on the question of procedure, would have to agree with the Chair that this is not a motion which could be accepted at this time. It is irregular for reasons which I gave in detail when I ruled out three previous motions. I can assure hon. members that it is with a sad heart that the Chair must come to this conclusion because nothing would please me more than to be able to accept a motion which would take this matter away from the responsibility of the Chair, upon whose shoulders, it has been suggested, it now rests. But I am prepared to accept my responsibility and my responsibility is to decide that this motion should not be accepted, and I so rule.

Mr. Lambert: Mr. Speaker, if I may say so, I agree with your judgment in this regard. But I had hoped that hon. members opposite would have borne in mind Standing Order 42 which says:

> A motion may, in case of urgent and pressing necessity previously explained by the mover, be made by unanimous consent of the House without notice having been given under Standing Order 41.

It was with this sentiment in mind that I advanced my motion.

Mr. Nielsen: Mr. Speaker—

Mr. Olson: Under standing order 42 I should like to move the following motion—

• (4:20 p.m.)

Mr. Speaker: I understand that the hon. member for Medicine Hat has a proposition or another motion to make and I am prepared to hear him.

Mr. Nielsen: Mr. Speaker, before that I wish to be helpful to Your Honour. I have a suggestion to make.

Mr. Speaker: Perhaps I could hear the hon. member for Medicine Hat and before proceeding any further after I have heard him I will hear the hon. member for Yukon. I do not wish to be unfair to the hon. member for Yukon but two members rose at the same time and I recognized the hon. member for Medicine Hat. I suggest that perhaps I can hear him without prejudice to the hon. member's suggestion.

[Mr. Speaker.]

[*Translation*]

Mr. Maurice Allard (Sherbrooke): Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order—

[*English*]

Mr. Speaker: Order. The hon. member for Medicine Hat on a point of order.

Mr. Olson: Mr. Speaker, under standing order 42 I would ask the unanimous consent of the house to accept the following motion:

> That a special committee be set up, composed of seven members of this house; and that the special committee be empowered to consider the "procedural impasse" respecting the alleged questions of privilege and report its recommendations to this house by 2.30 p.m. on March 17, 1966.

There may be some difficulty in respect of the language. I think you will realize, Mr. Speaker, that this motion was written here at my desk within the last few minutes. I hope it will be accepted by the house as a means of finding some way around this procedural impasse. In this committee there could be cool and thoughtful consideration given to some way to deal with the matter.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Allard: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. At the beginning of the sitting this afternoon—

Mr. Speaker: Order. Before hearing the hon. member for Sherbrooke, who has risen on a point of order—

[*English*]

I should like to refer to the motion made by the hon. member for Medicine Hat who moved, seconded by Mr. Thompson, that a special committee, composed of seven members of this house, be empowered to consider the procedural impasse respecting the alleged questions of privilege and report its recommendation to the house by 2.30 p.m., March 17, 1966. This is the same type of a motion as one submitted to the Chair previously. I advised the hon. member for Yukon that I would do nothing to prejudice his position. I understood from what he said that he had a helpful suggestion for the Chair. The hon. member for the Yukon.

Mr. Nielsen: Your Honour has a motion before you now. I was going to suggest that the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre pointed out a Standing Order of which Your Honour might avail himself in order to regularize the first motion by striking out the words which appeared to be offensive to the

other side, and Your Honour did not exercise that prerogative.

Mr. Speaker: My understanding is there was a reference made by one member that it was within the competence of the Chair to make alterations, but in answer to this I say that my interpretation of citation 99 of Beauchesne is that these changes are only in respect of form and that this is done frequently by the Chair, particularly in committee where, because of a suggestion of the Chair, certain changes are made in a motion which has been proposed. This can even be done in the house. However, this has to do with form and not substance. Therefore I could not accept the interpretation of the hon. member for Edmonton West. I appreciate the helpful suggestion of the hon. member for Yukon.

We now have a motion and a request by the hon. member for Medicine Hat for unanimous consent for the Chair to propose this motion.

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Some hon. Members: No.

Mr. Speaker: It is with regret that I cannot accept the motion because there is not unanimous consent to the dispensation of the requirements of the rules in respect of putting the motion to the house.

[*Translation*]

The hon. member for Sherbrooke rises on a point of order?

Mr. Allard: I may be a little late in doing so, Mr. Speaker, but I would like to be enlightened on something of which I cannot make head or tail.

Last night, at ten o'clock, we were discussing the question of privilege raised by the hon. member for Kamloops (Mr. Fulton). I am of the opinion that we should now resume discussion of the matter, by virtue of standing order 7.

Your Honour pointed out to the house, at the outset, that three members had questions of privilege to raise.

Mr. Speaker, I should like to find out whether we are always considering the question of privilege, now that three questions of privilege have been raised, one by the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Diefenbaker) and two by two hon. members, or whether the business of the house has been adjourned.

Standing order No. 7 of the rules of the house provides that:

> At the ordinary time of adjournment of the house, unless otherwise provided, tthe proceedings shall be interrupted and the business under consideration at the termination of the sitting shall stand over until the next sitting day, when it will be taken up at the same stage where its progress was interrupted.

When the house adjourned last night, we were listening to the hon. member for Lapointe (Mr. Grégoire). Well, I am of the opinion that we should resume the discussion on that matter this afternoon.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

The point raised by the hon. member is interesting, but obviously the ruling of the Chair was to the effect that this motion should follow the question of privilege raised by the hon. member for Kamloops. No motion having been moved, the Chair allowed this morning the hon. member for Digby-Annapolis-Kings (Mr. Nowlan) to move another motion, followed subsequently by another motion moved by the hon. member for Edmonton West, which has been rejected.

[*English*]

Hon. Michael Starr (Ontario): Mr. Speaker, I think we have come to a position now where we in the opposition have endeavoured to do everything possible to bring about a just situation for those who are affected by this affair. We have pleaded with the Prime Minister and have pleaded with the government as a whole that justice be done, that a travesty upon the rights of individuals in this country should not be carried out and that justice should not be reversed. All of these arguments have been made effectively, I feel, and with passion. But the government is immovable in this regard. They have decided to go ahead with this plot that they have woven in order to bring about the conclusion they have in mind. There is nothing further we in the opposition can do.

I would suggest Mr. Speaker, that we proceed with Orders of the Day. Because of the fact that this would have been the second day of a supply motion and because of the lateness of the hour at which we will reach Orders of the Day and the question period, I would ask the government house leader to shelve the supply motion for today and I suggest that when we reach Orders of the Day we proceed immediately with government business as outlined by the government house leader last week.

Statement on Seal Slaughter

• (4:30 p.m.)

Mr. McIlraith: Yes, Mr. Speaker. I doubt very much that we can proceed with a supply motion in any event as the rule states that it must be commenced on a Monday. We would be very glad to proceed with the business outlined at page 2472 of *Hansard* for Wednesday, March 9.

[*Translation*]

FINANCE, TRADE AND ECONOMIC AFFAIRS

THIRD REPORT OF STANDING COMMITTEE

Mr. H. E. Gray (Essex West) presented, in French and English, the third report of the standing committee on finance, trade and economic affairs.

IMMIGRATION

RESTRICTION ON CANADIAN WORKERS ENTERING U.S.

Hon. Jean Marchand (Minister of Citizenship and Immigration): Mr. Speaker, on February 24 last, I was asked and I agreed to table the regulations of the American government governing immigration.

I am now prepared to table them if there is no objection.

[*English*]

Mr. Speaker: Has the minister leave to table the documents to which he has just referred?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

FISHERIES

SLAUGHTER OF SEALS—STATEMENT BY MINISTER

Hon. H. J. Robichaud (Minister of Fisheries): Mr. Speaker, I should like to make a statement concerning sealing operations off Canada's east coast. I am prompted to make it now in view of the numerous letters and telegrams which have and are being received by hon. members on both sides of the house.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. May we have order in the house.

Mr. Robichaud: I hope this statement will privide hon. members with information on which they can reply to representations which they are receiving on this matter. First, let me say that adequate measures are being taken for the conservation of the seal herds by my department. These measures are based on conclusive scientific evidence resulting from about 20 years' work by the Fisheries Research Board and there is no possibility that the Atlantic seal herds will be exterminated.

Indeed, our regulations in the gulf of St. Lawrence, where the fishery in 1965 and 1966 was exclusively Canadian, are designed to increase the herds. Following Canada's initiative, taken at the 1964 meeting of the International Commission on the North Atlantic Fisheries, we expect international conservation measures in other areas very shortly.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. There are too many conversations going on in the house at the moment.

Mr. Robichaud: Sealing last year put an additional $1,640,254 into the pockets of fishermen in three Atlantic coast provinces and is, therefore, an important source of income to those who have access to this fishery. While we do not have the value of seals to Prince Edward Island fishermen, we do know that last year sealing to Newfoundland fishermen was worth $901,663; to Nova Scotia fishermen $549,986, and to Quebec fishermen $188,605. In addition, of course, plant workers who process the skins on shore also benefit from this operation.

Following consultation with the industry and with humane society representatives, regulations governing sealing off the Atlantic coast were revised and made much more restrictive for the 1965 season. Open and closed seasons for operations from ships and aircraft were retained as before, and a number of new control measures were introduced.

For conservation purposes in 1965 a quota was applied for the first time to a large area of the gulf of St. Lawrence limiting the kill by sealers operating from ships and aircraft to 50,000 harp seals of less than a year in age. The killing of adult seals in breeding patches was prohibited. There was a new prohibition against the killing of hood seals in this part of the gulf. Steps were taken to limit the use of aircraft in the actual taking of seals to that area of the gulf of St. Lawrence where they had already established an operation by 1964. To avoid waste, new regulations limiting the time that seal skins could be left on the ice before removal to a base of operations were also brought into effect.

I realize, however, Mr. Speaker, that the great concern expressed in the house, and by the general public in hundreds of letters, is with the elimination of inhumane methods of harvesting this resource. There has been a great deal of publicity, both in this country and abroad, which has raised a storm of protest. Much of this publicity is exaggerated and some of it completely untrue. It has been said, for example, that seals are deliberately skinned alive in order to improve the quality of the pelts. There is not the slightest basis for this assertion. The quality of the pelts would, in fact, be damaged by such an inhumane practice.

Furthermore, part of that film which was shown in Canada and abroad, and which created such adverse publicity for Canada, was taken two or three days before the opening of the seal season in 1964 and some of the scenes shown were put-up affairs which grossly exaggerated the operation which normally takes place by regular operators.

I have already expressed my belief that, in general, the methods used by sealers, are humane in that the seals are killed instantly although some inhumanity can result from careless, unscrupulous or unskilful operations.

This was clearly evident from the report just submitted to me of the visit to the sealing grounds of the official team of observers who, at my invitation, were in a position to consider on the site the methods used in the slaughter of seals in area 2 of the gulf of St. Lawrence.

We are all equally concerned over the problem of preventing cruelty. After consultation with representatives of the humane societies and the industry, measures bearing on this problem were incorporated in the regulations for the 1965 season and further restrictions were brought into effect this year.

As this house knows, I made a personal visit to the ice in the gulf of St. Lawrence at the opening of the sealing season on March 7. As a result of this visit and seeing things at first hand, I am now in a much better position to make further improvements in the regulations to ensure that seals are killed in the most humane way possible.

As I have just stated, this year several representatives of humane societies were also present in the gulf at my invitation, and arrangements were made by officers of my department for them to see the sealing operations. I have received a report from the Ontario Humane Society which was jointly prepared by representatives of provincial and international humane societies. This report, which suggests certain improvements, will be discussed by the department, following the conclusion of the sealing season, with representatives of industry and humane societies with a view to further improvement of the regulations.

Commencing in 1965, the department has greatly increased its enforcement activities. Every sealing ship has aboard a fishery officer to see that the regulations are enforced. In addition, fishery officers patrol the ice where operations are being carried out by sealers both from ships and aircraft. Officers also check on quotas at landing points. I must stress that these officers are working long hours and are dedicated to their task.

• (4:40 p.m.)

I have been assigned the responsibility to introduce and apply regulations which will prevent such abuses as we have witnessed in the past in an operation which has proven most difficult to control. I have approached this problem with a sense of responsibility, fully aware that better and proper methods of killing had to be introduced and enforced if the whole sealing operation was to be conducted in full accordance with humane practices.

I should like, in closing, to assure those who have expressed concern about the sealing operations that additional steps are to be taken to improve the enforcement procedures and even more fishery officers will be at the scene of operations during next season to ensure that regulations are obeyed. It is my intention to arrange further visits to the ice in 1967 of representatives of humane societies and associated agencies, and also to have more consultation with them in a continuing effort to see that the most humane methods possible are used.

Right Hon. J. G. Diefenbaker (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, I begin by saying that I know the minister is tremendously interested in this problem and the voyage that he took to ascertain the facts was in keeping with his desire to do everything possible. The minister speaks of the pictures that were shown in various parts of the world which gave Canada a very black eye. He stated that these pictures were certainly not true representations of the slaughter of seals. Those pictures, however, were taken last year. The minister was present during the opening day of the sealing season this

year and various television organizations took pictures, which were shown across Canada. While not seen by me personally, they have been described by correspondents in various parts of this country as revolting, nauseating and shocking.

We want to do everything we can to remove the possibility of there being inhumanity in this slaughter. I have before me a Canadian Press article which says in part:

> Fisheries Minister H. J. Robichaud cuddled a baby seal and watched one being slaughtered yesterday as the annual hunt opened—

It goes on to say:

> One of the swilers—

A swiler is one of those engaged in this work.

> —demonstrated the killing and skinning. The minister borrowed a gaff and poked the carcass.
>
> "I don't think there's any doubt that the little thing was dead when it was skinned," he said—
>
> T. I. Hughes of Toronto, general manager of the Ontario Humane Society, agreed that the swiler had probably done a good job of killing the pup. "He wouldn't want to do a bad job with the minister there."

Mr. Hughes suggested that some other weapon should be used. He took along a pistol and a .22 calibre rifle equipped with special plastic bullets, which indicates that he felt vast improvements ought to take place in the killing operation. The article then says:

> At the same time, Dr. N. D. Scollard, director of Toronto's Riverdale Zoo, will examine hundreds of skulls scattered over the blood-splotched ice to determine how efficient the clubbing method is.

When we were in office we brought about legislation to assure in the slaughterhouses humane killing of cattle, hogs and sheep. It is not a responsibility resting solely on the minister; I am not placing it there. We as a nation must assure that cruelty shall be banned. The pictures shown over national television this year were not of the nature to lead people to believe that everything has been done that ought to be done.

The minister has indicated that not everything has been done that ought to be done because he said that further changes will be made after an examination of the recommendations that are before him. I hope that we in this nation will not allow anything to be done that will permit the continuation of a blot on our country. To prevent the situation depicted in other parts of the world requires the strictest and sternest action so that these poor little animals shall not for private gain or decoration be subject to unnecessary cruelty.

[Mr. Diefenbaker.]

Mr. Robichaud: Mr. Speaker, may I ask the right hon. gentleman a question? He has referred to pictures which were shown by the C.B.C. this year. Is he aware that those pictures were extracts of the film that was taken last year? I refer to the pictures shown on "This Hour Has Seven Days".

Mr. Diefenbaker: I am told the hon. gentleman was in the pictures.

Mr. Robichaud: No, not in those pictures.

Mr. Barry Mather (New Westminster): Mr. Speaker, I shall be very brief in speaking on this topic. In the first place I would say that we appreciate the information which the minister has given us on this matter. Second, I want to say that his leadership has apparently resulted in some action being taken to reduce the cruelty which has been for so long involved in the slaughter of seals. Third, I believe, and I think other hon. members agree, this is an indication of what aroused public opinion can do to bring pressure to bear on officials to take action along humane lines. We think something has been done to reduce the cruelty involved in the killing of seals but we also believe, as I think the humane societies do, that more has to be done. We shall be watching in the future to see what continued progress is made to reduce the cruelty in sealing.

Mr. A. B. Patterson (Fraser Valley): Mr. Speaker, we wish to express our appreciation for the fact that something definite is being done to meet this situation. I am sure that none of us appreciates the publicity that has been given during the past two or three years to the slaughter of baby seals. It has pointed up the fact that there are still those who for personal gain will bypass even the rudimentary principles of kindness to animals. I am sure we all recognize the fact that unless these people are willing to co-operate, some concrete action will have to be taken to insist that they recognize these fundamental principles.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Raymond Langlois (Mégantic): Just a few words, Mr. Speaker, to express to the minister our group's gratitude for his intention of handling, precisely, this problem which for many years already has caused great concern to the Canadian public because of the means used in seal hunting every season, or every year this operation is allowed.

Mr. Speaker, naturally we hear arguments that it is not worse than hunting and wounding other animals which cover many miles in a sad condition before dying.

Many such examples could be given. But a distinction must be made clearly and definitely, and that is the excuses or the methods, in short, the inhuman practices used in some areas.

Very often, when hunting, for instance, certain methods are used involuntarily, but this is no excuse for resorting to a practice or another method in some other field, like during this season when the skins of baby seals are mostly obtained. In addition, it is a hunt organized on the spot. Therefore, the practices used at present should not be tolerated.

I am sure the minister intends to introduce legislation to amend sealing regulations and, for our part, we can assure the minister of our full co-operation with a view to using efficient sealing practices in the general interest.

What methods does the minister intend to suggest? What legislation does he intend to introduce in order to indicate the methods to be used? It is up to him, but in any case, before deciding on a method care must be taken to choose the surest, the most efficient, the most humane one, so that present practices will no longer be tolerated.

We are anxiously awaiting the measures that the government intends to take and I hope it will be to the satisfaction of all, in order to put an end to this inhuman situation which occurs every year at this time during the seal hunt.

• (4:50 p.m.)

[*English*]

BILLS OF EXCHANGE ACT

PAYMENT OF CHEQUES ON NON-JURIDICAL DAYS

Hon. Mitchell Sharp (Minister of Finance) moved the first reading of Bill No. S-14 (from the Senate), to amend the Bills of Exchange Act.

Motion agreed to and bill read the first time.

EXTERNAL AFFAIRS

NATO—REFERENCE TO POSSIBLE WITHDRAWAL OF FRANCE

On the orders of the day:

Right Hon. J. G. Diefenbaker (Leader of the Opposition): Yesterday, I inquired of the Secretary of State for External Affairs regarding President de Gaulle's message to the various NATO countries. The minister stated he could not give any information on this question, yet yesterday in Britain information was given. I ask the minister this: Is Canada prepared to accept the idea of President de Gaulle that Canadian troops on French soil should be under French command? Is Canada going to accept such a proposition, whether or not there has been consultation with other countries?

Hon. Paul Martin (Secretary of State for External Affairs): I have read what was said in Britain yesterday, and I think they have not been more forthcoming, and understandably so, than we have.

Mr. Diefenbaker: They have been much more.

Mr. Martin (Essex East): I do not believe so, on the basis of the information that was given in Britain yesterday. With regard to the specific question, the Prime Minister has already said the answer would be no, Canada would not.

ADMINISTRATION OF JUSTICE

MUNSINGER CASE—REFERRING OF PRESS CONFERENCE TRANSCRIPT TO JUDICIAL INQUIRY

On the orders of the day:

Mr. David Lewis (York South): I wish to address a question to the Minister of Justice arising out of the discussion to which reference was made earlier today. I should like to ask the minister if he would inform the house whether he has a transcript of his press conference of March 10? If so, is he prepared to attach a copy of such transcript to the order in council establishing the commission of inquiry? Would the minister also inform the house whether he is prepared to offer himself as the first witness before the commissioner?

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. I have some doubt whether this question should be accepted. There is perhaps a point in the subject matter the hon. member is raising now. I think we are certainly embarking on a wrong course if we allow the hon. member to ask this question at this time.

Mr. Lewis: With great respect, Mr. Speaker, may I inform you that I know the minister is prepared to answer? I suggest,

with the greatest respect, that it may serve a very useful purpose to this parliament if the answer were on the record.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Mr. Speaker: If there is agreement between hon. members that the question may be asked, I have no objection.

Hon. Michael Starr (Ontario): I think this is a very important matter. The minister may have an answer and I think at this point particularly it may be helpful.

Hon. Lucien Cardin (Minister of Justice): Yes, Mr. Speaker, there is a transcript of the press conference I made on March 10. In order to allay the concern of the hon. member for York South and the concern in the minds of many hon. members, I would be prepared to have a transcript of my press conference of March 10, which is referred to in the order in council, transmitted along with the order in council. In so far as the second question is concerned, I am prepared to make myself available as the first witness before the commissioner in support of the statements that I have made on this matter.

Mr. Starr: May I ask a supplementary question? Can the minister advise us if this is the exact transcript of the tape, without changes?

Mr. Cardin: I can assure the hon. gentleman that it is an exact transcript. If he does not think so, then I will hand him the tape.

Mr. Starr: Don't be so touchy; I only asked, I did not say.

[*Translation*]

FINANCE

CONSULTATION RESPECTING INCREASE IN INTEREST RATE BY BANK OF CANADA

On the orders of the day:

Mr. Gilles Grégoire (Lapointe): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Finance (Mr. Sharp). Would he tell us whether there was an agreement between himself and the governor of the Bank of Canada before it decided to increase the interest rate?

[*English*]

Hon. Mitchell Sharp (Minister of Finance): Mr. Speaker, the Governor of the Bank of Canada, as is customary in such circumstances, consulted with me and I considered the change that was made in the bank rate appropriate in the circumstances.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Grégoire: Mr. Speaker, can the Minister of Finance tell us what motivated such increase in the interest rate? Is it due to an increase in the value of Canadian currency? If so, what was the percentage of such increase?

Mr. Speaker: Order. This question is not acceptable.

Mr. Grégoire: I wish to put an acceptable question on this matter which is very important to Canadians. Will the minister tell us if the increase in the interest rate is due to the increase in the cost of the paper and ink used to print Canadian dollars?

Mr. Speaker: Order.

[*Later:*]
[*English*]

Hon. J. W. Monteith (Perth): Mr. Speaker, may I direct a question to the Minister of Finance. I think he remarked in an answer given a few moments ago that under the present circumstances he agreed with the recent action taken by the Bank of Canada in raising the interest rates. I am wondering whether the government is planning any other moves because of these present circumstances.

Mr. Sharp: Mr. Speaker, I think the hon. gentleman will have to wait for my budget, which I hope will be coming down reasonably soon.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Henri Latulippe (Compton-Frontenac): Mr. Speaker, may I put a question to the Minister of Finance?

Could he tell the house what reasons prompted the Bank of Canada to increase its rates of interest?

Mr. Speaker: Order. I believe this question was put earlier.

[*Later:*]
[*English*]

Mr. Raymond Langlois (Mégantic): I have a question for the Minister of Finance, or possibly for the Prime Minister. In view of the statement of the Governor of the Bank of

Canada, does the government agree with the Governor of the Bank of Canada—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

Mr. Langlois (Mégantic): This is not the same question as I asked—

Mr. Speaker: Whatever the hon. member wished to ask, it could not be in order after the words he had used up to this point in his question. Whether the minister agrees or does not agree with the Governor of the Bank of Canada is not a question which can be asked at this time.

Mr. Langlois (Mégantic): I will put it this way, then. Does the government intend to react to the statement which the Governor of the Bank of Canada has made to the effect that Canada faces serious danger because of the high cost of living?

Mr. Sharp: I can answer that question very directly. The Governor of the Bank of Canada did not say that.

EXTERNAL AFFAIRS

RWANDA—REFERENCE TO POSSIBLE INVASION BY WATUSI

On the orders of the day:

Mr. R. N. Thompson (Red Deer): My question is directed to the Secretary of State for External Affairs and concerns the present threat of the Watusi invasion of Rwanda, poised on the Burundi-Rwanda border. I ask my question because it involves the safety of Canadian nationals in Rwanda, including some 100 on the teaching staff of the Rwanda National University.

My second question is, as a result of the fact this threat of warfare has been hanging on now for more than a month, has anything been done by the United Nations to try to relieve the situation?

Hon. Paul Martin (Secretary of State for External Affairs): No, Mr. Speaker; at this stage this is clearly an internal matter. There has been trouble there since January. The situation varies in intensity, and amounts almost to insurrection. There are about 100 Canadians, most of whom are at the university which is directed by the Rev. Father Lévesque.

CANADIAN BROADCASTING CORPORATION

REQUEST FOR CANCELLATION OF INTERVIEW WITH GERDA MUNSINGER

On the orders of the day:

Mr. Colin Cameron (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands): Mr. Speaker, I suppose my question should properly be addressed to the Secretary of State but in her absence I will address it to the Prime Minister. It arises out of a news story in the paper which appeared on my desk a few minutes ago and announces that tonight the C.B.C. is going to give the first television interview of Gerda Munsinger to be shown in North America. The interview will form part of a one-hour broadcast known as "C.B.C. News Magazine" and also includes comments from Montreal, Toronto and Ottawa on the Munsinger affair.

My question to the Prime Minister is this. Will he take some action to prevent this performance going on the air, because it seems to me that this matter may fall within the bound of being sub judice. In any event, it is certainly a grave impropriety that such a show should be put on now, in view of the appointment of the commission.

Right Hon. L. B. Pearson (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, I will be very glad indeed to bring the hon. member's remarks and my reply to the immediate attention of the C.B.C.

[*Translation*]

AGRICULTURE

CROP INSURANCE—POSSIBILITY OF MEETING WITH PROVINCIAL MINISTER

On the orders of the day:

Mr. Gérard Laprise (Chapleau): Mr. Speaker, I should like to put a question to the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Greene). Has the minister met with his Quebec counterpart or any Quebec government official concerning the amendments to the Crop Insurance Act and has the minister taken cognizance of the suggestions of the Massicotte report on this matter.

[*English*]

Hon. J. J. Greene (Minister of Agriculture): Mr. Speaker, I will take that question as notice.

LABOUR CONDITIONS

WINDSOR—PROSPECTIVE LAY-OFF OF FORD WORKERS

On the orders of the day:

Mr. H. E. Gray (Essex West): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Citizenship and Immigration. Is he in a position to give us a report on the investigation into the part carried out by the department in relation to possible lay-offs of tool and die workers at the Ford plant in Windsor?

Inquiries of the Ministry

Hon. Jean Marchand (Minister of Citizenship and Immigration): Mr. Speaker, following a meeting held on February 25 with the U.A.W. at Windsor, we sent two officials to Windsor, one from the Department of Industry and the other from the department of immigration, to inquire into this very serious problem.

Last week I received a very extensive report on the situation. At the time of the meeting the union suggested to us that the company intended to close down its tool and die room at Windsor. The result of the inquiry shows that that actually was the intention of the company. It is regrettable that the company did not co-operate more in this matter with the union, but I think we have to face these lay-offs and see how we can help the workers involved. We have asked our national employment service office to take the matter into immediate consideration.

Mr. Max Saltsman (Waterloo South): A supplementary question. In view of the answer the minister has given, can he tell the house whether he has any intention of seeing that the evil effects of lay-offs as a result of the automobile agreement are mitigated by making representations to the automobile companies regarding future lay-offs, so as to ensure that consultation will take place with their employees prior to a lay-off taking place in the manner in which this one did.

Mr. Marchand: Mr. Speaker, it is our intention to do this.

IMMIGRATION

HONG KONG—SHORTAGE OF EXAMINING OFFICERS

On the orders of the day:

Hon. Marcel Lambert (Edmonton West): May I direct a question to the Minister of Citizenship and Immigration. The day before yesterday the minister announced the opening of an immigration office in Tokyo, among other changes in the immigration set-up. Can he advise the house what he proposes to do at this time with respect to the office in Hong Kong, with a view to correcting the grave shortage of examining officers at that bureau?

Hon. Jean Marchand (Minister of Citizenship and Immigration): Does the hon. gentleman mean the shortage of personnel in Hong Kong?

Mr. Lambert: I refer to the shortage of examining personnel in Hong Kong, which was admitted by the minister's predecessors and which I personally verified some months ago.

Mr. Marchand: This is the first time I have heard of this, Mr. Speaker. I will inquire and make a report later on.

CANADIAN NATIONAL RAILWAYS

REQUEST FOR REPORT ON INVESTIGATION INTO GASPÉ-MATAPÉDIA SERVICE

On the orders of the day:

Mr. J. R. Keays (Gaspé): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Transport. This is the third time I have asked this question and I hope he has now had time to get a reply from the C.N.R. It concerns an inquiry which I requested into passenger service in the Bay of Chaleur.

Hon. J. W. Pickersgill (Minister of Transport): Mr. Speaker, I regret I have not yet had a reply.

EXTERNAL AFFAIRS

VIET NAM—INTERNATIONAL SUPERVISORY COMMISSION—DEATH OF MEMBER OF DELEGATION

On the orders of the day:

Mr. F. J. W. Fane (Vegreville): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Secretary of State for External Affairs having to do with the international commission in Viet Nam. I want to ask the minister whether recently a member of the Canadian delegation was killed in the performance of his duties. If he was, was he buried in Viet Nam; and with what flag was the casket draped at the burial?

Hon. Paul Martin (Secretary of State for External Affairs): Mr. Speaker, I will have to take that question as notice.

[Later:]

Mr. Martin (Essex East): The hon. member for Vegreville (Mr. Fane) asked me a question a few moments ago, which I took as notice. I had not fully understood whether his question had to do with an airplane accident in which one of our very able foreign service officers, Mr. Turner, was killed. Of course, that airplane in which he lost his life has not been found. With regard to deaths previous to that, the bodies of personnel serving Canada have been brought back to Canada.

Inquiries of the Ministry

[*Later:*]

Mr. R. N. Thompson (Red Deer): My question is supplementary to the question before the last one. How many Canadians were killed along with Mr. Turner in this carrying out of duties that Canada has as a member of the international control commission?

Mr. Martin (Essex East): Mr. Speaker, I think that before giving this information I should like to check the details.

[*Later:*]

Mr. Fane: I should like to address a supplementary question to the Secretary of State for External Affairs in order to obtain a further explanation. According to my understanding of his answer to the question I was asking him, the death was not that of a Mr. Turner but of another man who was killed by his jeep passing over a land mine two weeks ago. I was informed that the casket—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. The hon. member has asked his question. We have spent a fair amount of time on this particular question. If the minister has a further answer he may ask it, quickly.

Mr. Fane: I would ask my question, now. Was the casket at this funeral draped with the flag of the United States or with the Canadian flag and, if not by the Canadian flag, why not?

Mr. Speaker: Order. This question might be placed on the order paper.

VIET NAM—DELEGATION FROM VOICE OF WOMEN

On the orders of the day:

Mrs. Grace MacInnis (Vancouver-Kingsway): I should like to direct a question to the Secretary of State for External Affairs. Did the minister receive a delegation this morning from the Voice of Women to discuss Canada's role in the war in Viet Nam? If so, what progress was he able to report to them in regard to Canada's efforts to reconvene the Geneva conference?

Hon. Paul Martin (Secretary of State for External Affairs): I have not seen such a delegation. I understand that they will come, I think it is, next week.

Mrs. MacInnis (Vancouver-Kingsway): The news reported that it was today.

Mr. Martin (Essex East): Well, I have not seen them.

FISHERIES

SLAUGHTER OF SEALS—DISPOSAL OF CARCASSES

On the orders of the day:

Mr. P. B. Rynard (Simcoe East): Mr. Speaker, I should like to address a question to the Minister of Fisheries. In view of all the interest expressed about this matter today, I should like to know whether the carcasses, after they are skinned, are used commercially?

Hon. H. J. Robichaud (Minister of Fisheries): No, Mr. Speaker; in most cases they are not used commercially.

Mr. Lloyd R. Crouse (Queens-Lunenburg): A supplementary question. I listened carefully to the statement of the minister today and I know of the great interest in this matter; but in an effort to control the sealing industry would the minister give consideration to issuing licences to cover the quota in the gulf of 50,000 only to licensed inshore and deep sea fishermen? With this action he would, I believe, curtail the indiscriminate hunting of seals by people using aircraft and other means.

Mr. Robichaud: No, Mr. Speaker, it is not my intention to do this. I believe it would be pure discrimination and I do not think we could allow this in this country. I believe we have other ways of keeping full control without having to take such measures as suggested by the hon. member.

INQUIRY OF THE MINISTRY

On the orders of the day:

Mr. H. W. Herridge (Kootenay West): Mr. Speaker, I wish to address a question to the Postmaster General concerning a matter which could affect quite a large section of the civil service. Has the minister since taking office issued any regulations with respect to the length of hair male members of his staff are permitted to maintain while on duty, and particularly when in uniform?

ADMINISTRATION OF JUSTICE

STEVEN TRUSCOTT—RESPONSIBILITY FOR REVIEW

On the orders of the day:

Mr. Andrew Brewin (Greenwood): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Solicitor General and I think it is in order as it deals with the question of personal liberty, and is therefore urgent. Is the minister aware that

the Attorney General of Ontario has indicated that any review of the conviction and trial of Steven Truscott is, in his opinion, the responsibility of this the federal government, and can the minister undertake to expedite his study of the facts revealed in the trial of Steven Truscott, which have greatly disturbed a number of members of the house?

Hon. L. T. Pennell (Solicitor General): Mr. Speaker, I am aware of the remarks of the Attorney General only through a radio report. However, I can assure the hon. member for Greenwood that this matter is under active study at this moment and that I hope to be able to make a statement very shortly.

CAPITAL PUNISHMENT

REQUEST FOR INFORMATION ON DEBATING PROCEDURE

On the orders of the day:

Right Hon. J. G. Diefenbaker (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, I come back to a subject which I have raised on previous occasions. Quite a number of men are awaiting execution in various parts of Canada, and naturally the subject of the abolition of capital punishment is of very great importance not only to them but to all Canadians. Will the Prime Minister say now when it is expected to bring on this debate, because I think there should be as little delay as possible?

Right Hon. L. B. Pearson (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, I entirely agree that there should be as little delay as possible. I hope we will be able to get on with the consideration of this vitally important matter immediately after we complete the business before us; or, if not, then within the next day or two. There may be one or two small measures which have to be dealt with very quickly because of certain time limitations, but it is our intention to proceed with the matter mentioned by my right hon. friend immediately after them, and, of course, after the supply debate has been dealt with.

[*Translation*]

WINTER WORKS

RIVIÈRE-AU-TONNERRE—PAYMENT OF UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE BENEFITS

On the orders of the day:

Mr. Gustave Blouin (Saguenay): Mr. Speaker, may I put a question to the Minister of Labour?

[Mr. Brewin.]

I would ask the Minister of Labour whether he has received a telegram from the United Steelworkers of America, local 6797, Sept-Iles, asking him to make representations to the officials of the unemployment insurance commission, so that the workers engaged in the winter works of the municipality of Rivière-au-Tonnerre may get their unemployment insurance benefits without delay?

Mr. Speaker: Order. I do not think the hon. member can put such a question under the circumstances.

Mr. Blouin: Mr. Speaker, this is very important and very urgent.

Mr. Speaker: If the hon. member does not admit the correctness of the ruling of the Chair, he can always report the matter for further debate upon adjournment of the house.

Mr. Blouin: Ten o'clock tonight.

EXTENSION OF OPERATIVE PERIOD

On the orders of the day:

Mr. Raymond Langlois (Mégantic): Mr. Speaker, may I put a question to the Minister of Citizenship and Immigration in his capacity as future minister of manpower?

Following the telegrams sent to the minister by various municipalities throughout the country with respect to winter works this year, and since those works have been greatly delayed due to the weather, does the minister intend to announce shortly in the house his decision to extend the period for winter works?

Hon. Jean Marchand (Minister of Citizenship and Immigration): Mr. Speaker, I do not remember having stated that we would extend the period for winter works. We received a few telegrams, but the extension of this period is not being considered this year.

[*English*]

CANADIAN PACIFIC RAILWAY

MEETING WITH WESTERN MAYORS RESPECTING REDUCTION IN SERVICE

On the orders of the day:

Mr. J. E. Pascoe (Moose Jaw-Lake Centre): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Prime Minister. Some time ago in this house the Prime Minister agreed to a cabinet meeting with specific representatives from Calgary to Winnipeg regarding adequate passenger rail service on the Canadian Pacific. My question

is, has a definite date for this promised meeting been set?

Hon. J. W. Pickersgill (Minister of Transport): A definite date has not been set, because it was understood, as I think the hon. gentleman knows, or perhaps I should say that it was our understanding that the representatives of the municipalities, of the cities out west also wanted to appear before the parliamentary committee. I think there would be no difficulty about agreeing on a day or two days in succession when they could see a committee of the cabinet, and appear before the other committee as well. We want to make it as convenient as we possibly can for them.

Mr. Pascoe: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Has a request been received from these specific representatives to have the cabinet set the meeting date first, so that they could make arrangements for a meeting on that date?

Mr. Pickersgill: I am afraid I should have to inquire into that. I have been rather preoccupied for the last day or two.

Mr. H. A. Olson (Medicine Hat): I want to ask the Minister of Transport a question, Mr. Speaker. Is the minister suggesting or recommending that all of those who have petitioned and appealed the judgment handed down by the Board of Transport Commissioners should appear before the standing committee to argue, or present their viewpoint.

Mr. Pickersgill: No, sir, but I did understand from an inquiry made by the hon. member for Moose Jaw-Lake Centre (Mr. Pascoe) that the group, whose spokesman was the mayor of Moose Jaw, wanted to do both. I think it would be a convenience to them if we could arrange things so that that could be done on one single trip, particularly in view of the shortage of passenger service.

NATIONAL DEFENCE

R.C.A.F.—CURTAILMENT IN FLIGHTS OVER FRANCE

On the orders of the day:

Hon. Marcel Lambert (Edmonton West): I have a question for the Minister of National Defence. Can the minister advise the house whether there have been any curtailments of R.C.A.F. overflight privileges over France, utilizing Marville in its United Nations operations to North Africa or the Middle East?

Hon. Paul Hellyer (Minister of National Defence): Is my hon. friend suggesting recent curtailment?

Mr. Lambert: Yes.

Mr. Hellyer: Not to my knowledge, Mr. Speaker. I will have to take that question as notice. If there are any curtailments I will advise my hon. friend.

Mr. Lambert: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Would the minister ascertain whether there have been some rather odd delays of one day, which have thrown schedules out?

Mr. Hellyer: Yes, I will be glad to ascertain that, Mr. Speaker.

INDUSTRY

HEAVY WATER—REQUEST FOR STATEMENT ON SECOND PLANT

On the orders of the day:

Mr. John M. Reid (Kenora-Rainy River): My question is for the Minister of Mines and Technical Surveys. I would ask him if he is ready to comment on the negotiations between Atomic Energy of Canada Limited and Canadian Westinghouse.

Hon. Jean-Luc Pepin (Minister of Mines and Technical Surveys): Mr. Speaker, I wanted to have a chance—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. I suggest to the hon. member that it is not in order to ask whether a minister of the Crown is prepared to comment on a certain situation. Certainly that is not a proper question.

Mr. Reid: May I rephrase the question, Mr. Speaker. Yesterday as reported in *Hansard* the minister said that he would have to answer the question asked by the hon. member for Moose Mountain (Mr. Southam) concerning the state of negotiations between Atomic Energy of Canada Limited and Canadian Westinghouse. I would ask the minister if he could give us the information now.

Mr. Pepin: I think it would be fair for me to answer the hon. member for Moose Mountain, who asked me yesterday where the heavy water plant project of the Canadian General Electric Company would be located. Mr. Speaker, the 90 day survey period agreed upon between C.G.E. and Atomic Energy of Canada Limited will end on Friday next, March 18. We shall have to wait until that date to get a decision.

Inquiries of the Ministry

CANADIAN ECONOMY

STEPS TO MEET INCREASE IN COST OF LIVING

On the orders of the day:

Mr. A. D. Alkenbrack (Prince Edward-Lennox): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Prime Minister. Due to the continuing rise in the cost of living, will the government not act and legislate forthwith, to allay the burden of these high costs upon Canadians of meagre and limited means?

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Right Hon. L. B. Pearson (Prime Minister): My hon. friend should wait for the budget and the financial legislation which will be embodied in it.

OLD AGE ASSISTANCE

REQUEST FOR STATEMENT ON INCREASED PAYMENTS

On the orders of the day:

Mr. Eric A. Winkler (Grey-Bruce): A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. I would ask the Prime Minister if there are any further statements he might make in regard to the possibility of the increase in the old age security payments.

Right Hon. L. B. Pearson (Prime Minister): Not at the moment, Mr. Speaker.

PUBLIC SERVICE

INTERDEPARTMENTAL COMMITTEE ON BILINGUALISM—REQUEST FOR STATEMENT

On the orders of the day:

Mr. R. W. Prittie (Burnaby-Richmond): Mr. Speaker, yesterday I asked the Prime Minister a question about the forthcoming announcement concerning bilingualism in the Civil Service. I do not think he fully understood my question. One part of my question was this: Has the government's committee on this subject received a report from the Royal Commission on Bilingualism and Biculturalism, because I know that they have been making a considerable study of that subject.

Right Hon. L. B. Pearson (Prime Minister): When the interdepartmental committee was considering the matter, I understood they had talks with employees representatives of the Bilingualism and Biculturalism Commission, who were concerned also with this matter. They had an exchange of views at this time, and that was of assistance to the interdepartmental committee, and the report.

[Mr. Pepin.]

GRAIN

REQUEST FOR STATEMENT ON PRODUCTION OBJECTIVES

On the orders of the day:

Mr. E. Nasserden (Rosthern): I have a question for the Minister of Agriculture. I wonder if he would some time in the very near future, prior to the beginning of seeding, make a statement that would indicate objectives for grain producers in western Canada.

Hon. J. J. Greene (Minister of Agriculture): Mr. Speaker, I will be pleased to take this question as notice. I am not sure whether it comes under my department, or under that of the Minister of Finance in his capacity of being in charge of the Wheat Board. I shall be glad to take it into consideration, and to give the hon. member an answer shortly.

PRIVILEGE

MR. COWAN—OBSERVATIONS IN DEBATE BY HON. MEMBER FOR KOOTENAY EAST—TRUSCOTT CASE

Mr. Ralph Cowan (York-Humber): I rise on a question of privilege in which I know I am associated with a number of hon. members of this house—and as the facts are outlined I am sure I will be associated with the majority of hon. members of this house. This is the first appropriate opportunity which has presented itself since last Thursday night for me to rise on this question of privilege.

Last Friday afternoon during a day-long discussion of a certain matter, one of the members of this house made a reference to the judiciary and spoke in these terms:

> —it was the establishment again coming up with some idea of how to get out of this mess and how they could, by suggesting a judicial inquiry, shove it off on to some unbeknown judge who would work on their behalf.

At this point the Minister of Labour rose in his place, quite properly, to state:

> On a question of privilege, the hon. member suggested that a member of the judiciary of this country would be made a tool of this government. By doing so he reflects on the government and on our judiciary.

I am not supposed to refer to the action of the Speaker, but Your Honour then stated:

> Order, please. In general terms, the hon. member knows no comment should be made which reflects on the judiciary.

I rise at this time to state publicly that I dissociate myself 100 per cent—and I believe I am speaking for many members of this

house—from the remarks made in this chamber last Thursday night during what is known as the late show by the hon. member for Kootenay East.

There were only seven members of parliament in the house at the time, one of whom was in the Chair. In discussing this Truscott case the hon. member for Kootenay East went so far as to say this about the conduct of the case:

> I ask hon. members is this not a grotesque display of our much vaunted British justice? Even if the child were guilty as charged, and I have very serious doubts that he is,.. There are many serious minded persons... who share my view. Among them is Hon. George Wardrop...he expressed grave doubts of Steven Truscott's guilt... the cards were stacked against this boy... The defence evidence was glossed over in the charge to the jury by the trial judge.
>
> Defence evidence which would have proven conclusively that Steven had left the little girl far from the scene of the murder, and a perfect alibi, was disallowed. Mr. Speaker, I personally am so convinced of this boy's innocence that I am prepared, if necessary, to stake my seat in the House of Commons—

Brave words.

The hon. member had been listening to a previous discussion here:

> —on the outcome of an inquiry, or a royal commission, that would examine all the circumstances of the conduct of all the persons involved—including the roles of the judge, the prosecutor, the police officers, the three Crown doctors, and all other persons who took part in the proceedings.

Mr. Speaker, this case was tried before Mr. Justice R. I. Ferguson, a member of the Trial Division of the Supreme Court of Ontario. The conviction was appealed and the appeal was heard by five members of the Supreme Court of Ontario—Hon. Dana Porter, Chief Justice of the Court of Appeal; Hon. Mr. Justice Gibson, Hon. Mr. Justice Schroeder, Hon. Mr. Justice Lebel and Hon. Mr. Justice Morden, now deceased.

I wish to dissociate myself publicly from such remarks against the judiciary and, if I may be allowed to do so, I wish to compliment Your Honour on your ruling on Friday afternoon.

Mr. Byrne: Mr. Speaker—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. I can understand the desire of the hon. member for Kootenay East to reply to the comment made by the hon. member who has just resumed his seat. But before he can do so, a ruling has to be made by the Chair on the question of privilege. As hon. members know, the Chair has to decide whether there is a prima facie case of privilege. I rule there is no prima facie case of privilege and therefore there can be no further discussion of the matter.

Mr. Byrne: On a point of order, the hon. member has raised a question of privilege which he says affects all members of the house. Then he read the statement which I made. I said I was prepared to stake my seat on the outcome of an inquiry. If the hon. member wishes to lay a charge against me, let him do the same.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh.

Mr. Starr: The usual Liberal defence.

AIR TRANSPORT

REQUEST FOR STATEMENT OF GOVERNMENT POLICY

On the orders of the day:

Mr. Stanley Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Mr. Speaker, may I direct a question to the Prime Minister? In view of the announced intention of the Canadian Pacific to discontinue a few more of its railway passenger runs, will the government make a statement to the house at an early date as to its intentions regarding further air routes that are being competed for in this country?

Right Hon. L. B. Pearson (Prime Minister): This is a matter which we are considering, and if a statement can be made we shall be glad to make one.

BANK ACT AND QUEBEC SAVINGS BANKS ACT

EXTENSION OF CHARTERS TO DECEMBER 1, 1966

The house resumed from Thursday, March 10, consideration of the motion of Mr. Sharp for the second reading of Bill No. C-3, to amend the Bank Act and the Quebec Savings Banks Act.

Mr. Lambert: Has the Minister of Finance finished?

Mr. Speaker: Order. Before the hon. member for Edmonton West begins perhaps we might wait a few moments for order to be restored. Order. We are trying to restore order in the chamber so that the hon. member can make his speech.

Hon. Marcel Lambert (Edmonton West): Just before you called for order, Mr. Speaker, I asked the minister whether he had finished his remarks. I had forgotten that somewhat

strenuous exercise in extension of comments in which the minister indulged last Thursday when he proceeded to talk out his own bill until six o'clock. Be that as it may, the minister did make reference to certain studies which the government was making of this legislation at the present time. I intend to refer to this a little later. First, I should like to hark back briefly to some remarks made by the minister's predecessor in office on June 14 last when we were considering a similar bill at the resolution stage.

• (5:30 p.m.)

The minister at that time could not follow a suggestion I had made that the bill should be extended to June 30, 1966 rather than December 31, because he did not feel that following the announced summer recess we would have time to hear the public representations, make the appropriate deliberations and guarantee that the bill would be through this house and the other place. There was a procedural difficulty. However, I wondered how sanguine the Minister of Finance was really being at the time and whether he was not speaking with his tongue in his cheek. Obviously he had made up his mind he wanted an election in the fall and he knew then that if there were to be an election in the fall there would be no question of the house considering the bill which was before us then in time for the expiry date of December 31. However, I think events have been fortuitous in that in the interval there has occurred an event which has given the government an opportunity to review the amendments it had proposed to the Bank Act.

Criticism had been made to the original version of Bill C-102 that there was insufficient control over certain trust companies and near banks which are involved in our financial system and, of course, the Atlantic Acceptance Corporation debacle with all its consequences certainly demonstrated that. Certainly in the end result Canada and its financial organization will be the better for the fact that the Bank Act had not been considered and passed prior to these events.

The minister did indicate the other day and also at the Canadian Club on January 23 that the government was considering many changes with regard to the Bank Act. The minister was a member of the ministry which last year put forward a certain Bank Act bill. Presumably he agreed with the amendments at that time, but now he has had an opportunity for further thought and has made other proposals. May I hope, in all earnestness, that these will be in those areas which will be of the greatest benefit and that we will not have some of the difficulties that were pointed out in the last version of the bill. In any event I do not anticipate that we will receive the new Bank Act before the budget; I do not think one can expect it. Therefore we are waiting with anticipation not only for the budget, but for the changes in the Bank Act. Frankly I am a little dubious about the date of December 1, 1966. A great deal of water has to flow under the bridge before the amendments will receive the appropriate consideration in this place and in the other place, taking into account the public representations which have to be made. However, I can assure the minister, on behalf of myself and my colleagues who are members of the Finance, Trade and Economic Affairs Committee, that we intend to give the bill the most careful scrutiny in the committee, and the earlier the government can bring it forward the better off I think the whole business community will be. I urge upon hon. members of this house the early passage of this bill.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Maurice Allard (Sherbrooke): Mr. Speaker, last Thursday, March 10, the Minister of Finance (Mr. Sharp) in his brief speech mentioned the amendments and reforms which the government will soon bring to the Bank Act.

As reported at page 2498 of *Hansard*, the Minister stated:

> —there will be some desire to know what progress the government is making on this very important legislation namely, the substantive amendments that I hope to bring forward in due course in the next few weeks.

And several comments followed.

Since the Chair allowed the minister to open the way to eventual reforms, I take the liberty today to suggest some reforms that might be contemplated in the present economic situation.

First of all, Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact that the Bank of Canada increased its discount rate to 5¼ per cent, it is more necessary than ever to remove the 6 per cent interest rate ceiling imposed on chartered banks.

Besides, that suggestion is based on comments and serious studies made in that regard. I would like to quote, among others, the

comments made in the Porter report. Here they are:

> The 6 per cent interest rate ceiling introduces undesirable rigidity in the financial system and hampers and distorts the working of markets. It also has arbitrary effects on the institutions' competition for business and on their ability to serve the community well which were not contemplated when the ceiling was originally introduced and subsequently amended.
>
> We recommend that it be removed regardless of other changes in the legislation. The ceiling stands in the way of flexible lending by the banks in that it frequently prevents them from making loans on which higher rates must be charged to cover administrative costs and risks. Obviously, this is to the banks disadvantage; more importantly, however, it discriminates against borrowers such as small businesses which, if they are to obtain funds at all, must turn to other lenders which charge rates well above those the banks would ask if free to do so.

• (5:40 p.m.)

Moreover, Mr. Speaker, that suggestion to abolish the 6 per cent ceiling imposed on chartered banks was also made in another report, that is the second annual report of the Economic Council of Canada, whose conclusions and recommendations should be taken into account because those studies were made by experts in those various fields with regard to the development of our country and its economic growth.

I feel that those serious and detailed studies must not be disregarded.

As a matter of fact, the second annual report of the Economic Council of Canada made the same recommendation to enable the individual who needs money to borrow it as cheaply as possible from his bank, something which will not be possible in a number of cases unless the 6 per cent ceiling is abolished.

We know that chartered banks get a lower revenue than that on the short and medium term capital market. That market is slightly over 6½ per cent. That ceiling must be abolished also, as pointed out in the reports I mentioned a little earlier, to allow more competition between the banks and the loan companies.

Everyone knows how the personal loans companies operate and what rate they can charge the consumer.

If the 6 per cent ceiling were abolished, it would enable the banks to get a better rate, since the rate of the Bank of Canada was increased to 5¼ per cent. As a matter of fact, it would enable the chartered banks to put up a better fight and, in the end, it would benefit the consumer, the middle class and middle income Canadian.

One knows that when the worker, the farmer, the white collar worker, the store clerk is in financial difficulties, he is forced most of the time to borrow from finance companies at rates which are excessive and even abusive as far as he is concerned. If our chartered banks could loan money at an interest rate of 6½ to 7 per cent, it would be to the advantage of the consumers.

I feel that, in addition to contemplating a reform, the government should, in its new bill, consider also the possibility of amending the Small Loans Act and the Interest Act, precisely to prevent abuse. The interest rate should be set at a maximum of 12 per cent, in order to allow for a better balanced competition between the banks and the small loans companies and also to allow the small loans companies to lend money up to $5,000 at a very reasonable rate.

In fact, I put two bills in the order paper for the benefit of the average-income Canadian.

There is no doubt that the removal of the 6 per cent ceiling will contribute to the development of our economy and lessen the effects of the American decision.

For some weeks, we have directed many questions to the Minister of Finance concerning the implications of the American decision on our economy and our financial situation. Again yesterday, the minister told us that the question was under consideration.

Mr. Speaker, many Canadians are concerned about the implications of this American decision which will necessarily take away from Canada some of the capital it needs to develop its economy and its natural resources.

The province of Quebec is especially alarmed at the implications of this American decision.

Consequently, if we allowed our Canadian banks to lend more and use the money we have in Canada, this would help to lessen the prejudicial effects of the American decision to reduce American investments in Canada.

I also ask the minister to take into consideration in his plans of reform, the possibility to enable provincial governments to hold a number of shares in chartered banks.

Mr. Speaker, it is understood that banking operations are under the jurisdiction of Ottawa but the monetary and financial policies are not foreign to the economic policies of the provinces which would like to have their

say in the direction of financial policies with consequential effects on economic policies coming under their jurisdiction.

Mr. Speaker, we should not be afraid of the provinces, even if such a concern has already been expressed in statements made here and elsewhere. I feel we should not be afraid of the Canadian provinces.

In fact, if we look back, if we refer to past relations between the central government and the provinces, we notice that the provinces of Quebec and British Columbia have expressed themselves openly through their prime ministers.

But I want to speak more especially about the wishes of the province of Quebec where I live. Quebec wants to invest in chartered banks for two reasons: to be able to purchase a number of shares which would enable it to have representatives in the boards of directors where the financial policies of the country are developed, and this precisely because Quebec is experiencing an upsurge of its economy.

Quebec is also conscious of the fact that, in order to be able to do any long term planning, to guide the development of its economy, it must have a say in the institutions which determine our financial policy and control our monetary policy.

Another reason for Quebec to want to buy a number of shares in the chartered banks is because French Canadians would be allowed more openly and obviously to sit on the boards of the chartered banks, so they may be provided with the opportunity to play a part in this sector which is just as important and prominent as our Canadian economy, in Quebec as well as in the whole country.

I should like also to point out to the minister that it might be appropriate to let it decide on the approach, either by invitation or some amendment, to the Bank Act.

However, if my memory serves me right, there is nothing in the constitution of the Bank of Canada which prohibits loans to provinces, municipalities and school boards.

In fact, I believe that, at the beginning, the Bank of Canada did that on several occasions, until 1936, but since then it has not granted any loan to a provincial government, a school board or a municipal corporation.

[Mr. Allard.]

Our provincial and municipal governments and our school boards have been forced sometimes to go and borrow from other sources, and often from foreign markets. And we know that by doing so, they are subjected to the often unilateral variations and decisions of other countries, which interferes with the long-term planning of our provincial governments.

The Bank of Canada is a Canadian institution which should serve usefully our Canadian people; it could play a wonderful part in considering the feasibility of lending funds to our provincial and municipal governments and school boards, at very reasonable rates; this would allow it to play a direct role in the development of various administrative sectors of our country.

Mention was made, of course, in some places and mainly in the Porter report, of the advisability for the near-banks to come under the Bank Act.

In that respect, Mr. Speaker, I think that we should wait for the report of the commission set up a few months ago in Quebec especially to consider this particular problem. In fact, the Quebec government expects to receive this report toward the end of 1966.

I feel that it would be premature for the minister to introduce within the next month or two his proposed reforms to the Bank Act. By so doing, he would, in a fashion, be dealing categorically and inappropriately with the problem of all near-banks, with a view to establishing if they fit in and where, and their relationship with regard to other banks.

I humbly submit these few suggestions to the hon. minister, without dwelling on the matter too long.

However, there is no doubt that this act and the reforms the minister proposes to bring to the Bank Act, as well as the invitation he will probably extend to the Bank of Canada, will enable us to strengthen the Canadian people's confidence in our financial institutions.

There is, at the present time, some concern in industrial and business circles, especially with regard to certain decisions made by the government in Washington with regard, naturally, to foreign investments. There is some concern even with regard to launching major development projects in our country. It rests therefore with the hon. minister, as well as the acts and reforms he will present, to bolster the trust the Canadian people have in our financial institutions.

• (5:50 p.m.)

[*English*]

Mr. Colin Cameron (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands): Mr. Speaker, this bill is a rather slender peg on which to hang a speech, although I must commend the minister for the heavy garment of words he was able to hang on it last Thursday. It is, of course, a necessary piece of legislation at this time because we have to extend again the life of the bank charters. The revision of the Bank Act is now more than two years overdue and I trust that we shall soon be able to get to the work of revising that Act. This matter is of course not nearly so colourful as some of the matters we have been discussing of late. In fact, the thin attendance in the house is a rather interesting commentary on the order of priorities that members of parliament give to the business conducted in this house.

This bill is in a way a preliminary to the introduction of the new Bank Act. I hope the minister will be able to place his version of the revised Bank Act in our hands fairly soon so that long before the expiry of the time set forth in this bill we shall be fully seized of the ideas he wishes to advance for the revision of the Bank Act.

There has perhaps been some excuse in the past for delay in this respect. The delay was occasioned originally by our waiting for the Porter Commission report to be filed. That report has now been in the hands of the government for some time. It is to be hoped that the minister has made his decisions with regard to some of the recommendations in that report and that before long we shall be able to proceed with the work of revising the Bank Act and the Quebec Savings Banks Act as is provided by law in this country. I think that is about all that needs to be said at the present time. I hope this bill goes through quickly and that before very long we shall have on the Order Paper the bill to amend the Bank Act and that the bill will be in our hands.

Mr. Bert Leboe (Cariboo): Mr. Speaker, in a very few words I should like to state it is regrettable that as of this date we have not dealt with the amendments that are necessary in connection with bank operations. The fact is that due to the long drawn-out flag debate, another federal election and one or two other things we find ourselves in the position where we now have to extend the life of the banks' charters until late this year.

In our view the Porter Commission report recommends some very desirable changes. We believe, for instance, that it is essential that some means be found whereby the banks of this country will be able to take security on certain fixed and capital assets. There will be a great deal of interest in the changes to the Bank Act. I believe there will be more interest in this regard than there has been for a long time due to the fact that we have had bank mergers of late and there are before us applications for new banks to be created in western Canada. This means, of course, that the committee will have a great deal of work to do. I hope we can get at this work at a very early date in order to make certain that all interested parties are given a chance to appear before the committee and state their views.

The members of this committee will be able to examine in great detail the banking system in this country not only as it affects Canada as a nation but also the influences that our bank legislation has so far as other countries are concerned and in regard to the over-all banking system of the world. With those few words, Mr. Speaker, may I say that we hope real action will be forthcoming very soon to make sure that we finish our consideration of the Bank Act before the charters have to be extended once more.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Is the house ready for the question?

Some hon. Members: Question.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order. In accordance with standing order 37 (3) I must advise the house that if the Minister of Finance (Mr. Sharp) speaks now he will close the debate. The Minister of Finance.

Hon. Mitchell Sharp (Minister of Finance): Mr. Speaker, I rise only to thank the members of the house for their willingness to proceed so rapidly with the approval of this bill in spite of the length of the introductory speech made by the minister. I can assure all hon. members that it is the intention of the government to bring forward the substantive amendments to the Bank Act and to the other financial legislation as soon as possible.

Motion agreed to, bill read the second time, considered in committee, reported, read the third time and passed.

PROCEEDINGS ON ADJOURNMENT MOTION

SUBJECT MATTER OF QUESTIONS TO BE DEBATED UNDER ADJOURNMENT MOTION

Mr. Deputy Speaker: It is my duty, pursuant to provisional standing order 39A, to

inform the house that the questions to be raised at the time of adjournment tonight are as follows: The hon. member for Kootenay West (Mr. Herridge), Power—Columbia River—safety of High Arrow dam: the hon. member for Saguenay (Mr. Blouin), Winter Works—Rivière-au-Tonnerre—payment of unemployment insurance benefits.

It being six o'clock the house will now proceed to the consideration of private members' business as listed on today's order paper, namely private bills and public bills.

• (6:00 p.m.)

PRIVATE BILLS

EVANGELISTIC TABERNACLE INCORPORATED

The house in committee on Bill No. S-7, to incorporate Evangelistic Tabernacle Incorporated—Mr. Stefanson—Mr. Batten in the Chair.

On clause 1—*Incorporation.*

Mr. Howard: Before clause 1 carries, Mr. Chairman, perhaps the sponsor of the bill will recall that on second reading we expressed the thought, directed at this bill but also applicable to other bills of the same class, that there should be some other means of having groups and organizations such as this incorporated. They should not be subjected to the process of petitioning parliament and going through the mechanics of moving the bill through the Senate and House of Commons just as would be done in the case of an extensive public bill introduced by the government. I wonder whether this matter was raised in the committee and whether the sponsors of the bill, who undoubtedly knew of the debate we had on second reading, expressed any opinion one way or the other as to which would be the more desirable procedure? Were they satisfied with the manner in which this bill was dealt with?

I do not know what took place at the committee meeting. If we could have some indication of the attitude of the sponsors on this question it might help us look at the rest of the bill in a light other than that in which we may have to consider it if their attitude is not known. Does the hon. member who is sponsoring the bill know if any opinion was expressed on that particular aspect?

Mr. Stefanson: Mr. Chairman, when the bill was before the Miscellaneous Private Bills Committee there was a question directed by the hon. member for Ottawa East as follows:

> I wonder whether you could instruct us as to the reason why all these bills come before this committee? Is there no provision within the Committee's Act or Provincial Act to do the same—

The parliamentary agent for the group answered as follows:

> There is provision in the Provincial Act, but there is no provision which could give religious powers under the Secretary of State, and the Canadian Corporation's Act. The main purpose is, as you will appreciate, Mr. Richard, the necessity as a limited company and the limited liabilities. The ability to hold land, without having, this is throughout the country, as opposed to having a provincial charter and having to get extra provincial licences to carry on a term of business, or a licence to hold land, which is expensive and would be ten times the expense for a group of this sort.

This was the explanation given to the committee by the parliamentary agent for the particular group.

Mr. Howard: If the situation is as related by the hon. member it seems somewhat regrettable that this state of affairs has to be allowed to continue. In the past the house has treated such matters rather casually and looked upon the duty which devolves upon us of dealing with private bills as being an inheritance of our British parliamentary system. I am sure that most members of the house, if they were asked to answer the question in a yes or no fashion, would say they do not believe it is the business of the House of Commons of Canada to spend its time dealing with the incorporation of organizations such as the Evangelistic Tabernacle. I am quite sure the great bulk of members would answer in the negative. They would say that in this day and age it should not be one of the functions of parliament but that parliament should be concerned with the public business in the broadest possible connotation of that term. Parliament should be enacting statute law relating to the general public and not enacting laws which relate to a group of private individuals.

I do not know anything about the Evangelistic Tabernacle which is being incorporated. I do not know anything about the sponsors of this bill or what the organization has been doing in the past. I really do not believe that should be my concern because I do not believe this bill should be here in the first instance. I am quite sure we could bring about a change in the general law, if parliament so desired, through a rather tortuous process. You may well remember, Mr.

Chairman, that this purpose was accomplished a few years ago with regard to other private bills which no longer come to this chamber. However, it was a very awkward way of doing things. I am quite sure the same sort of approach could be used, if we desired to do so, to accomplish the same purpose, namely, to get bills such as this out of our hair so that we could spend this hour dealing with public business, motions or public bills introduced by private members.

• (6:10 p.m.)

I am neither in favour of the bill nor opposed to it. Within the framework of the attitude I have that we should be spending our time on public business, it is immaterial to me whether or not this bill is passed. If there were some general authorization given within a public act which would permit groups such as this to become incorporated by somewhat the same mechanism as private companies become incorporated, namely, under the Companies Act, then no one in this house would be concerned one way or the other about whether or not this organization became incorporated because that would be the desire and the decision of a private group of people. Parliament does not care or concern itself with whether or not Company X becomes incorporated under the Companies Act so as to carry out certain objectives. Presumably companies are incorporated every day under the general law in order to conduct their business. We look upon that as private business, not public business, and I think we should look upon this bill in the same light.

We cannot be so callous, of course, as to say that we do not care whether or not this organization is incorporated, because the bill is before us. Even though we may not agree with the procedure through which the bill passes in coming here and with the procedure which forces the group of people named in clause 1 to come to parliament in this fashion, nevertheless the procedure exists and parliament has undertaken this responsibility.

Whether or not we care if the Evangelistic Tabernacle is incorporated, as individuals we still have to decide yes or no. That is one of the reasons I am now on my feet and why I was earlier on second reading. I want to put forward the general proposition that this bill should not come before the house. I want to put forward the prospect of a group of members of parliament at some future time, which may not be too far away if the general law is not changed, saying to themselves that they should not have the responsibility of dealing with the private affairs of people in this particular fashion. I want to put forward the proposition that a group of members of parliament might in effect get their backs up and refuse to pass such bills. I would not want to see that happen but it could happen. A similar thing occurred before with another class of bill which does not now come before us.

I seriously urge upon the government and upon any member who sponsors a private bill the thought that parliament desires to pass a public law to permit private individuals, such as those named in clause 1 of this bill, to apply to some public body for incorporation under the general law of Canada instead of exposing their private dealings to view and subjecting themselves to harassment and appearance before committees in Ottawa. They should not be subjected to the whims of a committee or be subject to other overriding business of parliament. We should not have to put people such as those named in clause 1 to this rather costly process in order that they may carry on their private business.

The public law should be stringent enough that the public good is preserved, but I urge upon the government and upon any member sponsoring a private bill that they start serious discussions in government circles to see whether or not such a public law can be drafted. Otherwise we are likely to sit through private members' hours between six and seven, so long as they last, expressing the same sort of views and general objections about the passage of bills such as this when we know very well a much better method can be found at much less cost and harassment of the individuals concerned, a method which will give parliament that most needed extra time to deal with the public business of the country.

I do not care one way or the other whether this group is incorporated, but I do say they have the right to become incorporated under public law in a different manner. If that right exists for them, then subject to the bounds of whatever law exists for the public good, God bless them. Let them become incorporated in that manner. But there is no public law of parliament and has not been for some time which enables one to assess this particular bill from the point of view of the public good. Parliament is asked to be a watchdog not over this bill alone but over all bills of the

same class. Parliament is asked not to concern itself with whether these individuals have the right to become incorporated as Evangelistic Tabernacle Incorporated but parliament must concern itself with whether, if they do become incorporated, their subsequent actions will be for the public good and whether the public good will be best served thereby. I say we are not competent to make this decision because we are in the position of picking and choosing what is for the public good.

The sponsor of the bill may have one concept of what is for the public good so far as this particular group is concerned. Another member may have another concept as to how the public good can best be served by the incorporation of this group. But I do not think parliament can afford to go through the same general debate about whether or not the public good will be served each time a bill such as this comes before us. The public law should be invoked in the first instance, and once we establish the criterion of what is for the public good so far as such groups are concerned we must make it clear to all that the public good will be protected.

I do not intend to say any more about this particular aspect at this stage. I do not look forward to the prospect of having to make these same comments on each and every private bill that comes before us. Even though there are no cabinet ministers in the house at the moment, I hope we will have a declaration on this matter from a member of the government. I am sorry; I did not see the Solicitor General (Mr. Pennell) who is not in his seat. I apologize for my oversight. But I am sure that other members would like, as would I, in the not too distant future a declaration by the government that it intends to draft a public law which will establish criteria as to how the public good would be best served and which would permit of some machinery whereby a group such as Evangelistic Tabernacle Incorporated and others in the same class can be incorporated without going through the present procedure. Now they go to the Senate with their bills, because it happens to be cheaper over there. These bills have to pass through all readings and the committee proceedings there. Then they come over to this house and have to pass through three readings and the committee stage, with all the difficulties attached thereto.

[Mr. Howard.]

• (6:20 p.m.)

I am sure the Solicitor General is not in a position right now to make a declaration of government policy in this regard but I should like him to take this question to the cabinet. I realize the cabinet has many other things to deal with but one of its responsibilities is to promote public law and to introduce into the house bills reflecting this policy. I think that government policy in the general field I have discussed should be the same with respect to companies incorporated for the carrying on of private business.

Some time in the future I hope that cabinet will come to grips with this matter so that we may have a declaration along the lines I have suggested and so that we do not have to go through the same tortuous process every time private members' hour comes on.

The Chairman: Order, please. When the hon. member for Skeena began his remarks I had hoped they would be a little shorter than they have been. I would draw to his attention that the house has already accepted the principle of this bill on second reading. I think there is a distinct difference between discussing the method of passing legislation and one particular piece of legislation. The remarks that the hon. member has just made might more properly have been made at another stage of the bill or on some other question having to do with general legislation. I would hope that the hon. member would not continue his remarks in this vein.

Mr. Howard: Mr. Chairman, I could not agree with you more. There is no question but that within the strict application of the rules I was out of order. I saw you were not seeking to interrupt me, so I proceeded. Perhaps I took advantage of your kindness, but that was not my intention.

I wanted to get across for the second time what I think is a much better way of dealing with this and similar bills. My transgression of the rules was not designed to embarrass anybody or to flaunt the rules. I think that we could proceed in a much better fashion than we are.

The Chairman: Shall clause 1 carry?

Mr. Peters: Mr. Chairman, I do not intend to repeat what the hon. member for Skeena has said but I presume it will have to be repeated many times before a change is made in the format of these bills. This bill has been before a committee. Those who were not on the committee would be well advised to take

a look at the minutes of proceedings of the Miscellaneous Private Bills Committee. They will be struck by the fact that the only questions asked appeared to be put for the reason of getting the names of those asking the questions on the record. There does not seem to be much justification otherwise for the report.

When this bill was up for second reading the same kind of questions were asked about the government's intention with regard to doing something about the format and method of introducing such bills. I had hoped that this matter would be discussed in the committee. I find that it was not. I think that the chairman is lacking in this regard in his chairmanship of the committee because I think that in this case the relationship between the individual and the public at large is not necessarily being protected. I believe the evidence will bear this out. The hon. member for Ottawa East (Mr. Richard) drew certain things to the attention of the committee and the representative of the organization and he asked a question which I shall read. I quote from page 8 of the proceedings of the Standing Committee on Miscellaneous Private Bills for Tuesday, March 8, 1966:

Mr. Richard: Mr. Belfoi, I wonder if you could instruct us as to the reason why all these bills come before this Committee. Is there no provision within the Committee's Act or provincial Act to do the same—

The Chairman: Order, please. The hon. member is now discussing something which is not contained in the bill itself, although I recognize that the bill itself is contained in the general observations he is making. I think it might be better if the hon. member were to confine his remarks to the bill in general, since we are on clause 1, and not discuss the method of handling this particular piece of legislation.

Mr. Peters: Mr. Chairman, I only referred to the committee report. I would assume that reference to the committee report covering the discussions that took place in the standing committee would be in order. Otherwise Your Honour would probably have a responsibility to draw to the attention of the house the fact that the chairman of this committee did not carry out the duties we gave him in referring this bill to the attention of that committee.

The problems that we are concerned with in this bill are fairly general. You will notice from the report that in six lines all sections of the bill were moved and carried without any discussion at all. The discussion came before the sections of the bill itself were introduced.

In the committee questions were asked why this matter should come before parliament. I think this is where the problem in regard to this particular bill might lie. We are certainly not opposed to the Evangelistic Tabernacle or to their parliamentary agent, Mr. Belfoi, making a presentation to the federal parliament for incorporation of the Tabernacle. I think it is the natural thing to do. But the question I want to ask is, why should they come to the federal parliament? Why should they ask for a present form—

The Chairman: Order, please. I must advise the hon. member that he is still out of order. He is talking about something not contained in clause 1 of this bill. He is making references to the method by which such legislation is handled by parliament and why it is handled in that way. That is a separate question altogether from what is before us now, which is clause 1 of the bill, the principle of the bill having already been approved.

Mr. Peters: We shall accept your ruling, of course, Mr. Chairman. However, I contend that on clause 1 of a bill it is usual to have a general discussion. Unless we have new rules, there can be a general discussion on the bill.

My point is that parliament is being asked to incorporate the Evangelistic Tabernacle which is coming here because of the requirements of federal legislation contained in the Companies Act, a federal statute. The Tabernacle seeks to be incorporated and to do a number of things set out in this bill. The objects of the corporation include such things as promoting, maintaining, superintending and carrying on, in accordance with the Christian faith, certain things. A number of things are outlined that it seeks to do.

• (6:30 p.m.)

My purpose in discussing the general terms of the bill on clause 1, and I am surprised that the parliamentary agent was not asked this question, is to ask why the bill is in this form. I believe we can reasonably ask why an organization of this kind should require all the things outlined in detail in the bill such as the power to hold property, lend money, borrow money, establish and administer trusts and so on. With these powers one could effectively operate a corporation of almost any stature.

On reading the report of the committee I find that the general purpose for which this measure is required, as set out by parliament counsel, is to ensure that a religious organization which is unincorporated at the present time may get together and have an incorporated body to carry on religious organization and to get affiliation and other religious provinces to associate with it. What parliamentary counsel appears to be saying is that these people have one branch of a small church in the city of Winnipeg. Since 1956 they have had affiliated with them other small groups in Saskatchewan, one in Vancouver, one in the Okanagan Valley and one in Kenora, Ontario.

It is true that this makes it an interprovincial matter. It was pointed out that in every case except one, that is, in the province of Saskatchewan, there were no buildings owned by the applicants. There was some land held in Saskatchewan and apparently they owned their hall there. It therefore seems to me that a religious organization of this kind should be able to apply for incorporation without assuming by reason of this action all the liabilities, responsibilities and obligations, financial and otherwise, which we are providing in the present measure. These things were not asked for and it seems to me they are unnecessary.

I am surprised that the members of the committee were apparently unconcerned about the type of format we are using in the present bill, one which contains 18 clauses including some very onerous and complicated ones. In many cases the sponsors of the bill have not indicated that these powers are necessary and their parliamentary counsel has not done so either. The point I am making is that this is not the type of format which should be provided. It is archaic—

The Chairman: Order. I am sure the hon. member realizes he is ranging beyond the terms of clause 1, the general clause of the bill. The question of the format of this particular type of bill or whether the bill has come before the house under the Companies Act is something which may have to be discussed when the house is engaged on some other business. At the moment this particular bill is before us and I think the hon. member should confine his remarks to a general discussion of the measure as is usually done. Remarks as to the method by which this bill comes into the chamber or by which the legislation is carried out are out of order at this stage.

[Mr. Peters.]

Mr. Peters: On the point of order, I would call attention to clause 1 of the bill where the following phrase appears—

> —for the purposes set out in this Act and, in particular, for the purpose of administering the property, business and other temporal affairs of the Corporation.

This is why the present bill is before us. This is what is being sought. This is what we are discussing under clause 1. My contention is that what we are providing for these people is much more than they are actually seeking and much more than is necessary. I do not see why clause 1 needs to be worded in its present manner. It is clear from the report of the committee that when this question was discussed parliamentary counsel indicated that the Evangelistic Tabernacle was seeking an act which would allow particularly Raymond Lee Bradley, who is a clergyman and the main petitioner, to establish an alliance with several other churches of like denomination and with persons similarly inclined in the province of Manitoba and to allow them to incorporate this religious body in other provinces. I believe this is all that was asked for. Yet because we presumably do not have any other format we have this long and detailed document in terms sufficient, I suggest, to establish the Bank of Canada, finance companies or anything else one might think of.

For these reasons I am of the opinion that this measure should be returned to the committee. I believe the committee should hear this application again, discuss the matter, and refer it back to the Senate in order that a modernization of the format can be brought about and a change made. If it is in order to do so on clause 1, I would move reference back to the committee for such a study.

Mr. Nasserden: I have one question I should like to ask on the motion which has been made by the hon. member for Timiskaming. Does he not think there is a better opportunity to bring about changes in the rules of the house, or rather in its procedure in a matter of this kind, than by moving the particular motion he is now thinking of making? After all, he will have plenty of opportunities to try to bring about the changes in procedure that he wishes to introduce without inconveniencing the people involved in the bill before us at the present time.

• (6:40 p.m.)

Mr. Olson: Mr. Chairman, in considering whether or not this motion is in order may I suggest that what is before the committee at

the present time are the terms and conditions of Bill S-7 which has been passed by the Senate, has been given second reading by this house, has been considered by the Committee on Miscellaneous Private Bills and now has been returned to the house for consideration in detail. I have listened very carefully to the arguments advance by the hon. member for Timiskaming and he has not raised any objection to clause 1, the clause we are on. He has objected continually to the procedure in bringing bills of this kind into the whole process of parliament in order to set up this type of corporation. Therefore it would seem to me that the only kind of amendment which would be proper at this time would be an amendment to clause 1.

I take it from the remarks of the hon. member who is trying to move this motion that he does not have any specific objection to clause 1 but is objecting to the procedure. The hon. member for Rosthern said that if it is the procedure he is objecting to surely that should be brought up when the procedures of the House of Commons are under consideration. As you have pointed out on many occasions in the last few minutes, Mr. Chairman, the procedures of the house are not under consideration at the moment. What is under consideration is clause 1 of Bill S-7 and nothing more.

The Chairman: Order. The hon. member for Timiskaming has moved the following motion: That Bill S-7 be not now read but be referred back to the committee for reconsideration. The motion as it stands affects every clause of this bill when only clause 1 is before us. I suggest the proper time to move such a motion would be during second reading or third reading of the bill. It is out of order at this particular stage.

Mr. Howard: Mr. Chairman, I have been reading clause 1 and have been following the very well thought out arguments of my colleague, the hon. member for Timiskaming. In my limited understanding of this matter it does seem that we are being asked in effect to buy a pig in a poke. For the benefit of those who may not have followed the refinements of my argument earlier, I was not objecting to the procedures of the house but rather to the fact that there is not a general public law in existence which would permit this group to be incorporated in another way and not by way of statute law.

In the last clause which was read by the hon. member for Timiskaming there is something in its construction which concerns me a bit. It says:

> —for the purpose of administering the property, business and other temporal affairs of the Corporation.

These are the objectives and they are spelled out in more detail in subsequent clauses of the bill but particularly they are for the purpose of administering the property, business and other temporal affairs of the corporation. It would seem to me that the word "other" should not be in here because the implication is that the corporation would administer the temporal property, the temporal business and other temporal affairs. It would seem to me we should take out the word "other" to make it clear that we are not interpreting the administering of the property and the administering of the business of the corporation as being temporal affairs, although perhaps in the strict sense of the word it is correct.

When the hon. member for Timiskaming read that I came to the conclusion that the word "other" really was adding a bit of confusion to what the particular propositions of the corporation are. I should like to have some comment from the sponsor of the bill in respect of what the petitioners felt about that aspect, whether they felt anything or whether grammatically it is the correct way to phrase it.

There is another matter which I should like to raise, but in doing so I think I have to make reference to the fact that there is no public law in existence under which such a group can be incorporated. If there were we would have the guide lines or criteria established with regard to what the corporation could or could not do. As it is now parliament has to decide in every individual case what the corporation can or cannot do. Parliament has to decide what is or is not in the public good.

I suggest to the hon. member for Timiskaming that one of the reasons there were not very many questions asked in the committee is that there was not that much interest in the committee and that the members who attended the meeting were not too interested in this particular bill one way or another. I submit that that is an attitude a great number of members take in respect of private bills of this nature. They give lip service to the concept that we have a bounden duty to

pass on these matters and that is the extent of their participation.

Parliament is in the position of having to decide whether or not the incorporation of this group, the Evangelistic Tabernacle, will serve the public good and I submit we are not competent to do that. Surely we are being helped in our ignorance of the matter here because clause 1, after it mentions certain individuals, reads:

—together with such other persons—

That is satisfactory.

—and congregations as become members of the religious body—

They do not say what is the religious body to which such other persons and congregations can adhere or join and what constitutes the congregation is extremely vague. In the committee proceedings this matter was mentioned briefly by Mr. Smith asking:

Is there only one congregation of this organization?

• (6:50 p.m.)

Mr. Belfoi replied by saying:

The present incorporate corps are a Winnipeg congregation of about 120. There are four other groups, one in Saskatoon, one in Vancouver, one in Okanagan Valley and one in Kenora, Ontario.

Mr. Smith then asked:

Do the other groups have such an incorporation?

To which Mr. Belfoi replied:

No, the other groups do not, but they will all form part of this incorporation, after it is incorporated, of course.

There is no doubt in Mr. Belfoi's mind that the other groups will automatically become an integral part of the incorporated structure which we are now being asked to pass on in this house. If we are always going to be faced with the prospect of determining whether or not in the case of any bill, and with particular reference to the one before us, incorporation of the group will serve the public good, then we shall have to ask the committee to examine all groups and in this particular instance all the other potential congregations, especially the ones mentioned in the reply which I read just a few moments ago. The minute we get into the ludicrous situation of having to examine sundry unknown people and congregations, we might as well ask the Prime Minister to set up another royal commission of inquiry, because the matter will be that extensive.

[Mr. Howard.]

Mr. Nasserden: On a point of order, Mr. Chairman, the only thing ludicrous about this is the way the hon. member is dealing with it. Everyone knows what the definition of a congregation is in the sense in which it is used in this particular instance. We have here and now a display of a type of tactic to hold up the business of the house. It happens to be private members' hour, but this is an indication of something which has been done by the hon. member for Skeena and the hon. member for Timiskaming so many times during the last few years. On a question such as this I think they should think twice. They will have other opportunities to bring forward their ideas in regard to the procedures of the house rather than take up our time now.

Mr. Howard: Mr. Chairman, it is too bad one cannot approach an important matter such as the bill now before us in a reasoned way without having to be subjected to the asinine comments of the likes of the hon. member for Rosthern.

If I were to think twice about this that would be five times as often as the hon. member for Rosthern, because if he had half thought about the proposal I am making he would see the merits of it and would not have resorted to the mild castigation he indulged in just a moment ago.

Mr. Nasserden: It is just obstruction.

Mr. Howard: The hon. member says "obstruction". After the last four or five days I am sure he has served his full apprenticeship in that field. I am merely seeking to try to serve the public good in the best way I can and to examine the prospects—

An hon. Member: Hypocrisy.

Mr. Howard: There is another comment about hypocrisy. Hon. gentlemen to my right in the Conservative party are past-masters of that. There is no question in my mind about the passage of this bill by seven o'clock. All I want to do is place before the committee what I consider to be reasonable proposals. I will not disclose the names or the constituencies of members of the party to which my hon. friend for Rosthern belongs who said to me that I have got a good point and that we should try to do this some other way.

All I am trying to do is to seek to examine the bill in that light, and if the hon. member for Rosthern does not like it he can go and have supper. Perhaps he will listen carefully to what I am trying to establish. When a

company is incorporated to engage in a mining venture, a logging venture, a manufacturing industry or any other form of business, it is incorporated under a law that sets out the criteria as to how that company will operate and what it shall do and shall not do in order to serve the public good. But here in parliament we have no such rules or criteria as to what a body such as this shall or shall not do in order to serve the public good to the best advantage. That is the point I am making. We have to approach it in our own way or not approach it at all.

As a matter of fact, I submit that approaching it in our own way is a most unsatisfactory way to pass statute law for the incorporation of companies because we are doing it on the basis of what each member of parliament happens to think is the best way to do it.

The hon. member for Rosthern should know this, having listened to what I said on second reading and on the first clause of the bill a little while ago. I am advocating that we get this sort of business out of parliament so that we do not have to do it here.

The Chairman: Order. There may be a good deal of merit in what the hon. member for Skeena has been saying but his objection is not against the bill now before us. His objection happens to be against the Companies Act or any other legislation which allows the bill to be put before us in this way. Right now it is not the method of passing legislation that is in question. What is before the committee is this Bill No. S-7. The method of passing the legislation is a subject quite different from clause 1, which is what we are discussing.

Mr. Howard: I could not agree with you more, Mr. Chairman. I have refrained from transgressing against your original ruling, but I was inveigled by the hon. member for Rosthern into explaining my position and that is what I was trying to do.

Clause agreed to.

Clause 2 to 18 inclusive agreed to.

Preamble agreed to.

Title agreed to.

Bill reported.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: When shall the said bill be read a third time? By leave, now?

Some hon. Members: Now.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Mr. McIlraith, seconded by Mr. Benson, moves that the said bill be now read a third time and do pass. Is it the pleasure of the house to adopt the said motion?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Mr. McIlraith: Mr. Speaker, I wonder whether it is a good thing to have ministers of the Crown on the record as having moved and seconded a private member's bill. I think there should be unanimous consent to have that changed to the name of the hon. member sponsoring the bill and the name of another private member.

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Mr. Howard: You can use my name.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: I did not hear the suggestion of the hon. member for Skeena.

Mr. Howard: I just said I would be glad either to move or second the motion.

Mr. Stefanson: I will move the motion.

Mr. McIlraith: Mr. Speaker, perhaps I was not heard just a few moments ago. The moving and seconding of the motion on the private member's bill was indicated as having been done by two ministers of the Crown. That was done inadvertently. In order not to establish a precedent which might cause difficulty in the future the names of two private members should be substituted for them. I believe there is unanimous agreement.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: I recognize this was done inadvertently. I do not know whether I had better apologize to the two ministers of the Crown or to the two private members involved, but may I ask for unanimous consent of the house to have the names changed to the hon. member for Selkirk (Mr. Stefanson) and the hon. member for Moose Mountain (Mr. Southam)?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Motion agreed to and bill read the third time and passed.

• (7:00 p.m.)

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order. The house will now resume the business interrupted at six o'clock.

PENITENTIARIES

APPOINTMENT OF JOINT COMMITTEE

Hon. L. T. Pennell (Solicitor General) moved:

That a joint committee of the Senate and House of Commons be appointed to consider the state of

penitentiaries under the control of the government of Canada and the plans of the government in relation thereto with powers to report from time to time its observations and opinions thereon; send for persons, papers and records; adjourn from place to place; sit during sittings of the house; and print from day to day such papers and evidence as may be ordered by the committee, and that standing order 66 be suspended in relation thereto;

That 15 members of the House of Commons, to be designated at a later date, act on behalf of the house as members of the said committee; and

That a message be sent to the Senate requesting that house to unite with this house for the above purpose, and to select, if the Senate deem advisable, some of their members to act on the proposed joint committee.

He said: Mr. Speaker, I respectfully commend this motion to the house. The subject matter, I believe, does not raise differences in a party sense, although I recognize that there may be difference of opinion among members in their individual capacities. It is within the recollection of the house that I made a reasonably lengthy opening statement regarding penitentiaries on the calling of the estimates of the Department of Justice. I therefore do not propose to trench upon the time and patience of the house except to offer two short points in support of the motion.

We are now well into the first half of the ten-year penitentiary plan and I humbly suggest that it would be profitable to examine our physical plant before launching into the second part of the program. I do not conceal from myself or the house that there has been some criticism of our new institutions. The principal target has been the special correctional units, one of which will be completed later this year at St. Vincent de Paul. The penitentiary service appreciates that such criticism is inspired by a genuine interest in this important matter. The building of three other units has been stayed, and I believe it would be worth while for the members of a committee to have a first hand inspection of this one unit so that they would have an opportunity to voice their opinions before we march forward.

A question was raised during the estimates debate whether a penitentiary committee was necessary having regard to the fact that there is a Justice and Legal Affairs Committee already in existence. It is interesting to note that of the 14 members who last year offered enlightened opinions on this important subject of penitentiaries, all of whom I believe are still members of the house, only two are members of the Justice and Legal Affairs Committee. In other words, I am saying that many members whose training and experience is outside the legal world have a deep and abiding interest in penitentiary affairs and the failure to establish this committee might mean that the house would be deprived of the benefit of their judgment.

I do not, of course, suggest that the members of my own profession are not competent to deal with this matter, but I do want to emphasize that the subject of penal reform in this modern age is no longer the private preserve of judges, jailers and lawyers. The penitentiary service is faced with a building program of formidable dimensions and great urgency. In closing, Mr. Speaker, I renew my plea that this motion be adopted, for I believe that a committee can render valuable assistance in drafting the blueprint necessary for the development of our penal institutions in the difficult days ahead.

Mr. Eric A. Winkler (Grey-Bruce): Mr. Speaker, we appreciate the views that have been set forth to the house in this regard. We appreciate the fact that the plan in respect of penitentiaries is of a rather extensive nature. We certainly recognize the need for this program and the need of the community at large in so far as penal reform and our present institutions are concerned.

We, too, believe that this motion should be adopted without extensive debate. However, we in the opposition think that the justice committee as constituted at the moment might well deal with this question and so avoid a great deal of conflict in regard to these matters. So far as the participation of members of the other place is concerned, we believe that they could be asked to join the justice committee for this purpose.

The minister stated that the interest of people hitherto concerned with this problem might not be taken into account, but we believe that those who were interested might well become members of the committee for this purpose. We do not believe that a duplication of committee responsibility is necessary. We believe the division of the Department of Justice has caused concern in regard to the responsibilities of the ministers involved. These questions are all in the field of justice and we would ask the minister to allow the present standing committee to deal with this problem.

Recognizing the need and the fact that the committee might well get to work immediately in the areas the minister has suggested, I

suggest this would be the best possible way to deal with the questions at hand. We would then be studying this problem on a continuing basis and continuity would be established in successive sessions. I ask the minister to take this suggestion into consideration. I also ask hon. members to consider my suggestion when placing their views before the house.

I believe that the adoption of this suggestion would expedite the formation of the committee and dealing with the work at hand. As I say, Mr. Speaker, we agree with the need, we agree with the objectives, and we are interested in seeing the committee get to work at a very early date.

Mr. Frank Howard (Skeena): Mr. Speaker, I wish to say a few brief words in support of the motion. We do not think it is so much the name of the committee that is important as the authority of the committee, its responsibilities and the fervour with which the committee members prosecute the responsibility given to them.

• (7:10 p.m.)

If we hark back a couple of years we find the origin of this proposal. At that time the hon. member for Danforth (Mr. Scott), the hon. member for Timiskaming (Mr. Peters) and I took occasion to make a number of rather dramatic visits to that hell hole in Montreal, St. Vincent de Paul penitentiary. This visit caused such public concern that the then minister of justice and the then minister of public works, Mr. Deschatelets, paid an unprecedented ministerial visit to St. Vincent de Paul with an entourage of some 50 or 60 newspapermen, radio and television men, complete with cameras, recording equipment and the like. One of the officials of the penitentiaries branch with whom I spoke said that some of his predecessors would turn over in their graves if they knew this were happening.

It was following that visit by the then minister of public works and the then minister of justice, and following upon our persistent demands for a parliamentary committee to inquire into the whole situation, that an annoucement was made that there were going to be two committees. One would be a committee of experts which would look into the sociological and penological aspects of our penal system and the other a parliamentary committee which would look into the state of the penitentiaries. This presumably refers to the physical facilities, the buildings and conditions. The Solicitor General (Mr. Pennell) nods his head in assent that this is a correct interpretation of the word "state".

We are of the opinion that the committee should not look at the word "state" in the narrow sense of merely going around peering in corners to see whether or not they have been swept out or ascertaining the size of cells, what sort of facilities exist for segregation and the like. The committee should concern itself with the use to which these facilities are being put. There is not much sense in examining a cell to ascertain its dimensions and its sanitary facilities, because a person will be locked up in that cell. There is not much sense just looking at the physical aspects of penitentiaries unless the committee also concerns itself with what is going to happen to the individual who is in that cell once he is released. I think that in this sense the construction of the motion is lacking.

I am afraid there will be a tendency to look purely at the physical state and condition of the penitentiaries rather than looking at the after effects of incarceration. For years we have had the cycle of arrest, conviction, incarceration and release. Upon release the person has been in the position of starting the cycle all over again. History has proven that it does not really matter what the state of the penal institution is because people still manage somehow or other to get into it. As so-called civilized people we deplore the state of some of our prisons. We think that sanitary facilities are not what they should be. We concern ourselves about the paint, the calcimine, the white-wash, whether the bars are shining, whether the clothes are suitable, whether the food is good, whether the shoes are satisfactory, but we do not concern ourselves with what happens to the individual once he walks out through the gates. The whole emphasis of any study of our penitentiary system must be on this point, to ensure that we are doing as much as we possibly can to see that the human being we lock up in a cell is treated as a human being. The state of the cell really does not matter, although our sensitivities may be offended, because we should concern ourselves with assuring that everything possible is done to give the man the best possible chance of not returning.

This is the point with which the committee should concern itself. This should be the mental orientation of every member of that committee regardless of the fact that it is set up merely to consider the physical facilities that exist. I urge upon all the members of this committee, and I say this because of my

interest in penology and because of visits to a number of penitentiaries, to disregard as much as they can the terms of reference when they visit the institutions. They should think in terms of the human beings who are held in these institutions and in terms of making as sure as they possibly can that all these human beings have the best chance for success in society once they are released.

Mr. H. A. Olson (Medicine Hat): Mr. Speaker, I want to say first that we support the motion to set up a joint committee of the House of Commons and Senate to consider the state of penitentiaries under the control of the federal government. The resolution also calls for the committee to consider the plans of the government in relation, I presume, to the state of penitentiaries under federal government control. I feel this is the wrong time to go into a detailed discussion of what may be right or wrong with our penitentiaries. I think we should wait until we receive a report from the committee that is being proposed and then, in some degree at least, accept the advice of the 15 members of the House of Commons who will have had an opportunity of making a detailed study of this matter.

In closing, Mr. Speaker, I want to say that while there has been a great public outcry about the rehabilitation of prisoners in penitentiaries and it has been said that the penitentiary program ought to be redesigned with more emphasis on rehabilitation, I think we can go too far with this concern. I have no objection whatever to more emphasis being placed on the rehabilitation of prisoners but I believe we forget, at least in some degree, that the reason they are in penitentiaries is that they have demonstrated they are not fit persons to be in society. We as members of parliament, as well as the government of Canada, also have the responsibility of protecting society generally against this kind of individual. I should not like to see this committee call for new plans with regard to penitentiaries which would be so overweighted in favour of the prisoner and the rehabilitation of the prisoner that they overlook the fact these people are dangerous to society. It has been proven it is not safe for them to be ordinary citizens, with all the freedom of ordinary citizens.

• (7:20 p.m.)

Hon. W. G. Dinsdale (Brandon-Souris): Mr. Speaker, as other hon. members have indicated in this discussion this is not the time for a full scale debate. However, I should like to say a few words just in case I do not happen to be fortunate enough to be appointed to this special committee.

As the hon. member for Grey-Bruce (Mr. Winkler) intimated, it had been the hope of this party that the work of this committee might be carried out by the justice committee already appointed. However, the minister has indicated that this is to be a committee of experts or at least of members of the house who are primarily interested in the state of Canada's penitentiaries. I do not pose as an expert, although I first started visiting penitentiaries back in 1940. At that time an excellent report had been brought down by the then government of Canada—I think the date of publication was in 1938—the well-known Archambault report. The Archambault royal commission had been constituted because of the riots in Kingston penitentiary during the mid-1930's, and as I recall that report was a rather definitive examination of the problems which prevailed in Canada's penitentiaries at that time.

It is said, Mr. Speaker, that it takes 37 years before the birth of an idea is implemented in this house in the form of legislation. If that statistic be true, we are almost reaching the stage where Canada and this parliament are ready for a major breakthrough in our approach to penology. In addition to the Archambault report we have as background the Fauteux royal commission report which confirmed and re-endorsed many of the findings of that earlier period.

Like other members who have participated in this discussion I hope that the phrase "state of penitentiaries" is not going to be restricted to the bricks and mortar aspect of the problem. I rather had the impression from the minister's statement that he is willing to put a broader interpretation on the terms of reference. Indeed, the very fact that a special committee is being brought together with a broad interest in the subject suggests that the minister wants to enlarge the terms of reference so that they can provide for a thoroughgoing review of the matters discussed in the earlier reports to which I referred. Otherwise I think the effort made by such a committee would be rather sterile, if indeed the time is not wasted.

As I read the further words of the resolution I note that it empowers the committee to send for persons, papers and records. This, it seems to me, is the aspect of the operations of the committee which may make it possible to

embrace a wider perspective. I say this because it will provide an opportunity to bring before this committee of special interest people and groups in Canada who themselves for a long period of time have had a special interest in the question of modern penology. I refer, for example, to the representatives of the John Howard Society who have had broad experience in this subject. I think it would be almost imperative that they have the chance to present their views to the committee. As a result of their close contact with the problem I am sure they would give some advice on the structural or bricks and mortar aspects of the problem as well as on the sociological and psychological aspects.

My own experience, which goes back 25 years, was in connection with the Salvation Army's interest in penal matters. I think it is another organization which would have something helpful and useful to say to the committee.

During the past 30 years, ever since the Archambault report was brought down, there has been a tremendous improvement, I would say, in the attitude of the general public toward the group in society to whom we refer as criminals. My good friend from Medicine Hat indicated that he hopes there will not be a tendency—I am paraphrasing what he said —to be soft toward those who find themselves embroiled with the law. In another day and finds itself behind bars—I think it was by age reference was made to the group which John Wesley—in these words: "There, but for the grace of God, go I".

I associated with and personally was in touch with many of these men when I was active as what used to be called a prison worker but is now called a correctional officer, which indicates a shifting emphasis in our attitude toward the handling of these problems. I found very little difference in attitudes between those who often find themselves behind bars and those who find themselves outside bars. Indeed, even were it not so, we must protect society from the criminal element, but in almost very case, in fact, in every case involving a penal or criminal offence eventually the person concerned will have to return to society. If that particular person has not been prepared for this return by a process of training, education, rehabilitation and all the other services now available to deal with problems of human behaviour, it means that eventually he will fall afoul of the law once again and the problem of recidivism, which has been one of the chronic difficulties in Canada's penal system, will remain with us.

• (7:30 p.m.)

It is not necessary at this stage to quote statistics. I am sure they will be brought out during the course of the committee's hearings. I commend the government for bringing forward this resolution at this time and I hope the committee will interpret the terms of reference relating to its functions to make it possible to deal with all aspects of the problem. After a delay of 30 years or more, in the history of coming to grips with the matter, I think this is our opportunity at last to get some concrete legislation on the subject. I do not say that nothing has occurred in the intervening years. Indeed the minister in his statement said that we are now in the midst of a ten-year plan to improve our penal facilities. The hon. member for Kamloops, when he was the minister responsible, endeavoured to come to grips with this matter. No doubt he will be representing this party on that committee, and will of course be a worthy spokesman.

Mr. David Orlikow (Winnipeg North): Mr. Speaker, it is not my intention to delay or oppose this measure before the committee. As I said when we discussed this question last year, I think we are approaching the problem from the wrong direction. I emphatically disagree with my good friend the hon. member for Medicine Hat (Mr. Olson), with whom I so often agree when issues are discussed in this house, when he expresses the view, the view of many people in Canada and of many members of parliament, namely that because people have committed crimes, have been brought to trial and been found guilty, the answer is to lock them up.

We have not done much to find better ways of dealing with offenders. Locking a person up does not do much for that person, nor help him in the future. When a person is sentenced to a penitentiary in Canada, he is really being sent to a university of crime.

Some time ago when the son of one of my constituents was sent to a provincial jail for stealing a car, she said to me, "When my son first went to jail he only knew how to start one type of car without a key. When he came out of jail, he could start any car without a key". That is the value of what happened to that boy in jail, and that is the sort of thing that happens to most people whom we send to our penitentiaries. They come out, and then go back a second and third time.

I was disturbed by a speech the minister made some days ago in this house in which he said, and I am speaking from memory, that the present penitentiary population is 7,000 and something, and the predicted penitentiary population in the early 1970's probably would be over 10,000. I think that was a disastrous speech for the minister to make, and a disastrous approach for the minister to have. It indicated to me a shocking situation. Nothing the minister has said since that would indicate that it is his feeling that we can do something to change this.

A committee is being appointed to look at our present penitentiaries, which are a disgrace. That committee will bring back reports which will contain recommendations for parliament. Many people know the kinds of penitentiaries we have. The situation in St. Vincent de Paul is a disgrace in a modern society. What is it proposed that the government should do? It is proposed that the government spend somewhere in the neighbourhood of $200 million in the next ten years, to build new penitentiaries.

Anybody who has any kind of heart at all will agree that even if people do commit crimes, they should not always be put into penitentiaries. They should not be put into the kind of buildings we have here, the kind of buildings of which St. Vincent de Paul is an example. By building better buildings we shall have accomplished nothing in solving the kinds of problems which make people commit crimes. I know that this is not the place to discuss jails, but we are talking about the spending of $200 million to build buildings. I think it would be better if the minister would come forward and say, "We know on the basis of experience that probation works. Probation keeps 85 to 90 per cent of the people who are handled by the probation service in the province from committing a second crime, and from going to prison possibly a second time."

Surely the minister and the department, instead of talking about spending a tremendous amount of money on buildings to house people who have committed a first, second or third crime, might do better by saying to this house: "We are going to propose to the provinces an expenditure of several millions of dollars which, if they are prepared to match that, would mean that they could expend very large sums on probation services." Certainly probation is the responsibility of the provinces at this time. If the suggestion I put to the house were carried out, it would keep people out of the penitentiaries, and that is what I would like to see.

Another thing we are going to propose, Mr. Speaker, is that people with better than grade 10 or grade 11 education be employed at penitentiaries. These people will not just be guards. I am not being critical when I say this, nor am I being critical of people working in our penitentiaries. We have the kind of peoople there we want, and that we are prepared to pay for.

I hope the minister in the very near future, if he cannot do so tonight, will say, "We are going to raise the standards required for a person to get a job in our penitentiaries, and we are going to increase the salary range to get the kinds of people who will not just be guards, but who will be able to do rehabilitation work. We are going to allocate enough money so that we will not just have a few part time psychiatrists."

I happen to know the psychiatrist who works at St. Vincent de Paul. I know his reputation in the field of correction. I am not being critical of him, but a psychiatrist for three half days a week cannot possibly do the job he is supposed to do.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, instead of spending money on buildings, we should be coming forward with a program to take on psychiatrists, psychologists, and teachers who are aggressive and dynamic, who would make prisoners enthusiastic to learn so that they could upgrade their education. If prisoners upgraded their education they might be able to get a better job when they come out, so that they would not have to commit crimes and go back to penitentiary again.

It is not my intention to make a long speech, or to hold up this resolution. I say tonight, as I said during the last session when this resolution was being debated, that we are putting the cart before the horse and we are going in the wrong direction. We do not need a committee to tell us that we need better buildings. We know that. The Archambault report and the Fauteux Report have already told us that. Experts have looked at the whole question of correction. It seems to me, Mr. Speaker, that the whole point of this committee is superfluous. It seems to me wrong to think in terms of large expenditures for buildings. If we are going to have as many people in the penitentiaries as the minister predicted, the situation is hopeless

• (7:40 p.m.)

What we are going to do in the next ten years is more of the same that we had in the last 20 years. This is a course of action which has failed miserably, a course of action which, when compared with countries such as Great Britain—though there have been problems in recent years—puts us to shame. It is a course of action which has led to this situation—that in a survey done by one of the United Nations agencies about this correctional problem, Canada—I am speaking from memory—ranked 48th among 50 nations in the way it was handling its correctional institutions.

I do not intend to oppose a study by this committee, but I hope that when the minister has had an opportunity to look at the whole question he will call a halt at once to the present trend, just as he has already called a halt to certain aspects of the prison building program. I commend him for the further consideration he has given to the building program at Montreal, now unfortunately almost completed. I hope the minister will call a halt to the building of more such buildings upon which too much money has already been spent, and that he will turn in the direction of changes which will emphasize that our determination that the number of people sent to these institutions shall be reduced rather than raised.

This can be done if we make up our minds to adopt an aggressive program of probation, parole and rehabilitation, using modern methods instead of the traditional methods of conviction and locking people up—methods which have been used in this country for far too many years.

Mr. Olson: May I ask the hon. member a question? I am sure he would want to be fair? Would he not agree that I did not say the only solution was to lock people up. I suggested that the members of this committee should be as concerned about their responsibility for the protection of the public as they are for the rehabilitation of prisoners.

Mr. Orlikow: I consider the hon. member for Medicine Hat to be a friend of mine. I consider him to be one of the best members of this house and if, in my desire to express my disappointment with his speech I over emphasized what I consider to be one aspect of that speech, I want to withdraw that impression. I do feel, however, that the record will show that the hon. member for Medicine Hat was, in effect, saying indirectly, if not directly, that we must continue the program of building buildings and locking people up, and so on.

Of course I agree with the hon. member for Medicine Hat that we have to think of the victims of those who commit crimes. I do not think we should simply allow people to continue to commit crimes against other citizens. The hon. member and I may have a basic difference of opinion, and time may prove that the hon. member for Medicine Hat is right and that I am wrong. But it seemed to me the hon. member was saying that society must protect itself against crime by continuing to do what has been done in the past, namely to apprehend the culprit, put him on trial and then lock him in a penitentiary.

An hon. Member: And throw away the key.

Mr. Orlikow: I certainly would not accuse the hon. member for Medicine Hat of taking that attitude. But that is the way I interpreted his remarks, and if I interpreted them wrongly, I apologize. I did not think, when I rose, of making an attack on the hon. member for Medicine Hat, who happened to speak just before I did. But I am critical of the approach which the department now headed by the Solicitor General is following.

I hope the Solicitor General (Mr. Pennell) and his department will move in the next year or so to adopt the proposals which were made very fairly and convincingly in the Archambault report and in the Fauteux report, and which will, I am certain, be made by the committee of experts the government has appointed. I feel sure the recommendations they will make will be along the lines of those contained in the Fauteux report. I hope that when this report is brought down, if not before, the minister will give serious consideration to an approach of the kind I have suggested, rather than the enlargement of a building program which is doomed to failure.

Mr. Olson: I do not agree with the interpretation the hon. member has made of my speech.

Mr. Robert C. Coates (Cumberland): I should like to speak on this resolution for a few moments. First I wish my good friend the Solicitor General well in his efforts, as far as the penitentiaries aspect of his portfolio is concerned, and tell him that we look forward to the setting up of this committee because I think it is the proper move for us to make. As members of the House of Commons we should always be endeavouring to keep up to

date in every aspect of the penitentiary service, determined to see we move always in the right direction. I should like to point out, in passing, that the Fauteux report has been before us now for a great many years. It would not be right or proper for us to rest on that report without attempting to go forward.

I commend the minister and the government for continuing the program initiated by the former minister, my hon. friend from Kamloops (Mr. Fulton) to provide for the enlarging of institutions and the construction of new ones across the country. No one who has been in Dorchester penitentiary as often as I have, for short periods of time, can fail to appreciate the difficulty faced by those associated with the Canadian penitentiary service when endeavouring to put rehabilitation programs into effect. It is next to impossible to try to operate such programs when there are far too many individuals incarcerated in our institutions, as a result of which security becomes the thing uppermost in everyone's mind.

I should like to say this to the minister: I believe that at the present time the morale of the staff is anything but good. This has nothing to do with their pay. I realize that everyone wants more money, no matter what job he may be doing. People are always endeavouring to secure new fringe benefits. I appreciate, also, that the government has a new system of pay for its employees under consideration at the present time. It is not this aspect which concerns me. It is the fact that they are uncertain about what is likely to happen with regard to individuals such as Reginald Colpitts, Leopold Dion and Georges Marcotte. They do not know how many more such individuals they are likely to have in a system which was not built to maintain people of this kind.

The guards at Dorchester penitentiary asked for danger pay of $1,000 a year. I do not think they were really concerned whether $1,000 was paid to them. I believe they were more concerned about the government taking action to protect them against inmates of this type. As far as I am concerned, our laws are not geared to allow such inmates to remain in our penitentiary system at the present time. The sooner we get on with the debate on capital punishment, whether for the abolition or retention of the death penalty, the earlier will every man in the penitentiary service be in a better position to know what lies before him. I think this house will be in a better position to know what needs to be done with this type of individual presently in our institutions. Not until then will we be capable of making the kind of decisions about them that we should be making.

[Mr. Coates.]

• (7:50 p.m.)

I would like to say also—and it was inherent in the speech by the hon. member for Winnipeg North (Mr. Orlikow)—that there is a great danger we are getting too soft about those people who go into our institutions. I believe in rehabilitation; I believe in doing everything possible to prepare a man to go back to life in our world, in society, but I believe he should go back only after he has realized he has committed an offence against society, and that to do it again will be to his detriment only.

I do not believe in providing radio facilities, all the other forms of entertainment, and all the other things which are available to a free man in society, to an inmate who has committed dastardly crimes to society, before he recognizes the seriousness of what he has done and is willing and ready to mend his ways and prepare himself for re-entry into society.

I believe, if we are to be practical, we must have maximum, medium and minimum security institutions. I do not believe we have enough to look after not only the population that is in our institutions today but also the population which is entering our institutions every day, and which is continuing and growing at a frightening rate. Certainly there are approaches we have to take which are different, which are new. These approaches are not necessarily to be accepted by everyone, but they are approaches which are far reaching and which in many cases have been proven to be acceptable, to a degree, in other countries of the world.

I believe the parole system we have established today is good. I believe naturally there are holes in it, like there are in anything else, but I do not believe there is anything significantly wrong with the approach we take today toward parole. I do not think there is anything more I would like to say. I would like to repeat however that I do believe this committee will be of value not only to the members who serve on it, but also to parliament. I hope the committee will be set up, set up quickly, and that we will get on with the consideration of this matter.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: If the hon. minister speaks now, he will close the debate.

Hon. L. T. Pennell (Solicitor General): Mr. Speaker, if I may, I would like to deal briefly with the matters which have been raised. I recognize the point made by the hon. member for Grey-Bruce (Mr. Winkler). I would say to him, with respect, that this is not the occasion for me to discuss the merits or demerits of the argument he proposed. I also recognize the points made by the hon. member for Skeena (Mr. Howard) and his colleagues who I know are deeply interested in matters relating to penal reform.

If I may be permitted to say so, the hon. member for Medicine Hat (Mr. Olson) made a short but interesting contribution. I turn now to the remarks of the hon. member for Brandon-Souris (Mr. Dinsdale) who entered a disclaimer of being an expert on penitentiaries. I must do the same thing and say, with some regret, that some of my former clients have much more knowledge of penitentiaries than I possess, but it will be my duty to rectify that situation. The hon. member made the point that penitentiaries are something more than just bricks and mortar, but are essentially people. In reply to him, and the hon. member for Skeena, as I interpret the terms of reference, they will include not only the physical plant, the cells and so on, but also matters such as staff training and such things as the program within the institution to prepare the inmates for their release.

The hon. member for Winnipeg North (Mr. Orlikow) suggested I made a disastrous statement, and I take his remarks in the spirit in which he made them, because I know he has a genuine interest in this matter. However, I am sure he did not wish to do me any injustice. He was referring to my statement when I said that the inmate population would increase to over 10,000—and he was quite right in the figure he gave. I was only pointing out that with the growth in population and the present trend it would reach this figure. He made a statement concerning probation officers and his remarks fell on sympathetic ears. Over the last year we added 21 new parole officers. I realize it is not a large figure in terms of our inmate population, but it is a step in the right direction.

The hon. member said I should do something about upgrading the staff. We are doing something about it. We are building new staff training colleges in Kingston and in Montreal, and are upgrading the skill and capability of the correctional staff. He also made the interesting statement that perhaps we should not be concerning ourselves, nor should the committee concern itself with the matter of putting up new buildings; that we do not need a committee to tell us that we need new buildings. That is not the purpose of the committee. It is to determine the matter of putting up the right type of new buildings. I suggest this is very important.

I thank the hon. member for Cumberland (Mr. Coates) for his kind remarks and for the support he has given this committee. He said we lag behind in penal reform. I must say I think there is some truth in this, but I think we now are moving forward. There has been developing a new sense of responsibility in this field. The initial impetus for this new sense of responsibility came from the previous administration, and I have no desire to conceal that fact. I hope we can continue it.

I am not suggesting we are going to build a new heaven on earth in our penitentiary service, but I do think we are taking a step forward, and with the co-operation of the committee I think we can make a useful contribution in that direction. I wish to thank all hon. members for their contributions.

Motion agreed to.

CONSUMER CREDIT

MOTION FOR ESTABLISHMENT OF JOINT COMMITTEE

Mr. Jean Chrétien (for the Minister of Finance) moved:

That a joint committee of the Senate and House of Commons be appointed to enquire into and report upon the problems of consumer credit, more particularly but not so as to restrict the generality of the foregoing to enquire into and report upon the operation of Canadian legislation in relation thereto;

That twenty-four members of the House of Commons to be designated by the House at a later date, be members of the joint committee, and that Standing Order 67(1) of the House of Commons be suspended in relation thereto;

That the said committee have power to call for persons, papers and records and examine witnesses; to sit while the House is sitting, and to report from time to time and to print such papers and evidence from day to day as may be deemed advisable, and that Standing Order 66 be suspended in relation thereto; and to engage the services of counsel, accountants and such other clerical and technical personnel as may be deemed necessary, that the Minutes of Proceedings of and evidence given before the joint committee during the Twenty-Sixth Parliament be referred to the said committee and be made part of the records thereof; and that a message be sent to the Senate requesting that house to unite with this house for the above purpose, and to select, if the Senate deems it advisable, some of its members to act on the proposed joint committee.

Consumer Credit Committee

[*Translation*]

• (8:00 p.m.)

He said: Mr. Speaker, the resolution now before the house deals with the appointment of a joint committee of the Senate and House of Commons to enquire into and report upon the problems of consumer credit.

This committee, Mr. Speaker, was established in the last parliament, and more particularly, sat during the last two sessions of the last parliament. It undertook a huge task concerning consumer credit, it had a lot of sittings but, unfortunately, because of the somewhat abrupt end which the last Parliament came to, it could not draft a report, following the long investigations it held.

The Committee was chaired jointly by the Hon. Senator Croll and the hon. member for Renfrew South (Mr. Greene). I suggest that if this committee could resume its studies as soon as possible, it should be able to report to the house and make proposals so that this problem, which is very much discussed at this time by the public, can be settled to the general satisfaction.

Naturally, serious problems arise as to whether this comes strictly under federal jurisdiction or under provincial jurisdiction? But I think the committee undertook very precise work in this field and that it should be in a position, after a few sittings, to bring down a favourable report, so that we can enact legislation to protect small consumers from certain abuses we have noted in the course of the investigations of this committee.

[*English*]

Mr. A. D. Hales (Wellington South): Mr. Speaker, on the reconstituting of this consumer credit committee I should like to make one or two observations. We are in favour of having the committee reactivated, and I personally realize the great value it can be to us. In fact, anything that can be done to relieve the high cost of living would be appreciated by everyone.

However, there is one part of the resolution I would like to bring to the attention of the house, where it provides that the committee may—

> —engage the services of counsel, accountants and such other clerical and technical personnel as may be deemed necessary.

The former committee followed that practice and hired outside counsel and an accountant. I am against giving this authority to the committee because I believe professional help is available from among our very

competent civil service staff. I do not think it is necessary to go beyond that staff to get any competent help required. I am sure the Department of Justice, the Department of Trade and Commerce and the Department of Industry could provide all the help necessary.

The former committee, under the joint chairmanship of Senator Croll and the present Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Greene), did a good job. I appreciated the opportunity to work on that committee, but it did engage outside counsel and an accountant, and in this connection I believe we members of the house should give some thought to the taxpayers of the country and to the way in which money is spent by the government.

The former committee hired an outside lawyer named Mr. Urie. There were 18 meetings held by the committee. He was paid at the rate of $250 per day, and $25 per hour for every hour he spent on preparation work. In all he was paid a total of $6,350.55. The accountant was paid at the rate of $100 a day, and $20 an hour for preparation work, a total of $1,855. The two combined received a total of $8,205.55 for 18 meetings. To me that seems an outrageous amount of money; but in addition to that I am against the principle of hiring outside help because I believe, when that is done, the same interest is not taken by members of a committee. They are inclined to sit back and say, "He is being paid for it. Let him do the talking." This does not improve the operations of a committee. I have no objection to setting up the committee, but I do object to this outside help.

Mr. Max Saltsman (Waterloo South): Mr. Speaker, like most hon. members I am anxious to see this resolution passed as quickly as possible so that the Consumer Credit Committee may resume its work. It has been meeting for over two years, has heard many briefs, and there are probably a few more to come. It is essential that the committee reach a decision, and communicate that decision to the public.

Four provinces have already taken legislative action in this field. A royal commission report has been received in the Province of Manitoba. In Alberta, after some question as to whether it had the power to legislate, the legislature there has accepted its responsibility. Nova Scotia has passed an excellent credit act, and Ontario recently published an excellent report of its select committee. What is disturbing is that the federal government,

which should be giving leadership in this field, finds itself in the position of being behind the provinces which have already passed legislation to deal with consumer credit. We are still debating the matter and it is vitally important that our committee resume is work as quickly as possible.

I feel somewhat differently from the hon. member for Wellington South (Mr. Hales) on the question of engaging counsel for the committee. I was appointed to the committee rather late last year, but one of the impressions I have retained is of the enormous value to the committee of the counsel it had at its disposal. Many of the witnesses who appeared before that committee attended with a phalanx of experts, up to 12 or 14 people, including accountants, lawyers and economists. The members of the committee were hardworking. They took a great interest in the subject but, without the help and advice of the professionals I think many of us would have been lost. Many of the arguments made by the representatives of those who appeared before the committee might not have been examined and questioned as closely as they were.

I hope the government will be allowed to see that counsel and accountants are provided as an adjunct to the committee. A figure of over $8,000 was given as the reason for dispensing with this type of expert advice, but when I think of the millions of dollars of which Canadian borrowers are bilked, the small sum of $8,000 seems to be a very small price to pay on behalf of the Canadian taxpayer to ensure that this committee will have expertese at its disposal.

I would like to pay my respects to and express my admiration for the work done by the joint chairmen, the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Greene) and Senator Croll. Senator Croll in particular has done a magnificent job in bringing the subject of consumer credit to public attention.

• (8:10 p.m.)

Before coming to the house I can recall the Senator for some reason or another sending me some of the speeches he made in the other place. I followed those speeches with a great deal of interest. I recall the tremendous difficulty this man had in the other place in receiving even preliminary acceptance of the idea that consumer credit should be examined by the Parliament of Canada. I think he fought a great fight in the other place and did a magnificent job as chairman of the Consumer Credit Committee. We in this party would like to express our appreciation to him for that effort and certainly hope he will continue as chairman of the committee.

The importance of legislating consumer credit in Canada should not be underestimated. Much of the social problem in this country stems from the abuses of consumer credit. The sooner the government takes action to correct those abuses, the sooner will we be able to correct some of our social problems. People are put into a state of perpetual poverty by misleading advertisements, misleading come-ons and, if not deliberate falsifications, certainly implied falsifications.

I believe this government must take strong and positive action in this regard. At the very least I think there must be in every credit contract in Canada in the future a declaration of simple interest that will be understood by everyone. I believe there is an argument for expressing it in dollars and cents and perhaps this should also be in the contract.

I should like to add my voice to that of other members of this party who have introduced private members' bills calling for a ceiling upon interest rates in Canada. There is a legitimate charge for interest, but when this charge gets to the point where you have to pay 30 per cent, 35 per cent or 40 per cent in return for obtaining credit, I think it is by no means legitimate. I do not believe these high interest rates should be allowed. This is not a conscionable charge to make under any circumstances. In my opinion we should move in the direction of ensuring that people and their families are protected from succumbing to the pressures around them to obtain credit. I conclude my remarks by expressing the hope that the committee will have all the counsel it needs and that there will be no hesitation on the part of the government to ensure that the people of Canada are represented by the finest experts it is possible to obtain.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Gérard Laprise (Chapleau): Mr. Speaker, the members of the Ralliement Créditiste readily endorse the setting up of this committee which will inquire and look into the problem of consumer credit.

During the previous session, this committee already held several meetings where experts

and representatives of various financial bodies of the country appeared to set forth this problem and offer solutions.

Personally, I did not attend those committee meetings, but I do hope to be appointed to this committee at this session and attend its meetings in order to become better acquainted with the matter and, if necessary, put questions to the witnesses who will appear before it.

I am also happy to note that the records of the previous committee which investigated this situation will be given to the members of the committee being established tonight, and I certainly hope to be a member.

We hope that this committee will be set up without delay so that it may proceed with and complete this work. But there is something I do not like in this resolution; it is the third paragraph which reads as follows:

That the said committee have power to call for persons, papers and records and examine witnesses.

Mr. Speaker, this is of concern to us, but when it is said that the committee will have to sit "while the house is sitting", I do not agree at all with that part of the resolution, because this will greatly increase our work load.

I remember during the last election campaign, we in this group were blamed, for not attending enough committee meetings while we attend the sittings of the house. Since we cannot be in two places at one time, I ask that this part of the resolution be eliminated, that the committee have power to sit while the house is not sitting.

With this proviso, Mr. Speaker, we are perfectly agreeable to the adoption of this resolution and I would ask the Parliamentary Secretary to express his views on this question.

[*English*]

Mr. R. N. Thompson (Red Deer): Mr. Speaker, although I have not been a member of the Committee on Consumer Credit which sat during the twenty fifth and twenty sixth parliaments, I do not believe a committee has functioned in our House of Commons that has been of greater interest to the general public of Canada than this one. If my mail is typical of that which comes to the average member of parliament in so far as consumer credit is concerned, I am sure each one of us is aware that the public are becoming alarmed at the situation that exists today in regard to the cost of consumer credit.

[Mr. Laprise.]

I do not believe the pattern that has already been set this year will change very much and I believe also that the cost of living will continue to climb. With the cost of living rising each month, it has become more and more part of our way of life for credit to be one way in which people are able to obtain the purchasing power they need. I believe that if there is one area in our economy that more than any other suffers abuse, it is this one. I am grateful to the committees in past parliaments for the work they have done and I join the hon. member for Waterloo South (Mr. Saltsman) in saying that each one of us owes a debt to the co-chairmen of these committees for the work that has been done.

I realize that the hon. member for Renfrew South (Mr. Greene) will be replaced but I think both he and the hon. Senator who have been co-chairmen of the committee have done an admirable job. I trust they will be able to complete that work very quickly in order that a full report may be brought back to the house and we may take legislative action. I am afraid I must also join the hon. member for Waterloo South in expressing my concern at the remarks made by the hon. member for Wellington South (Mr. Hales) in regard to counsel both legal and accounting. If members of parliament are to give leadership in the formation of policy and draw up the type of legislation that I believe it is their responsibility to enact, certainly this committee must have the necessary counsel in order to do its work effectively. It may appear from the figures quoted this evening that the cost of legal counsel in particular is high—and I do not know whether such counsel can be obtained at a lower fee—but I believe it is a small price indeed to pay for the results that could be forthcoming from this committee.

• (8:20 p.m.)

I do not see how members of parliament will be able to deal with the type of witness that will be called before the committee unless they have the benefit of this kind of counsel. The matter that is being dealt with represents one of the more grave abuses in so far as the cost of credit is concerned. I feel it is all the more important, therefore, that the members of the committee have the very best counsel and research assistants, so that nothing will stop them from coming to conclusions which will enable them to make intelligent recommendations to this house.

I support the remarks made by the hon. member for Waterloo South (Mr. Saltsman), particularly what he said relating to the necessity for revealing the actual cost of credit expressed in a percentage of interest. There has been, and there is now, too much covering up in so far as the general public is concerned, and people are paying much more than they should for consumer credit. If those who are responsible for providing these facilities, facilities which are essential under the system under which we operate, extend credit, then I do not see why they should be ashamed of revealing the cost of that credit.

I believe this is typical of one area in which this committee has a very unique and special responsibility. The committee should act as quickly as possible and bring back a report with which this house can deal. We give our support to the motion, Mr. Speaker, and we trust that no time will be lost in setting up the committee, that it can get down to business quickly and return a report to this House of Commons.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Gilles Grégoire (Lapointe): Before it carries, Mr. Speaker, I wish to say that a moment ago the hon. member for Chapleau (Mr. Laprise) asked the Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Finance (Mr. Chrétien) whether the government was agreeable to delete the words:

to sit while the house is sitting

Since the beginning of the session a new procedure has been followed: When a committee wishes to sit during the sittings of the house, special permission is sought each time on motions, at the opening of the sitting.

Is the parliamentary secretary willing to amend the motion and delete the words:

to sit while the house is sitting?

[*English*]

Mr. Thompson: May I ask a question of the parliamentary secretary?

Mr. Speaker: If the parliamentary secretary speaks now, he will close the debate. The questions which are being raised now should have been asked of the parliamentary secretary when he had the floor a few moments ago. However, I do not want to stop these questions if they might help advance the work of the house. Perhaps the parliamentary secretary might be allowed to answer that question from the hon. member for Lapointe (Mr. Grégoire).

[*Translation*]

Mr. Grégoire: Mr. Speaker, I would simply ask a question. Is the parliamentary secretary willing to withdraw those few words without putting an end to the debate?

Mr. Chrétien: Impossible.

Mr. Speaker: Order. I should like the parliamentary secretary to answer simply. If he makes a statement, he will end the debate.

Mr. Grégoire: Without making a statement, Mr. Speaker.

[*English*]

Mr. Thompson: I wonder if I could put a question related to the one that is being asked?

Mr. Speaker: Order. This is the situation we get into under these conditions. We get into a debate which the Chair could not allow.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Grégoire: Mr. Speaker, I would like to have an answer, without prejudice.

Mr. Speaker: Order.

[*English*]

Order, please. If the parliamentary secretary speaks now he will close the debate.

Mr. Thompson: May I ask a question which he may answer at the same time?

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. The hon. member has the floor. There has to be some order in debate, and I will recognize the parliamentary secretary.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Grégoire: Mr. Speaker, I put a simple question.

[*English*]

Mr. Starr: I rise on a point of order. Your Honour has recognized the parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Finance.

Mr. Speaker: Yes, that is correct. In justice to the hon. member for Lapointe, who asked if he could ask a question, I thought this might be done simply and the answer given quickly. Apparently, this is going to cause difficulty, but I should allow the hon. member for Lapointe to complete his speech. The moment the parliamentary secretary takes the floor, that will terminate the debate.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Grégoire: Mr. Speaker, without necessarily wishing to participate in the debate, I wonder if, in order to shorten the debate, he should not be asked whether he wants to take out those words. If not, rather than let the debate end, we will move an amendment to the proposed resolution to delete these words. Is the parliamentary secretary willing—

Mr. Speaker: This would end the debate.

Mr. Grégoire: Even if he answers by a nod, Mr. Speaker?

An hon. Member: He has the right to answer.

Mr. Grégoire: Is he willing to take out the words?

Mr. Speaker: If the parliamentary secretary speaks now, he will end the debate.

Mr. Chrétien: Mr. Speaker, the hon. member for Waterloo South (Mr. Saltsman) made certain comments concerning the hiring of technical advisers such as counsel and accountants to help the committee. I should remind the hon. member for Waterloo South and the hon. member for Red Deer (Mr. Thompson) that, when this committee met during the last parliament, we realized the importance of experts to enlighten us. Even if the taking of decisions is our responsibility, there is preliminary work to be done and that is where technical advisers did an excellent job. They analysed each of the documents submitted and the great value of such outside assistance is readily appreciated. Besides, I do not think there was any abuse on our part. The committee met perhaps 18 times, but without those advisers, we might have had to hold 20, 30 or 40 meetings to analyse all the briefs submitted to us.

The legal adviser and the accountant really helped to reduce the number of sittings. I feel that in the interests of people who have to do business and often in the interest of small borrowers who are taken advantage of, $8,000 is a cheap price to pay to enable those people to save millions of dollars in future. I wish to thank members of the committee who referred to the needs of the committee, who showed a great deal of interest and spared no effort to make the committee a success. I think the house owed them this tribute.

With regard to the question raised by the hon. members for Chapleau and Lapointe (Messrs. Laprise and Grégoire) I admit that I am in a rather difficult position. I agreed to delete the words:

—to sit while the house is sitting—

On the other hand, I quite understand that, as suggested by the hon. member for Lapointe, we could move motions to be able to sit while the house is sitting, because if we have people from outside coming here for a day only, in the interest of these people who come to give information to the committee, we cannot take too much of their time and must allow them to give evidence the same day.

We will be happy to move motions at the end of each of those sittings. However, I wish to point out to the house that last year there was no abuse. If I am not mistaken, the committee on consumer credit sat only once while the house was sitting.

I do not think we overdid it in the past and we could ask the consent of the house to do so.

• (8:30 p.m.)

[*English*]

Mr. Thompson: May I ask the hon. member a question. We are given to understand that this committee is nearing the end of its work, that it is not necessary to hold too many meetings. In view of this I wonder whether the burden of meeting while the house is sitting is really such a problem.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Chrétien: I think that the remarks made by the hon. member for Red Deer are quite in order.

We have in committee considered most of the briefs submitted by the various associations. I do not think that we could study the remaining requests without coming quickly to a decision about the work that the committee did during the last two sessions.

[*English*]

Mr. Speaker: Before the motion is put to the house perhaps we should clarify the matter of the amendment which the parliamentary secretary says he wants to propose to the house. With respect, I would suggest that the parliamentary secretary does not himself have the power to move this amendment. Perhaps the government house leader might want to make the motion which would remove the words "to sit while the house is sitting, and". I assume that they are the

words that will have to be removed if the appropriate amendment can be prepared.

Mr. McIlraith: I am prepared to ask unanimous consent to withdraw those words from the motion as it stands, or I will move an amendment, as the case may be.

Mr. Speaker: Is there unanimous consent of the house to that?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Motion agreed to.

PARLIAMENTARY RESTAURANT

MOTION FOR APPOINTMENT OF JOINT COMMITTEE

Hon. G. J. McIlraith (Minister of Public Works) moved:

That a joint committee of the Senate and House of Commons be appointed respecting the Parliamentary Restaurant:

That twenty five members of the House of Commons, to be designated at a later date, act on behalf of this House as members of the said committee and report from time to time, and that Standing Order 67 (1) be suspended in relation thereto; and

That a message be sent to the Senate acquainting Their Honours thereof.

Mr. H. W. Herridge (Kootenay West): Mr. Speaker, I do not want to delay the passage of this resolution for more than a few moments but I am rising to inquire whether the house leader can tell the house what actual authority this committee has. I was informed last year that the committee made recommendations to the Speaker regarding certain personnel on the restaurant staff, but no action was taken. I have talked to several members of the committee who were very concerned about this.

This committee has been appointed for many years on the understanding that its recommendations will be accepted. Two other members of the committee intended to be present this evening but they are unavoidably absent, and on their account I am rising to ask these questions of the house leader. Members do not want to sit on this committee spending their time making recommendations and presenting a report only to find that all their work has been futile. Would the house leader inform the house as to the status of this committee, and whether it has the same standing as other committees of the house.

Mr. J. Chester MacRae (York-Sunbury): Mr. Speaker, I support the stand taken by the hon. member for Kootenay West (Mr. Herridge). I was going to ask exactly the same question that he has asked. About three years ago I served on this committee, and to the best of my knowledge—and I do not think I missed any notices—we met once one morning. We had breakfast in the restaurant, which was very pleasant. Afterwards a small committee was appointed to look at the restaurant, and that was the last of it for that particular session. I repeat that I support what has been said by the hon. member for Kootenay West. It seems to me that this committee has done nothing, so why are we setting it up?

Mr. Speaker: If the minister speaks now he will close the debate.

Hon. G. J. McIlraith (Minister of Public Works): Mr. Speaker, the answer to the question involves my giving a legal opinion, which ordinarily I would hesitate to do; but since there will be no charge perhaps I can risk violating the rule a little. I am aware of the problem. The former committee did do considerable work, some of which was very good work; I would acknowledge that at once. However, a problem arose after the last committee was appointed, apparently because it attempted to take executive action for which it did not have authority. The committee has authority only to report to the house. When it does report to the house it is then a matter of taking action on that report.

If that action involves the raising of new expenditures, this has to be done through a procedure outlined in some rather old legislation whereby the Clerk of the House prepares his estimates and the Commissioners of Internal Economy have to approve the expenditures. If it is merely something of an administrative nature, I believe I am right in saying that this can be done through administrative action which is the responsibility of His Honour the Speaker.

That is the position of this committee. Perhaps it is a little uncertain, because it depends on what type of action is taken when it makes a recommendation. I did look into the problem when the last committee was active, and this is precisely where the difficulty lay.

Having said that, and the government having brought forward this measure, the Commissioners of Internal Economy, who consist of four ministers of the Crown along with His Honour the Speaker, will take very

careful cognizance of any recommendations made by the committee. I would of course feel it improper for me to indicate the actions to be taken by His Honour the Speaker, but I am sure we can rely on his unerring good judgment and good taste.

Mr. Herridge: Just one question to clear my mind, Mr. Speaker. Would the minister approve of a judicial inquiry into the rights and responsibilities of this committee?

Mr. McIlraith: No, Mr. Speaker. But having read the legislation on the subject, and having studied it rather thoroughly, I must say that I wish at some time we could have some good judicial ability to put to work to draft a new bill.

Hon. Marcel Lambert (Edmonton West): Just one small point, Mr. Speaker. This does not mean that there will be 24 chefs and 24 "maîtres d's" acting independently, does it? In the past there have been unfortunate occurrences where members on the restaurant committee have suddenly decided that they would take over management of the restaurant and kitchen, which resulted in much chaos.

Motion agreed to.

Mr. McIlraith: Mr. Speaker, I wonder whether at this point in the proceedings I might have the indulgence of the house to ask whether it wishes to call item No. 25, the motion to set up the joint committee on divorce. I understand there will be no debate on that.

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

• (8:40 p.m.)

DIVORCE

MOTION TO ESTABLISH JOINT COMMITTEE

Hon. G. J. McIlraith (Minister of Public Works) moved:

That a Special Joint Committee of the Senate and House of Commons be appointed to inquire into and report upon divorce in Canada and the social and legal problems relating thereto, and such matters as may be referred to it by either house;

That 24 members of the House of Commons, to be designated by the house at a later date, be members of the Special Joint Committee, and that Standing Order 67 (1) of the House of Commons be suspended in relation thereto;

That the committee have power to engage the services of such technical, clerical and other personnel as may be necessary for the purpose of the inquiry;

That the committee have the power to send for persons, papers and records, to examine witnesses,

[Mr. McIlraith.]

to report from time to time, and to print such papers and evidence from day to day as may be ordered by the committee, and that Standing Order 66 be suspended in relation thereto; and

That a message be sent to the Senate requesting Their Honours to unite with this house for the above purpose, and to select, if the Senate deems it so advisable, some of its members to act on the proposed Special Joint Committee.

Mr. Stanley Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): May I just ask one question before the minister closes the debate. Will the private members' bills that were referred to the Standing Committee on Justice and Legal Affairs be withdrawn from that committee, and be referred to this joint committee?

Mr. McIlraith: Yes, Mr. Speaker. I have that motion here.

Motion agreed to.

Hon. G. J. McIlraith (Minister of Public Works) moved:

That the order of the house of Monday, February 21, 1966, referring the subject matter of the following bills to the Standing Committee on Justice and Legal Affairs, namely:

Bill C-16, An Act to provide in Canada for the dissolution of marriage (additional grounds for divorce).

Bill C-19, An Act to provide in Canada for the dissolution and the annulment of marriage.

Bill C-41, An Act to amend the British North America Acts, 1867 to 1965, (provincial marriage and divorce laws).

Bill C-44, An Act to provide in Canada for the dissolution of marriage.

Bill C-55, An Act to provide in Canada for the dissolution of marriage.

Bill C-58, An Act respecting marriage and divorce.

Bill C-79, An Act to amend the Dissolution and Annulment of Marriages Act (additional grounds for divorce).

be discharged and that the subject matter of the same bills be referred to the Joint Committee of the Senate and the House of Commons on Divorce.

Mr. Robert McCleave (Halifax): I wonder if the minister would be good enough to add the words, "together with the subject matter of Bill C-133."

Mr. McIlraith: Mr. Speaker, I have come to the conclusion that that bill, together with certain other bills which came on the order paper after the bills I have mentioned were referred to the standing committee on justice and legal affairs, should also be referred to the new committee. I would agree that Bill C-133 and the other divorce bills remaining on the order paper should be referred to the new committee, but this should be done in private members' hour.

Motion agreed to.

BRETTON WOODS AGREEMENTS ACT

PROVISION FOR PAYMENT OF SUBSCRIPTIONS BY CANADA

Hon. G. J. McIlraith (for the Minister of Finance) moved that the house go into committee to consider the following resolution:

That it is expedient to introduce a measure to amend the Bretton Woods Agreements Act to provide for the payment, out of the Consolidated Revenue Fund, to the International Monetary Fund and the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development of sums not exceeding in the whole an amount equivalent to the subscriptions thereto required from Canada, that is to say, one thousand five hundred and thirty-two million United States dollars.

Motion agreed to and the house went into committee, Mr. Batten in the chair.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Chrétien: Mr. Chairman, the main objective of the resolution under consideration, namely a measure to amend the Bretton Woods Agreements Act, is to enable Canada to keep on supporting actively the work of the International Monetary Fund by providing for an increased Canadian contribution to the resources of that institution.

The bill provides for the increase of our contribution to the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development.

Finally, the act will amend the existing act so that the reports submitted to parliament under that act will bear on the calendar year rather than the financial year.

In 1964, at the annual meeting of the international monetary fund, there was considerable support for an increase in the assets of the fund, and its governors, including the Minister of Finance of the day, supported a resolution instructing the board of governors to the fund to see whether it would not be possible to increase their assets by increasing quotas.

At the beginning of last year, the managing director proposed, in his report, a general increase of 25 per cent of all quotas in force on February 26, 1965, subject to deferred payments in the case of less developed countries facing payment difficulties.

The report also recommended additional increases in quotas for 16 member countries, including Canada, in view of the relatively high rate of growth of the economy and foreign trade of these countries, since the last revision of the quotas, in 1959.

Undoubtedly, it is proper for Canada to participate in the general increase in the assets at the disposal of the fund and, in addition, to accept a special increase in its quota.

Consequently, the former minister of finance, Mr. Gordon, in his capacity as governor of the fund for Canada, voted in favour of the proposed increase in quotas and the government is now asking the house to approve an amendment to the Bretton Woods Agreements Act, to enable Canada to increase its subscription. Canada has taken an active and leading part in the International Monetary Fund since its establishment in 1946 under the Bretton Woods Agreements Acts.

As a central organization dealing with international monetary problems, the Fund has achieved a noteworthy success in the pursuit of its commendable aims.

The latter, stipulated in the statutes of the Fund, are designed to encourage international monetary co-operation, to promote the development of international exchanges, to promote the stability of exchange, to contribute to the establishment of a multilateral system of international payments with regard to current transactions by making available to its members medium term resources, so as to enable them to make up their deficiencies in the balance of payments without resorting to measures likely to affect international prosperity and to shorten the duration and decrease the intensity of the imbalance of international payments of member states.

The significant success achieved since 1946 in the attainment of these aims has enabled our country to grow and to prosper even though it depends to a great extent on trade and international movements of capital.

If we actively support the Fund, it is because we believe the aims pursued initially are still of current interest and their achievement is very important for Canada.

It must be kept in mind that even though Canada is at present an important creditiste—

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh.

Mr. Chrétien: —creditor nation of the Fund, in 1962, when Canada experienced an exchange crisis, our country become a net debtor in the amount of $275 million which was finally paid up at the end of 1964. The additional amount of our subscription to the Fund will help generally to improve the international monetary liquidity by increasing the resources of the International Monetary Fund.

As you know, Canada was an active participant in the discussions at the International

Monetary Fund and the Group of Ten, discussions which, it is hoped, will lead to new arrangements to ensure that future international requirements of owned reserves and withdrawal rights can be honoured.

The increase in our subscription will also make available to Canada additional amounts of internation credit against which withdrawals can be made, if needed. It is in our interest that withdrawal rights on the International Monetary Fund be increased in accordance to our share of world trade. Finally, this special increase will protect Canada's strong and influential position with the International Monetary Fund as the sixth most important quota holder.

The implementation of the Administrator's suggestions will mean that the resources of the Fund will increase from the present 15.8 billion to approximately 21 billion in United States dollars. Canada's share in this increase will bring its quota from 550 million U.S.A. dollars to 740 millions, of which 42 millions will constitute our special share. Of this total increase, one fourth or 47.5 million U.S.A. dollars will be payable in gold to the Fund out of our exchange reserves. The rest will be payable in Canadian dollars.

It has not been found necessary at this time to increase generally the resources of the international Bank for Reconstruction and Development.

According to the policy of the Bank and the Fund, any country who is attributed a special increase of its quota in the Internation Monetary Fund must increase its subscription to the Bank by an amount equivalent to the special increase of the Fund quota, in order to maintain in the two bodies the same vote ratio of the country concerned. It was therefore suggested that Canada's subscription to the I.B.R.D. be increased by 42 million United States dollars, which would bring it to $792 million.

Of this additional sum, 1 per cent or $420,000 will be payable either in gold or in U.S.A. dollars, and 9 per cent or $3,780,000 in Canadian currency; the balance would go to increase Canada's subscription which serves as security for I.B.R.D. loans on the capital markets of the member countries.

The proposed quota increases became effective when 59 member countries of the Fund holding over 66⅔ per cent of the votes in the Fund agreed to the increase suggested in their particular case.

[Mr. Chrétien.]

Before the government of Canada agrees to the quota increase suggested in its case, the present ceiling of our obligations to the Fund and the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development—obligations which total 1,300 million U.S.A. dollars—must be raised by $232 million to 1,532 million U.S.A. dollars, so as to meet Canada's increased quota to the Fund as well as its subscription to the Bank. The proposed amendment to section 5 of the Bretton Woods Agreements Act is precisely to this effect.

Section 7 of this Act now requires the Minister of Finance to present to Parliament, within 30 days following the end of each fiscal year, a report on the operations under the Act for that fiscal year. However, as the fiscal year of the government of Canada does not coincide with that of the two aforementioned institutions, officials of the latter have been called upon in the past to do a great deal of work in order to provide us with information in a form suited to our needs.

The amendment we propose to bring to section 7 of the Act will correct that situation and specifically allow reports to be submitted on a calendar-year basis. In addition, we should like those reports to put greater emphasis than in the past on operations which are of special interest and importance for Canada.

• (8:50 p.m.)

[*English*]

Mr. Lambert: First, I compliment the parliamentary secretary on the performance of his task of introducing a bill, or representing his minister during the present stage of this bill. Perhaps I might from this distance offer him a word of advice. He might look back over the records of *Hansard* during the years between 1958 and 1962. I would commend the presentation and the performance of my hon. friend from Carleton who occupied the post of parliamentary secretary to the Minister of Finance and who acquitted himself so well at that time in his approach to these somewhat difficult and technical matters.

Mr. Mackasey: On a point of order. I think that is an inference that the parliamentary secretary is not carrying out his job with dignity and a certain degree of competence. I, for one, resent that inference.

Mr. Lambert: I am amazed at the thin-skinned susceptibility of the hon. member for Verdun. I was pointing out that the hon. member for Carleton had done very well. I

said nothing to complain about the performance of the present parliamentary secretary.

Mr. Mackasey: Then why compare it to the performance of the hon. member for Carleton in the years up to 1962?

Mr. Lambert: Perhaps the example which was set is something to be emulated in this house. It is something that not too many parliamentary secretaries were given the privilege of doing. In the same way, I might point out to next year's grand marshal of the St. Patrick's parade in Montreal what the hon. gentleman did, but I trust that somebody else would not be thin-skinned and say this was an odious comparison.

I would have hoped that the parliamentary secretary when dealing with the amendments to the Bretton Woods Agreements Act would have enlightened the house by incorporating in his remarks a table showing the present and the proposed contributions both to the International Monetary Fund and to the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development, as was done by the minister of finance in 1959, as appears from page 3851 of *Hansard* for that year. Such a table is most constructive. Perhaps this could be done at a later stage and permission could be obtained from the house to put these figures on record.

It certainly is constructive to compare the contributions being made by the various countries which participate in the work of these organizations. In addition, because the increases in contributions required vary from country to country, and since this variation represents possibly an assessment of economic development in each of these countries, such a table does show what the directors of the I.M.F. and the I.B.R.D. considered to be the increase in economic activity and international trade of the particular countries concerned. We could either derive some satisfaction at the progress which has been made by Canada on a relative basis or we might have to content ourselves with a more modest appreciation of our efforts. As we know, the act was originally passed in 1945, as it appears in chapter 19 of the Revised Statutes of Canada. It incorporated the statutory form of Canadian participation in the International Monetary Fund and the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development, and at the same time it was a ratification of the Bretton Woods Agreements.

I know that in 1959 the members of the opposition at that time, as well as the members of the New Democratic party, supported wholeheartedly the agreements and the increase in the assessment. At that time there were no members of the Social Credit party or of the Creditiste party in this house; but casting our memory back we recognize that the Bretton Woods Agreements were the work of the devil, apparently, in the minds of certains members of the Social Credit party.

• (9:00 p.m.)

I am just wondering whether this philosophy is continued with those who now have come back in this house, or whether this is one of the doctrines of the Social Credit party that had better lie buried forever. In any event, Canada's original contribution was set at $700 million. In 1959 this was amended to $1,300 million, and we now are being asked to increase our contribution, or our commitments, to the International Monetary Fund to $1,532 million. If I caught correctly the text of the parliamentary secretary, I understand that this is an increase of approximately 25 per cent.

Now, Canada's contribution to the International Monetary Fund in 1959 was increased from $300 million to $550 million and in respect of the I.B.R.D. from $325 million to $750 million. What I am particularly interested in is, what will this mean in an actual outlay of cash, notes or gold, and/or our obligations? I believe the parliamentary secretary did give some figures, but I did not get them.

I may be digressing a little from the subject, but in looking over the past debates in 1959 I came across something in the record of *Hansard* which was confusing. Every reference to the International Monetary Fund, to the World Bank, and the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development, was in lower case letters. It was impossible to determine, unless you looked, very closely at the text, whether you were getting the name of an institution or an international body. This is an old sore point I think with regard to *Hansard,* one with which I never have agreed and which I trust is being amended so that all of the proper names will appear capitalized so that they are immediately recognizable.

We know that since 1959 the International Monetary Fund has come to the assistance of

various countries. The parliamentary secretary mentioned Canada's recourse to the fund in 1962. Certainly Britain has found, much to her solace, the fact that she could have had on perhaps three occasions since 1959 loans to shore up her defences against an attack on the pound, and I am sure there are many other countries.

I have not studied the annual report of the International Monetary Fund sufficiently to ascertain what countries have obtained this support, but I am sure that the I.M.F. and the I.D.R.B. have justified fully their existence and that they really are the instrument whereby the gnomes, shall we say, of the international financial markets can be defeated in their sort of pressing activities upon the currencies of the various countries from time to time. I do not know whether this will continue in its present form, in view of the activities or suggestions of the French government that the unit of international value shall not be the United States dollar, but that we are being pushed into some form of gold standard. Well, I think this will take a great deal of careful study, because I am rather suspicious of what may be happening in this regard.

There is one point, however, in respect of which I perhaps may have some sympathy with a number of countries. This is a point which has been raised in this house by a number of speakers from time to time; that is, that since the United States is the biggest contributor to the World Bank and the International Monetary Fund by reason of its predominant economic position in the world and because the headquarters are in the United States, therefore there is a danger that the operations of the International Monetary Fund might become an extension of the United States foreign policy. I am not saying in all respects this might be bad; but one must be aware of this potential tendency. Certainly there have been charges in the financial pages of the press from time to time by representatives of certain countries that the United States operates directly through its predominant position in the I.M.F. so as to further its own foreign policy. This may have been the case at the time of the Aswan dam—it is hard to say. In any event, on behalf of the opposition I certainly do agree that the amendments should come forward and that this resolution should pass, after examination by representatives of the other parties.

[Mr. Lambert.]

Mr. Cameron (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands): Mr. Chairman, it always is interesting to note that a measure which very well may affect the lives of everyone in the western world is one that usually excites very little interest either here, in the press, or on the part of the public. I suppose it is because it appears to be a rather dull subject. The measure before us is a fairly simple one, to increase Canada's contribution to the International Monetary Fund and to the World Bank.

There is of course a background to this, Mr. Chairman, which has not yet been made public so far as I know, but which I think can be discussed with a certain discretion. I think it is fairly common knowledge among those who watch these events that there has been a growing concern in recent years about the question of the international liquidity that has been brought about largely by the situation in which the United States finds itself.

• (9:10 p.m.)

It is three years ago now that I raised this question at an international conference in Belgrade. I pointed out at that time that the rest of the world, a short period before that, had really received notice from the U.S.A. that it was now no longer going to be able to finance, to the degree it had been doing, the exchange reserves of a large part of the world, contributions that were brought about inadvertently, or at least without deliberate purpose, by the development of deficits within the United States. At that time the announcement of the Interest Equalization Act was the notice to which I have referred.

Ever since that time there have been continuing reports in the press of discussions, particularly among the Big Ten countries, of which Canada is one, on the necessity of reconsidering our whole problem of international exchange. I think it is no secret that the Canadian government has been playing a prominent part in these recent conversations and is preparing, if it has not already done so, to present to the other members of the so-called Big Ten, certain proposals for the development of what I would term the new unit of international exchange—a cautious step, shall I say, perhaps in keeping with our usual caution in world affairs, by which we do not quite cut the umbilical cord of gold but we do attenuate it to some extent.

I am reminded that at the time the Bretton Woods Agreements was drafted, the late John Maynard Keynes proposed at that time a new

international unit, which he suggested should be called bancor. It is possible that Maynard Keynes made a rather rash comment in introducing his idea at the Bretton Woods conference, pointing out that if the conference accepted his idea it would be the first step toward global administration, which immediately caused a scurry of anxiety and apprehension, and his proposal got no further. I suspect, sir, that before long we are going to have to deal with this in somewhat the same manner that Lord Keynes suggested at Bretton Woods.

We have had a series of currency crises, and there seems no reason that there will not be more currency crises in future, with the great increase in world trade and the growing stringency in international liquidity.

There is another aspect of our problem, Mr. Chairman, which ties in very directly with the question of the International Monetary Fund and its position in the world in the future. That is the relationship between the developed countries and the undeveloped parts of the world where there is, of course, a common saying that the gap between the poor and the rich countries is growing wider and is, to some extent, to be accounted for by the difficulties that the emerging countries have in obtaining sufficient foreign exchange to finance their development.

I would hope that we shall hear more of the proposals of the Canadian government with regard to the new unit of international exchange during discussion of this bill, if it is to be referred to the Committee on Finance, Trade and Economic Affairs, which I hope it will be. And I hope, if it is referred to that committee, that the Minister of Finance will undertake to have appear before the committee some of the leading figures, most of whom are quite readily available in the United States, who have been advancing various ideas for the solution, or at least the amelioration of this problem of international liquidity.

I think, sir, one might say that we are now facing in the international scene somewhat the same situation that national economies faced some 30 years ago when most of the countries were attempting to maintain the gold standard, and were strangling themselves in that attempt. I think we have now reached somewhat the same position internationally; that we are going to have to break away from a fixed relationship that must restrict the expansion of world trade in future unless some rough equivalent to the managed currencies with which modern societies operate is found in the international field.

I notice the suggestion of the hon. member for Edmonton West that there might be danger of American domination of the world through the operations of the International Monetary Fund and the World Bank. It is, of course, quite true that it was at the instigation of the United States that the World Bank withdrew its proposed financing of the Aswan dam in the United Arab Republic, to my mind a disastrous move for which we have been paying ever since.

This may well be the case, but I do not know how you can overcome that because the United States is at the present time the most powerful and wealthy nation in the world. One can only hope that those who are in charge of the United States policy will take a larger view than merely the immediate interests of the United States, and realize that the well-being and prosperity of the American nation is as dependent as that of any other nation on general world prosperity and development, and will be prepared to use their tremendous power and influence towards developing the undeveloped areas of the world and, by that means, ensuring some peace and stability.

I would just conclude by again asking the parliamentary secretary, and through him the Minister of Finance, to consider the referral of this bill to the Committee on Finance Trade and Economic Affairs, and to make arrangements for various people, of whom I am quite sure the Minister of Finance is well aware, to attend and give us some advice as to the possibilities and the dangers that lie before us in the field of international exchange.

Mr. Thompson: Mr. Chairman, in following the hon. member for Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands I would just say we trust that this legislation can be referred to the Committee on Finance and Economic Affairs without much delay. I believe the situation relating to foreign exchange is rapidly reaching a crisis, and something different from what has been done already will be necessary. We in this house will want answers to many of the questions that are in our minds at the present time with respect to the whole area of international settlement. In fact, I would say that the whole area of international settlement, apart perhaps from the international situation in southeast Asia, is the most critical problem

we face on the general scene today. Certainly it is a problem for us here in Canada.

The other day in the financial section of the *Globe and Mail*, dated March 9, I noticed that our own situation is emphasized by the fact that Canadian borrowings on the United States capital market are running at a rate 11 times more than they were in 1965.

It stated:

> A total of $172,880,000 in U.S.-pay issues had been offered by the end of February by Canadian governments and corporations, compared with only $15,000,000 in the first two months of last year, according to the monthly compilation by Wood, Gundy and Co. Ltd.

Likewise, Mr. Chairman, this point is emphasized on the international front by the fact that the big ten in international finance recently had an important meeting in Europe and, owing to the policies of France, they found themselves in a situation for which it was most difficult to find a solution.

From the limited amount of news which has come from that meeting we find there were three main ideas being presented as alternatives. One of them, and I think it is the one secretary Fowler of the United States treasury is advancing, is that we must retain the present gold standard, with probably a few innovations such as we are being asked to make here, by increasing our own contributions to the International Monetary Fund.

• (9:20 p.m.)

Then there are those who believe that the gold standard must be scrapped altogether and an entirely new basis of exchange provided. There are others who feel that the gold standard must be maintained although it must be modified. Amongst the latter are those who believe that, gold having maintained a constant value for the past 30 years, it must be decreased in value; that it is not reasonable to expect that the standard price of gold 30 years ago should apply or function effectively today; that the cost of living has more than doubled across the world and therefore they advocate a major revision of the gold policy.

The Social Credit party—I say this for the benefit of the hon. member for Edmonton West who made some remarks in this regard a short while ago—advocates a measure that will get us out of the situation we are in, and we believe this can only be done by a completely new approach to the problem of international settlements. We go along with the hon. member who preceded me in saying that in the same way that the gold standard was put aside in the mid-1930's on a national basis, so the time has come when the gold standard has to be revised at the international level as well. Not until this has been done will we avoid crises such as we have at the present time, in which we are being asked to increase our contribution to help solve this problem of international liquidity.

[Mr. Thompson.]

It is a very serious problem that we face in this regard. It is interesting to note that prior to the time the Bretton Woods Agreements was first reached, Prime Minister Churchill had made a commitment to President Roosevelt that he would do everything he could to get Britain back on to the gold standard in order to strengthen the position of the United States. The situation which they then anticipated, developed following the end of the war. As a result we have now reached the point where there is no question at all that this whole policy of international settlements is tied part and parcel with the policy of the United States treasury. I think it goes even farther than that. I believe it goes right to the whole closed shop for monetary reform that is at the present time operated by the international bankers of the world.

I should like to put on the record a few sentences from "The New Republic" of September 25, 1965, in relation to this problem. The only reason I do so is that it might provide a little background when this bill is considered by the committee and might allow an understanding of the critical situation represented by what this bill proposes to do relating to the over-all picture of international settlements. This article is entitled "Closed Shop for Monetary Reform" and was written by one Nathaniel McKitterick, whose name I think is familiar to most of us. The article reads as follows:

> The Benevolent and Protective Order of Central Bankers, gathered this week in Washington—

This was last fall at the last meeting of the International Monetary Fund.

> —for the annual meeting of the International Monetary Fund, is wrestling with a major constitutional crisis. The Bankers Union has been running the international monetary system for as long as there has been an organized system. They have been running it according to a set of rigid rules which have only been basically and deliberately changed twice and then only in conjunction with two catastrophes—the Great Depression and World War II. Now the bankers face the challenge of changing the rules in advance of catastrophe—a challenge they have never met before.
>
> The Bankers Union is in a bind because its jurisdiction over money—or more precisely over the maintenance of confidence in money—is threatened. And good members of the Bankers Union, like good trade unionists, regard their first

duty to be protection of their jurisdiction against intrusion by outsiders.

The threat to the bankers' jurisdiction comes, not from another union, but from responsible political leaders—that is, politicians responsible to the voters for their offices. This threat has grown ever since the old gold standard was abolished and responsible political leaders, instead of submitting to the tyranny of gold, started to follow deliberate and discretionary policies to reconcile the often competing objectives of domestic price stability and high employment levels. Now the Bankers Union fears, and with good cause, that responsible leaders may want to reduce the role of gold as an international medium of control in favour of discretionary policies, implemented through the international monetary system, to sustain increasing flows of goods and capital among countries.

The reason why so many people, even some in the Bankers Union, are saying that the rules of the monetary system must be changed is that the present system threatens to force a serious contraction in world trade and investment (and in domestic growth rates in countries particularly short of reserves)—

This is the situation that is developing in the United States today, because their continuing imbalance of trade and foreign credits is something which they realize cannot continue. The article goes on:

—when it ought to be sustaining and encouraging expansion. The present system relies on dollars and pounds sterling to overcome the inability of gold to provide the "liquidity"—the means of payment—to finance expanding world trade and investment.

We may criticize the President of the Republic of France for some of the things he is suggesting in regard to this particular problem, but when one understands the problem that France faces—and it is the problem that many other nations face; it is the problem that Canada faces also—perhaps some of the things he is saying make more sense than we give them credit for. The article continues:

Gold has long since ceased to supply more than a fraction of the needed international reserves; over the past seven years foreign holdings of dollars have accounted for about three-quarters of the total. However, the system has an inherent weakness; the very U.S. payments deficits which make the creation of new reserves possible were deemed by the Bankers Union to undermine foreign confidence in the dollar; central bankers, under the existing rules, could not continue to accumulate dollars in their reserves and in fact began to reduce their holdings by buying U.S. gold.

I might add, in the same way as France has been doing, to a point of danger as far as the system is concerned. The article goes on:

With the elimination of the major source of new reserves—dollars—it is generally agreed that the present system will be unable to generate adequate amounts of "liquidity" in the future.

This is why at the present time it is necessary for the International Monetary Fund to come to Canada and ask for an increase in our contribution. The article continues:

In fact, many highly qualified observers, including Sir Roy Harrod, feel that the world is already in need of greatly increased reserves. But even if some of them grant the need privately, it is nearly impossible for members of the Bankers Union to do anything about it in public. Any step to increase reserves, by creating a new international monetary unit to provide the base for expanding world credit, will inevitably grant responsible political leaders a larger discretionary role in the operation of the monetary system than is now the case; any practical reform will change the existing rules somewhat and at least potentially weaken the bankers' jurisdiction as the upholders of confidence in money. It is nearly impossible, constitutionally, for the Bankers Union to address itself to fundamental changes in its rules. Change means risk and risk is something that bankers must avoid if they wish other people to entrust their money to them. The bankers are the prisoners of their occupation, indentured to gold.

I think it would be very revealing to find out just what proposals Canada made at the meeting of the 10 major financial powers, held in Belgium last week. I believe this points up the fact that Canada must take the lead, for her own survival if for no other reason, in bringing forward an alternative proposal in this whole area of international settlements. It means a medium of exchange other than gold, because we in the Social Credit party maintain that gold is just as inadequate today on the international scene as it was in 1935 in Canada.

• (9:30 p.m.)

So, Mr. Chairman, we are not dealing just with our share of the increased contribution, we are dealing with something that is far more important. It goes back to the basis of the Bretton Woods Agreements itself. It goes back to the problem that developed first during the depression days of the thirties. It became acute during world war II, when we were forced to make changes because of this emergency. During the depression years, world trade had dropped to less than 50 per cent of what it had been during the twenties. When consumer goods came back on the market, trade again became vital to the economy of our nation. The nations were able to bridge the gap for a while longer. However, we are moving into an area where this crisis is just ahead of us. This time, we are faced with the task of having to provide a solution before the crisis reaches us because if it does come upon us it will create a situation even more intolerable than we can visualize if war came again.

I am convinced, Mr. Chairman, that the only basis upon which the total development of our resources in the world, both human and material, can go forward, is the continued expansion of world trade. It must be possible for us to exchange our goods back and forth as the needs and the markets provide the opportunity. Unless the whole set-up for international settlements is brought in line with this need, then we are going to continue with a situation in which the rich nations get richer and the poor nations get poorer. We have this intolerable situation where millions of people are starving to death in the face of plenty, where we cannot provide for three billion people when there could be twenty billion people within the same area. We are not solving this problem, simply because the closed shop of the bankers' union is more interested in perpetuating the power they now hold than in meeting the greatest need of this world today, namely, an increase in world trade. We need a situation in which the goods that are available, whether they be primary or secondary in nature, are able to reach the people who need them.

After all, the only reason we produce anything is so that we can consume it. The only basis upon which we can interchange these things, be they goods or services, is by the monetary system. The monetary system, as it relates to the particular issue before us, is an international one. I am convinced there will have to be a completely new organization for international settlements, with a new medium of exchange if we are ever going to accomplish the expansion of world trade.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I do not intend to speak longer. However, I should like to say for the record that I believe this is one of the most inportant problems that we face in this parliament. It is not going to be good enough to go along and say, sure, Canada is a good fellow; Canada is always willing to do her share; Canada is going to put up another $45 million—to perpetuate what? We are doing this to perpetuate the arrangements for international settlements, and those arrangements are not working. They cannot work, because the basis is wrong.

It is not until we realize this fact that we will come up with the suggestions that ought to be made to conferences such as the annual meeting of the International Monetary Fund. I hope we step out and say that we who can be the bread basket of the world, are willing to set a basis for world trade which the world must have in future years if we are ever going to have a peaceful development, if we are ever going to meet the needs of human beings.

In closing, I would just say we believe this matter must go to the committee. We hope that when it does the government will agree that we can discuss the matter in greater depth, and we will not be limited to the question of whether or not we intend to make this contribution. I agree we are going to have to make the contribution until some other arrangement is adopted. I emphasize that this is one of the most important problems that faces us so far as the international scene is concerned. This is one area in which we can give leadership, and we can show the United States that the system they are advocating, as Mr. Fowler has said repeatedly during the last few days, is wrong so far as the development of commerce in the world is concerned.

Mr. McLean (Charlotte): Mr. Chairman, I did not intend to say anything about this world monetary situation, since I came in late. However, I have been a world trader for the last 50 years. Before the first great war we had a unit of settlement in the world and that was the pound sterling. All settlements were made in London, no matter where in the world you were trading. They were made on the basis of the pound sterling. After the first great war, England lost her commerce. She was drained of her gold, and she could no longer act as a world banker.

Before the first great war, England was a free trader. She had a surplus of currency beyond her world requirements and she invested that surplus around the world. She lost money on her investments, but she kept world trade moving. After the first world war, the United States was not a free trade nation. She was a tariff country and she said, we will take your gold but we will not take your products. The United States accumulated a lot of gold.

• (9:40 p.m.)

I attribute the collapse in 1929 to the fact that the United States was not a free trade nation, would not take products but would take gold. When she got all the gold, trade was at a standstill. In my opinion, it is world trade that keeps things moving. We had the collapse in 1929, and the hungry thirties. Then, President Roosevelt, that great President of the United States, came on the scene. Prices were down. Potatoes were 10 cents a barrel; copper was down to 9 cents a pound,

or something like that. Somebody told President Roosevelt that if he would raise the price of gold, he would raise prices. He raised the price of gold from $20.67 to $35 an ounce. This move did not raise world prices, but it certainly adjusted the exchanges around the world. At that time the pound in South Africa was $8; in Australia, $3 and in the West Indies it was something else. We could not possibly trade because the exchanges were all different. When President Roosevelt raised the price of gold to $35 an ounce, the exchanges of the world were adjusted to $35. I know whereof I speak because at that time many factories were idle. Within a month when world trade became adjusted those factories were working and prices came up. Although I do not think it was the President's idea to bring up world prices, they were brought up owing to the restoration of world trade.

We have a different situation today. The United States is the banker of the world and the United States dollar is the world's unit of settlement, not the pound sterling. The pound sterling is backed by the U.S. dollar and if the U.S. dollar fails so does the pound sterling. The U.S. dollar is based on gold, according to the United States government.

In 1934 when gold was $35 an ounce the U.S. dollar was worth $1. Today the purchasing power of the U.S. dollar is only 44 cents. That is agreed to by all business magazines. Therefore how can 44 cents buy the same amount of gold that $1 bought in 1934? It is impossible.

The United States government owes $30 billion on demand. De Gaulle of France, or any of the central banks of Europe, can demand their money and the U.S. government must pay them in gold. The United States government is now proposing a new unit of settlement which is based on paper, known as the c.r.u. Countries put so much money into the monetary fund, and this new c.r.u. unit is based on paper, not on gold.

Why does the United States say that gold is worth $35 an ounce when the double eagle $20 gold piece of the United States is sold in Europe for $45. We sold $50 million Canadian gold to the United States for $50 million U.S.; but if we minted double eagles selling for $45 in Europe our gold would be worth twice what it is worth today.

I see no reason to continue participating in the International Monetary Fund. The fund is directed by the United States which, as far as I can see, uses it to further its own interests. If that country does not wish to base its money on gold, it should do what we do in this country and base its money on the resources of the country, letting gold find its own value.

In 1934 many precious metals went up in value by 50 per cent, but gold remains the same. This is an impossible situation. Whether gold backs the currency or not, it must go up in price. Take, for example, the little Portuguese settlement of Macao off the coast of China. They imported $1,500 million in gold which can be bought in England a few cents per ounce over the $35 price. The Portuguese government takes a commission of $1 an ounce. That gold is hoarded. Every year the mines of the world produce $1,400 million in gold. Some $1 billion goes into hoarding and $400 million goes into our central banks.

We cannot go on in this way; yet the United States says it is not going to raise the price of gold. If you do not raise the price of gold you let the dollar go.

No bank in Canada will sell gold. Neither can it be bought in the United States. If you are found with a bar of gold in the United States you go to the penitentiary. You cannot buy gold in England as a citizen of that country, either. But we find citizens of the United States coming to Canada to buy up our gold mines. Little Longlac was bought up by United States citizens and they took the treasury and bought up other gold mines. You will find, Mr. Speaker, that citizens of the United States own most of the gold mines in Canada. This is because Canadians cannot mine their own gold, although United States citizens can own our gold mines. The United States should divorce its dollar from the gold standard and the dollar should become the international unit of payment.

We have the dollar in Canada. For a $50 bill we can get 50 $1 bills, or two $20 bills and a $10 bill, or we can get silver. But we cannot get gold. We can buy bar gold which is not minted, but we can sell it only at the bar gold price. What we should do internationally is divorce our money from the gold standard and let gold find its own value, in which event its price would go up.

For thousands of years gold has been the standard of credit on which everyone depends. The people of the world do not depend on paper but on gold. If the United States would divorce its dollar from the gold standard and would make the U.S. dollar the unit

of settlement for the entire world, things would be all right. We would not have to contribute to the International Monetary Fund. The United States dollar would be the international unit of settlement, as was the pound sterling before the great world war.

There is no reason this cannot be done, but the United States government is as stubborn as a donkey and will not change its policy. They say the dollar is worth $1 in gold, but I say it is not; the purchasing power of the dollar is only 44 cents and is going down. Prosperity on the North American continent implies gradual inflation, which means that the dollar will go down in purchasing power.

I say that the establishment of the c.r.u. is a lot of baloney. When the price of gold changed in 1934 to $35 an ounce, it was said that the United States public had a "baloney" dollar. I say that when they imply that their dollar is worth $1 of gold they have a "baloney" dollar because their $1 is worth only 44 cents. Our gold is worth twice that, and more.

• (9:50 p.m.)

I say we are acting like ostriches and burying our heads in the sand when we think we can distribute our gold around the world, letting speculators take advantage of this. We in Canada let our gold mines go down. Our gold production in Canada has gone down greatly, year after year. The result is that we take $15 million out of the taxpayers pockets to keep the gold mines going every year.

What has happened has not contributed to any new gold mines coming into being. What we want in this country is a policy that will develop new gold mines from coast to coast. We have such gold in our pre-Cambrian shield, but we are not doing anything about it. The United States is leading us in this respect. In this case, the policy of the United States is wrong, although I would say that it is right in a great many things. The United States is wrong in the conception of what gold is worth in the world. The whole of world opinion is against the United States in its conception about gold. Gold is the basis of all credit, and the sooner the authorities in the United States realize that, the better.

Contributions to the monetary fund and things like that to bolster our credit I do not think will be of benefit. The authorities in the United States ought to have common sense, because we look upon the United States dollar as the unit of settlement for the entire world, in the same way that we looked upon the pound sterling. We recognize that, but we say that gold ought to find its own level, and then the United States dollar in turn will find its level. That fundamentally is our feeling, because the United States dollar in purchasing power is now worth 44 cents, compared with 1934.

[Mr. McLean (Charlotte).]

The Chairman: Shall the resolution carry?

[*Translation*]

Mr. Latulippe: Mr. Chairman, there are a few comments I feel I must make on the Bretton Woods Agreements. It is really time to amend the legislation on the Bretton Woods agreements signed with the United States and various other countries.

Unfortunately, those agreements were approved in 1944 by the Liberals, who were then in office, and also by the Conservatives and the socialists, who were in the opposition. There is nothing surprising in that because when the International Monetary Fund was set up in 1944, under the Bretton Woods agreements, it was the old capitalist formula that prevailed. Three great capitalist countries had their formula adopted and it was that formula which prevailed and which the other countries had to accept. Three great countries hold among themselves a substantial part of the majority of the shares.

Instead of an institution controlled by just a few countries, quotas of equal value should be set for each country and equal voting rights provided for all members of the agreement.

The Bretton Woods agreements especially favour creditor nations like the United States without requiring them to balance their trade by accepting goods from other countries. That obligation is imposed on debtor nations.

When they established the gold standard, they gave creditor nations the right to wait and to insist upon being paid in gold or American dollars. There is the problem we have to solve. Until we do or as long as we do not take steps to reach better agreements with the United States and the other two greatest countries, we shall not be able to settle that problem.

That, Mr. Chairman, is the cause of the international balance of payments problem. The big countries take advantage of the small ones. Small countries are asked to pay their accounts in American currency or gold, which is practically impossible.

I fully agree with the hon. member for Charlotte (Mr. McLean) who has just concluded his remarks, when he says that improvements can be found, that the Americans

dominate us and that our dollar is worth only 44 cents. He is perfectly right when he says that instead of converting our gold, we sell it to the United States at ridiculous prices. We fully agree on that.

It is very advantageous for the United States to come and develop our natural resources in Canada and mine our gold to take it home when we could convert that gold or exchange it, which would double its value for Canada.

The hon. member for Charlotte was perfectly right about that. We fully agree with him.

I ask those who will be called upon in committee to consider the Bretton Woods agreements to study the structure of the international monetary system and to find the solutions which Canada needs.

At this time, practically everyone agrees that we are exploited by the three larger countries which signed the Bretton Woods agreements and which, through their action, dominate all other nations. There is a lot of work to be done in that respect and I ask the government to appoint to the Commission experts in that field so that Canada will benefit to a greater extent from those agreements, will no longer be exploited by various nations, will be able one day to balance its international accounts and prosper like the other countries instead of devaluating its currency, giving discounts on its products to pay its international accounts, which is contrary to social justice.

There are other reforms to carry out in that field and I am convinced that the suggestions and good ideas of the hon. member for Charlotte will greatly help on the Liberal side. Frankly, something must be done in that respect.

[*English*]

Resolution reported and concurred in.

• (10:00 p.m.)

Mr. McIlraith thereupon moved for leave to introduce Bill No. C-144, to amend the Bretton Woods Agreements Act.

Motion agreed to and bill read the first time.

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE

Mr. Winkler: May I ask the leader of the house what the business for tomorrow may be?

Mr. McIlraith: Yes, Mr. Speaker. Tomorrow we shall call item 8 on the order paper, the resolution preceding the bill for the development of the commercial fisheries of Canada; item 4, the resolution preceding the bill to amend the Research Council Act; item 15, the resolution preceding the bill providing for the establishment of a Science Council of Canada; item 3, the resolution approving the agreement concerning automotive products between Canada and the United States.

Mr. Winkler: You can stop right there.

Mr. McIlraith: Then item 23 on the order paper, second reading of a bill to incorporate the Ottawa Terminal Railway Company; and item 24, second reading of Bill S-15, to authorize the construction of a bridge across the St. Croix River between the province of New Brunswick and the state of Maine.

PROCEEDINGS ON ADJOURNMENT MOTION

A motion to adjourn the house under provisional standing order 39A deemed to have been moved.

POWER—COLUMBIA RIVER—SAFETY OF HIGH ARROW DAM

Mr. H. W. Herridge (Kootenay West): It is a thrilling experience, Mr. Speaker, to rise in this stimulating atmosphere, but what we lack in physical bodies we know we have here in spirit.

On March 14, I asked the Secretary of State for External Affairs the following question:

> In view of the fact, that the members of the standing committee on external affairs were assured that the High Arrow Dam was a completely safe structure would the minister inform the house why, in the report of the Columbia Treaty Permanent Engineering Board, which includes representatives of Canada and the United States, the board does not accept direct or implied responsibility, for the safety of the structures being built according to the Columbia River Treaty?

Now the Columbia River Treaty Permanent Engineering Board is composed of two representatives from Canada and two from the United States. The Canadian representatives are Mr. G. M. MacNabb, Chairman, a well known engineer, and Mr. A. F. Paget who is in charge of the water resources branch, British Columbia. The United States representatives are Mr. Wendell E. Johnson, Chairman, and Mr. Morgan D. Dubrow. This board is charged with the responsibility of making certain that the provisions of the Columbia River Treaty are carried out. I have in my hand the first annual report to the

governments of the United States and Canada of the Columbia River Treaty Permanent Engineering Board, dated December 31, 1965. Reading from this report I see that the duties and responsibilities of the board are outlined. However, I was surprised to read with respect to the activities of the board at page 11 the following paragraph:

> The Board considered its responsibility for the safety of structures authorized for construction by the Treaty. The Board concluded that neither the duties specified in the Treaty nor its consideration of design data received from the Entities for the purpose of keeping fully informed regarding the projects gives the Board either a direct or implied responsibility for the safety of the structures or for the adequacy of their structural design. However, it was agreed that any apparent defects noted by the board would be promptly called to the attention of the Entities.

Now, Mr. Speaker, during the hearing of the Standing Committee on External Affairs when the Columbia River Treaty was under consideration, we were assured by Dr. Arthur Casagrande, a world wide authority on the building of dams and soil conditions, and also in respect of the damage that could be done by tremors and earthquakes, that the High Arrow dam, with which we were particularly concerned, was completely safe. Numerous people have written to me about this, because we must not forget that last year we had a tremor in southeastern British Columbia in which buildings were rocked in Trail, which is only 18 miles south of the High Arrow dam. We were assured that this dam was completely safe.

I was rather shocked to read in this report that the very board, whose responsibility we were assured it would be to see that the terms of the Columbia River Treaty were carried out, had failed to accept any responsibility for the safety of the structures being built under this treaty.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I regret having to keep the minister a few minutes after ten o'clock, because I know he would prefer to be in another place at this moment. Therefore I shall be as brief as possible. I do want him to explain to the house why the Columbia River Treaty Permanent Engineering Board made this decision after we were told that this board was responsible for seeing that the terms of the Columbia River Treaty were carried out. Part of those terms are to see that all the structures are safe.

Mr. Speaker, I shall look forward to the reply of the minister, because not only the member for Kootenay West, but also a good many of the people whom I have the honour to represent, are interested. Before concluding I would suggest to the minister that this is a very interesting report. Would he take up the question of having copies made available for members of the house who wish to obtain them.

[Mr. Herridge.]

Hon. John N. Turner (Minister without Portfolio): Mr. Speaker, I would like to say that I appreciate that the hon. member for Kootenay West has brought up a very interesting point. I will make the answer as brief as I can and say that there is nothing within Article XV of the Columbia River Treaty which makes the permanent engineering board responsible specifically for the safety of construction sites. The responsibility for the safety of the dams lies under the aegis of the two contracting parties, namely the United States and Canada, as two separate entities.

I wish to say that the permanent engineering board, of course, is an international body which, if it had the responsibility for reviewing construction standards and, were it responsible for the safety of those dams, then what the hon. member really would be implying is that the engineers from the United States would have a veto over Canadian construction standards and construction methods.

• (10:10 p.m.)

Under the treaty the dams on the Canadian side of the border are the responsibility of the federal government, as delegated to the province of B.C., and the construction of the dams, the Libby dam in particular in the United States, is the responsibility of the United States government. I am very surprised, in view of the earlier representations of the hon. member for Kootenay West (Mr. Herridge), that he should imply that United States engineers should have a veto over Canadian construction standards.

I refer to page 4934 of *Hansard* for July 2, 1964 when he said, in a question to the Secretary of State for External Affairs (Mr. Martin):

> In view of the assurances given by him—

That is, the minister.

> —to the committee . . . that the safety of the dams was known and satisfactory, would the minister inform the house whether he thinks it is necessary for the government of British Columbia to call in three United States engineers to clarify his assurances and to make sure he was giving the committee the facts?

Of course, the answer was that Canadian engineers were perfectly capable of reviewing Canadian construction standards.

I want to say further that there is no suggestion in the Columbia treaty that either country may interfere with or dictate construction methods in the other country; yet this could be the case if the permanent engineering board were given the responsibility of passing judgment on the safety of the treaty structures.

As to the safety of the dams themselves, let me say that in Canada the British Columbia government has accepted federal responsibility for the construction of the Canadian dams, and the design of those dams is reviewed by five separate bodies. The first is the British Columbia Hydro and Power Authority, the second are the consultants to the Hydro Authority; the third is the British Columbia Water Rights Branch; the fourth is the consultants to the Water Rights Branch, and the fifth is a board of review consisting of five eminent United States and Canadian engineers.

I also recall that last year, on June 21, 1965, I replied to a question of the hon. member, as recorded at page 2672 of *Hansard,* when I talked about the safety factor. I said:

> Every precaution in the interests of safety against possible damage from earthquakes, seepage, erosion, or other causes, has been taken in the design and in the construction requirements. This subject was considered in detail by the Standing Committee on External Affairs during its consideration of the Columbia river treaty and protocol, and in particular during its sessions on April 24 and April 28, 1964, when expert evidence on these aspects of the safety of the project was given—

I went on to give the names of the people who had given that expert evidence. The hon. member and I had the privilege of serving on that committee together. We heard that evidence together. I am satisfied that not only has the safety of the dams been provided for, but I am also satisfied that proper control of that safety is effected by Canadian engineers, and that is the reason why the permanent engineering board, in its report, has given as its interpretation of the treaty that it does not bear the responsibility for supervision of safety construction standards.

Mr. Herridge: But we have to accept the board that is appointed and rely on them to give us their advice.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order.

[*Translation*]

WINTER WORKS—RIVIÈRE-AU-TONNERRE—INQUIRY AS TO UNEMPLOYMENT BENEFITS

Mr. Gustave Blouin (Saguenay): Mr. Speaker, even at this late hour, I should like to refer to a question I asked this afternoon to the Minister of Labour (Mr. Nicholson):

> I would ask the Minister of Labour whether he has received a telegram from the United Steel Workers of America, local 6797, Sept-Iles, asking him to make representations to the officials of the Unemployment Insurance Commission, so that the workers engaged in the winter works of the municipality of Rivière-au-Tonnerre may get their unemployment insurance benefits without delay.

I must tell the Minister that the question is very important and very urgent, because this situation affects several heads of families of the municipality of Rivière-au-Tonnerre who are naturally waiting for those payments to provide for their daily needs.

[*English*]

Hon. J. R. Nicholson (Minister of Labour): Mr. Speaker, I am very glad that the hon. member for Saguenay (Mr. Blouin) raised this question today because it affords me an opportunity, as the minister through whom the Unemployment Insurance Commission reports to the house, to clear up a situation that has been troubling a good many people in the riding of my hon. friend.

The Unemployment Insurance Commission is an independent body, answerable to parliament. It is not a branch or division of the Department of Labour. In this particular case an injustice might have arisen if the commission had not taken prompt action in response to the wire referred to by the hon. member for Saguenay.

That wire was received by me approximately one week ago. I got in touch with the commission and asked for a report. I was advised that they had received notification that a list of job opportunities had been sent out to a large number of people in the general vicinity of Seven Islands, advising that work opportunities existed for them. These job opportunities involved travel of five to 12 miles. This might not have worked a great hardship, but associated with the job opportunities was an arrangement that the people who took work would receive credit from the local merchants. On the strength of that the Unemployment Insurance Commission, I think very properly, said that no insurance was payable to the claimants.

However, they did conduct a further investigation. It now develops that the arrangement with the local merchants to extend credit up to 60 per cent or 70 per cent of the wages that were expected has not materialized. When this was brought to the attention of the Commission they immediately took steps to accept the claims. Not only did they accept the claims but they have made payment retroactive to the date when each claim became payable. I am very glad to be able to make this report and I commend the Commission for having acted so promptly in this case, and I have advised the local union who sent the wire of the Commission's action.

Mr. Blouin: Mr. Speaker, may I be permitted to thank the minister for his prompt attention to this matter.

Motion agreed to and the house adjourned at 10.18 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS

Wednesday, March 16, 1966

The house met at 2.30 p.m.

SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATES, 1965-66

A message from His Excellency the Governor General transmitting supplementary estimates E for the financial year ending March 31, 1966, was presented by Hon. E. J. Benson (Minister of National Revenue), read by Mr. Speaker to the house and referred to the Committee of Supply.

TRANSPORT AND COMMUNICATIONS

CONCURRENCE IN THIRD REPORT OF STANDING COMMITTEE

Mr. Joseph Macaluso (Hamilton West) presented the third report of the Standing Committee on Transport and Communications, and moved that the report be concurred in.

Motion agreed to.

FINANCE

GUIDE LINES—REQUEST TO REFRAIN FROM ACQUIRING SECURITIES SUBJECT TO U.S. INTEREST EQUALIZATION TAX

Mr. Mitchell Sharp (Minister of Finance): Mr. Speaker, when the United States balance of payments guide lines were being discussed in this house on February 2, I said that it would be most undesirable if the effect of these guide lines was to induce strong new demands upon capital markets in Canada. I also indicated that if necessary we would take whatever action is appropriate to protect Canadian interests. Prior to our meeting with United States Secretaries in Washington it seemed clear that pressures on our capital markets were being accentuated as an indirect result of the United States guide lines, and we discussed this with them.

• (2:40 p.m.)

Under the guide lines, United States companies are being encouraged to raise funds abroad for their international operations. In response to this, well known United States companies and their foreign subsidiaries are issuing dollar securities for sale outside the United States. To the extent that this search for funds abroad by United States companies attracts funds from Canada, it puts abnormal pressure on the Canadian market and could force Canadian borrowers to rely more heavily on the United States capital market.

It has been, and continues to be, the policy of the government to encourage Canadians to invest their savings in Canadian development. We are now entering our sixth consecutive year of significant economic growth. Heavy demands are being made on our capital markets as Canadian industry expands its capacity and improves its efficiency and as Canadian governments and municipalities undertake to provide the many services required by our expanding economy.

To meet this situation I am, on behalf of the government, making the following request today to Canadian investors.

To help ensure that Canadian savings are available to meet the present large demands for capital in Canada the government is asking all Canadian investors, including financial institutions such as the banks, life insurance companies, and trust and loan companies, as well as other corporations, pension funds and individuals, not to acquire securities, denominated in Canadian or United States dollars, which are issued by United States corporations or their non-Canadian subsidiaries and which are subject to the United States interest equalization tax if purchased by United States residents. Investments in such securities made by Canadian financial institutions and pension funds to cover foreign currency liabilities to non-residents of Canada and the United States are exempt from this request.

Canadian borrowers have co-operated with the government's requests in the past for the exercise of some temporary restraint in borrowing abroad in the national interest. I feel certain that Canadian investors on their side will co-operate fully with this request which is also in the national interest.

For some time the Bank of Canada and the Department of Finance have, in answer to inquiries, been discouraging the issue of securities in Canada by foreign borrowers. I feel that we should continue to discourage such issues since the use of Canadian savings in this way could bring increased pressures on our capital market and lead to increased borrowings in the United States by Canadians

under the exemption from the interest equalization tax. I am confident that our financial institutions will continue to assist us in carrying out this policy.

Hon. J. W. Monteith (Perth): Mr. Speaker, I commend the Minister of Finance (Mr. Sharp) for taking this step, but I feel that it is long overdue. I feel that the steps he has taken at this stage are required. I do not know what teeth they may have in them to make sure that these guide lines are followed. I noticed that, according to the minister's statement, investments in such securities made by Canadian financial institutions and pension funds to cover foreign currency liabilities to non-residents of Canada and the United States are exempt from the request. I can understand this provision. I hope, Mr. Speaker, that despite the lateness of this action it does have the effect suggested.

Mr. T. C. Douglas (Burnaby-Coquitlam): I am sure all members will be pleased if the government is taking some measures to protect the Canadian economy against any adverse effects which might arise from the economic guide lines policy of the United States government. I think the minister would have helped the house and the country had he given us some indication of whether or not there has been large scale diversions of Canadian capital either to the United States or to United States investments in other parts of the world. If this has been going on to any considerable extent, I think that we ought to know about it.

We ought to know, second, whether or not the rather bland step mentioned in the statement is a sufficiently strong measure to grapple with the situation. Since we do not know how grave the situation is, we do not know whether the remedy which the minister has proposed is adequate to meet the crisis. I hope that at an early date the minister will tell us how serious is this capital flight. I hope he will also tell the house at an early date whether the measure which he has proposed today is having any beneficial effect. I am sure the house will watch the question with a great deal of interest; and I am also sure we are relieved that the minister is concerned about the matter and is apparently taking at least a preliminary step to cope with the situation.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Gilles Grégoire (Lapointe): Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the Minister of Finance (Mr. Sharp) really understands the situation which prevails at this time in Canada in the field of savings and investments.

The Minister of Finance is asking Canadian investors to invest in Canadian industry and borrowers to put an end to their borrowing in the United States.

Well, Mr. Speaker, if you look at the situation squarely, you will note that the biggest borrowers in Canada are the public bodies, namely the federal government, the provincial governments, the municipalities and the school boards.

They are the biggest borrowers and they get most of the savings of Canadians, and today the Minister of Finance is making an appeal to all Canadians, all private investors, in short banks, insurance companies, trust and loan companies, other corporations, pension funds and even private individuals, but he is forgetting the main institution which could solve the problem, namely the Bank of Canada.

The Bank of Canada is a public body which should be responsible for investing in the public sector, that is the federal, provincial and municipal governments and the school boards, thus leaving the private banks free to look after the private sector.

But as long as private savings have to meet the needs of public bodies, governments, I am saying to the minister that there will not be enough private capital in Canada to finance at the same time public and private investments.

Another solution will have to be found instead of the guide lines given at the present time by the Minister of Finance. In my opinion the only solution is to ensure that a public body in Canada, such as the Bank of Canada, can meet the needs of the public bodies, that is the governments. Private enterprise should be left free to meet the needs of private enterprise. Private investors should meet the needs of private borrowers, private companies, and a public body or the Bank of Canada should be given the authority to exist, in order to meet the needs of the public bodies.

That is the only solution and if the Minister of Finance does not want to get that into his head, he will never find another solution to the problems of our modern economy.

[*English*]

Mr. H. A. Olson (Medicine Hat): Mr. Speaker, very briefly we want to thank the

Minister of Finance (Mr. Sharp) for the announcement he has made this afternoon. It was only a few days ago that the leader of our party and I asked him some questions respecting this particular matter. There were announcements in the press that some large United States corporations were attempting to sell some issues outside of the United States and some rather large figures were involved. Had they moved into the Canadian capital market to raise money for use in their international operations, I am sure it is obvious to all members of the house that things would have been made very difficult for a capital market the size we have in Canada.

• (2:50 p.m.)

It is not clear, Mr. Speaker, at first glance what the Canadian guide lines will be in the suggestion or the request that the Minister of Finance is making to the banks and to the other sources of credit. However, after we have had a little time to study these several paragraphs in his statement, perhaps it will be more clear.

We join with the Minister of Finance in that part of his statement where he suggests that governments and municipalities are undertaking now to provide for expanded services required in our expanding economy. It is interesting to note that the requirements for these purposes in Canada and borrowings in the United States have gone up from $15 million for the first two months of 1965 to $172,880,000 for the first two months of 1966, which is proof that there is a greatly expanded demand by our municipal governments for funds in this year.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, we should like to say very briefly to the Minister of Finance again that this is good and sufficient reason for his taking action that we expand the municipal development fund, and even take some action to set up a municipal development bank, because there is ample evidence now that this is required in Canada. We should not like to see our municipal governments, our school districts and so on being short of funds or having interest rates forced up. We should like to see this expansion I talk of taking place in the country.

WATER RESOURCES

GREAT LAKES—DISCUSSIONS WITH U.S. RESPECTING ANTI-POLLUTION MEASURES

Hon. Jean-Luc Pepin (Minister of Mines and Technical Surveys): Mr. Speaker, on March 8 I was asked by the hon. member for Kamloops (Mr. Fulton) to make a statement regarding the discussions held in Washington on March 4 and 5 with respect to the urgent problem of pollution on the Great Lakes and with respect to the effects of a law of the United States Congress authorizing a study of the waters tributary to the Great Lakes. I undertook to make such a statement at an early date.

I may say first that the undersecretary and officials of the Department of the Interior of the United States attended the joint meetings in question and participated in a most constructive way in the discussions which were held on the matters which have been mentioned. In addition, I was invited with my officials to visit the Department of the Interior and took advantage of the opportunity which was thus afforded. Good working relations have existed for some time among the experts and specialists in both countries and relevant information is being exchanged freely, as well as views. During my visit we were able to review in particular a number of points pertaining to communication and liaison.

In the communiqué issued at the end of the ministerial meeting representatives of both governments recognized the serious implication of the recent interim report of the International Joint Commission on pollution in the two Great Lakes mentioned. In addition both sides confirmed the importance of co-ordinating our studies of this entire problem and supporting the program of investigation and research. Due note was taken of the urgency of curbing inflow to the lakes of certain pollutant materials.

May I say in passing that organizational changes have been undertaken recently in both countries to make sure that the federal governments are enabled to assume a more effective role with respect to matters of water pollution. It was valuable to receive in Washington an explanation of the Water Quality Act of 1965 and of the administrative measures presently taken. Our United States friends were most interested, too, in our proposed Department of Energy, Mines and Resources, with central co-ordinating responsibilities in the field of water pollution.

May I add for the information of hon. members that the advisory board to the International Joint Commission forecasts three phases of study of the pollution in the Great Lakes.

The first phase consists of short term concentrated studies to determine the extent,

origin and location of pollution in the waters. The second phase consists of continuing studies of the mechanics of the lakes as they affect pollution distribution and assessment of the changing effects of pollutants, and the effectiveness of remedial measures. The third phase consists of research into more effective means of treatment of wastes, the toxic levels of pollutants under Great Lakes conditions, the cycle of eutrophication—I have a technical definition of that, should hon. members want one—and the disposition of pathogenic bacteria and viruses.

The details of the coming summer's work by Canadian governments have been assembled. Essentially they involve sampling of the eastern end of Lake Ontario and of the St. Lawrence River by the Department of National Health and Welfare; of the bulk of Lake Ontario and of Lake Erie by the Department of Mines and Technical Surveys, and inshore sampling of the western end of Lake Ontario and of the margin of Lake Erie by the Ontario Water Resources Commission.

The investments made by mines and technical surveys alone, this year, in this research on pollution in the Great Lakes will be at least $600,000 for operation and $400,000 for beginning construction of the first of three research ships.

With regard to United States public law 89-298, this gives the United States Corps of Army Engineers a moderate sum of money to commence preliminary studies on storage and diversion in water basins supplying the Great Lakes system. Because Canadian interests might conceivably be affected by actions ensuing from such studies, I inquired as to American intentions. It was made clear, that the United States is not contemplating any action which would contravene its agreement with us under the Boundary Waters Act, or affect Canadian interests adversely. In this connection I might read a Canadian dispatch from Washington dated March 7, 1966 which represents an attempt to summarize the present situation. I quote—

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh.

Mr. Churchill: Order, we don't want press comments.

Mr. Pepin: Well, this is a somewhat technical subject and I thought it was the right thing to do.

Mr. Grafftey: Hire a precis writer.

[Mr. Pepin.]

Mr. Pepin: I see that at least the hon. member for Kamloops agrees. This dispatch says:

Officials here dispute a conclusion by water specialist Thomas Kierans of Sudbury, Ontario, that a 1965 United States law could unilaterally threaten water levels in Lake Ontario and the St. Lawrence River.

They also differ with his view given in a recent interview that the legislation authorized American diversions from water systems connected with the Great Lakes system without being affected by the Boundary Waters Act of 1909.

The Leader of the Opposition questioned me recently about the subject of the first paragraph. I continue.

Much more important, these officials say, is that any action must be in step with the Water Resources Planning Act and this specifically rules out any development affecting the "jurisdiction, powers or prerogatives" of the International Joint Commission.

I could go on—

Mr. Starr: Go ahead; might as well, now.

Mr. Pepin: Very well.

This Commission, a product of the Boundary Waters Act of 1909, is the Canada-U.S. agency which deals with boundary waters matters. Therefore, it is held, the threat seen by Kierans automatically would fall within the scope of the Commission.

Hon. E. D. Fulton (Kamloops): We appreciate the minister's having made a statement to us as to the scope of his discussions with representatives of the United States government. I do not want to appear to take an unreasonable attitude but the minister will appreciate that while we fully recognize the need for studies, the situation disclosed in the report of the International Joint Commission makes action imperative.

While therefore we are glad to hear of the plans for making studies of water samples from the lakes, we reserve our judgment on the question of whether sufficient action is to be taken. There are three programs of sampling. But here again, though we recognize that studies must be made, it seems that to date we have been given only a forecast of action rather than action itself. This is an urgent problem. I trust, therefore, that the planning and thinking in connection with matter covered in this report are being carried on with a greater sense of urgency than the report itself makes evident.

• (3:00 p.m.)

The only matter of detail upon which I would like to comment is that I am surprised to find there are apparently to be two agencies of the federal government carrying out sampling for the same basic objective, one the Department of National Health and

Welfare and the other the Department of Mines and Technical Surveys. I had understood the whole purpose now was to co-ordinate these activities under one agency and I am surprised, therefore, when we start our first study that we are undertaking to carry it out by two different departments.

I am at a loss to understand why that should be so. I think there would be less efficiency and greater cost involved; but I shall reserve final comment until we receive more particulars, and similarly with respect to the matter of the views of the United States officials and their difference of opinion with Mr. Kierans. I hope the minister's estimates will be brought in early in the supply program this year so that we can have the kind of discussion that is essential about this whole urgent matter.

Mr. T. S. Barnett (Comox-Alberni): Mr. Speaker, I was interested in the latter part of the observations of the hon. member for Kamloops (Mr. Fulton). Like him, I was somewhat puzzled by the fact that two federal agencies of government were being authorized to undertake these studies. However, it is possible that these studies may lie in different fields and, on the basis of further information we may be able to get, we can assess whether this is the most economical approach.

On the broader question of the announcement made by the Minister, I am sure all hon. members of the house welcome this indication that some specific action is being taken.

Certainly the reports we have been getting about the increasing level of pollution in the Great Lakes system show that some sort of crash program is required. Whether the study which is being proposed will be expedited to the point where it can launch corrective measures quickly enough to combat the growing level of pollution is questionable, but I think I can best sum this matter up by saying I am glad to see some attempt is being made to lock the door of the barn before all the horses have been stolen.

Mr. R. N. Thompson (Red Deer): Mr. Speaker, without detracting from the urgency and importance of the statement the minister has made, we in this group will reserve our observations until we are able to study his report made this afternoon. But I would say it emphasizes in this one area the great importance of an over-all water resources policy which will include the subject of water pollution.

PARLIAMENTARY RESTAURANT

JOINT COMMITTEE—HOUSE OF COMMONS PERSONNEL

Mr. Bernard Pilon (Chambly-Rouville) moved:

That a message be sent to the Senate to acquaint their Honours that this house will unite with them in the formation of a joint committee of both houses on the direction of the parliamentary restaurant, and that the members to serve on the said committee, on the part of this house, will be as follows: Mr. Speaker and Messrs. Bigg, Boulanger, Brand, Cantelon, Cowan, Crossman, Crouse, Emard, Ethier, Hales, Herridge, Horner (The Battlefords), Johnston, Langlois (Chicoutimi), Leblanc, (Laurier), Matheson, McNulty, Noble, Peters, Rock, Simard, Tucker, Vincent, Whelan and Winkler.

Motion agreed to.

EXTERNAL AFFAIRS

TREATIES WITH FRANCE—TABLING OF SUPPLEMENTARY DOCUMENTS

Mr. D. S. Macdonald (Parliamentary Secretary to Secretary of State for External Affairs): Mr. Speaker, on February 2, 1966, the house made an order pursuant to motion No. 24 in the name of the hon. member for Carleton (Mr. Bell) for the production of certain papers related to agreements entered into between the Governments of Canada and France and of the province of Quebec. Subsequently the hon. member for Carleton pointed out that a number of additional documents were referred to in one of the documents tabled. Upon examination it was found that the documents referred to by the hon. member for Carleton had already been tabled in the house pursuant to motion No. 17 of the last session in the name of the former hon. member for Pontiac-Témiscamingue which was adopted by this house on May 5, 1965.

The hon. member for Carleton suggested, however, that for the convenience of members it would be useful to have copies of the papers tabled under the earlier order along with those tabled pursuant to the order of February 9, 1965. In addition, since the date of the order of the house on February 9, a translation of one of the documents which was not available at the time of the order of the house has now become available and I would ask the concurrence of the house in making an order supplementary to the order of February 9 to permit the production of these additional papers.

Mr. Speaker: Has the Parliamentary Secretary leave to table these documents as supplementary to the previous order?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Questions

QUESTIONS

(Questions answered orally are indicated by an asterisk.)

MAINTENANCE COSTS OF PRISON INMATES

Question No. 22—**Mr. Orlikow:**

1. What was the average cost of maintaining one inmate during the years 1962, 1963, 1964 and 1965, in (a) federal institutions of all types (b) maximum security institutions (c) medium security institutions (d) minimum security institutions (e) farm and work camps?

2. What was the recidivist rate of males admitted to each Canadian penitentiary in the years 1962, 1963, 1964 and 1965?

Hon. L. T. Pennell (Solicitor General): 1. The average cost of maintaining one inmate during the years 1962, 1963, 1964 and 1965 is as follows:

	1962-63	1963-64	1964-65
(a) Federal institutions of all types	$2,753.83	$2,743.98	$3,074.51
(b) Maximum security institutions	2,624.03	2,650.84	2,964.67
(c) Medium security institutions	3,135.12	3,054.78	3,464.15
(d) Minimum security institutions	2,572.65	2,687.99	3,019.92
(e) Work camps	2,261.09	2,408.54	2,595.78

The statistics with reference to farm camps are not available, since the operation and maintenance costs of these camps are absorbed in the expenditures of the parent institution.

2. The recidivist rate of males admitted to each Canadian penitentiary in the years 1962, 1963, 1964 and 1965 is in accordance with the following table:

RECIDIVISM

Males admitted to penitentiaries in fiscal years ended March 31, 1962 to 1965 inclusive, showing those previously committed to penitentiary or to any correctional institution.

	Total Inmates	Nfld.	Dorchester	St. Vincent de Paul	Kingston	Manitoba	Saskatchewan	British Columbia
Fiscal Year 1961-62: Males Admitted	3,331	29	383	978	931	241	399	370
Previously Committed to Penitentiary	1,377	3	146	370	431	79	165	183
% Previously Committed to Penitentiary	41.3%	10.3%	38.1%	37.8%	46.3%	32.8%	41.4%	49.5%
Previously Committed to Any Correctional Institution.	2,556	13	266	620	805	192	342	318
% Previously Committed to Any Correctional Institution	76.7%	44.8%	69.5%	63.4%	86.5%	79.7%	85.7%	85.9%
Fiscal Year 1962-63: Males Admitted	3,656	28	386	953	973	253	475	588
Previously Committed to Penitentiary	1,504	7	164	366	428	90	181	268
% Previously Committed to Penitentiary	41.1%	25.0%	42.5%	38.4%	44.0%	35.6%	38.1%	45.6%
Previously Committed to Any Correctional Institution.	2,808	21	271	595	850	208	408	455
% Previously Committed to Any Correctional Institution	76.8%	75.0%	70.2%	62.4%	87.4%	82.2%	85.9%	77.4%
Fiscal Year 1963-64: Males Admitted	3,816	41	398	1,172	969	294	418	524
Previously Committed to Penitentiary	1,588	7	194	434	427	106	185	235
% Previously Committed to Penitentiary	41.6%	17.1%	48.7%	37.0%	44.1%	36.1%	44.3%	44.8%
Previously Committed to Any Correctional Institution.	2,948	28	301	754	823	230	368	444
% Previously Committed to Any Correctional Institution	77.3%	68.3%	75.6%	64.3%	84.9%	78.2%	88.0%	84.7%
Fiscal Year 1964-65: Males Admitted	3,621	46	388	1,115	913	303	431	425
Previously Committed to Penitentiary	1,549	9	173	410	439	129	180	209
% Previously Committed to Penitentiary	42.8%	19.6%	44.6%	36.8%	48.1%	42.6%	41.8%	49.2%
Previously Committed to Any Correctional Institution.	2,787	26	290	706	774	253	374	364
% Previously Committed to Any Correctional Institution	77.0%	56.5%	74.7%	63.3%	84.8%	83.5%	86.8%	85.7%

Questions

EXPO '67 DELEGATION TO MOSCOW

Question No. 163—**Mr. Coates:**

1. Was a delegation sent from Expo '67 to Moscow, U.S.S.R. and, if so, for what reason?

2. How many delegates were associated with the delegation?

3. What were the names, positions and expenses of each?

Hon. Robert Winters (Minister of Trade and Commerce): 1. Over the past three years, five delegations of Corporation employees have been sent to Moscow, U.S.S.R. A delegation consisting of the Commissioner General, the Head—Master Programming Division and the Head—Cultural Division was the most recent to go to Moscow, at the request of the Commissioner General of Section of the Soviet Participation to meet with Russian officials to negotiate specific individual attractions. Examples of the attractions in question are the Bolshoi Opera and Ballet, the World Soccer Tournament and the Moscow Circus. A presentation was made to the Minister of Culture, Madame Furteba. Some members of this delegation also had discussions for the cultural program of Expo in London and Paris.

2. Three.

3. Names, positions and expenses of each are as follows: P. Dupuy, Commissioner General, $2,922.55, London, Paris and Moscow; G. Hilker, Head—Master Programming Division, $1,695.91, London and Moscow; G. Lefebvre, Head—Cultural Division, $1,720.39, London and Moscow.

AID TO SOUTH VIET NAM—CANADIAN COMMITMENTS TO U.S.

Question No. 264—**Mr. Douglas:**

1. What are the economic and financial aids now being provided by Canada in South Viet Nam?

2. Is any extension of this aid being contemplated at the present time?

3. Have any financial or economic commitments been made to the government of the United States with respect to South Viet Nam?

4. If so, what are these commitments?

Hon. Paul Martin (Secretary of State for External Affairs): 1. Canada is providing aid to South Viet Nam in the form of both technical and capital assistance. There are four Canadian advisers now serving in South Viet Nam, three of them in the medical field, while some 183 Vietnamese students are presently undergoing training in Canadian schools and institutions. Capital assistance has included the provision of laboratory equipment, foodstuffs and help with the construction of a science building at the University of Hué through the use of counterpart funds.

2. Yes, particularly in the medical assistance field. Canada is prepared to undertake a major project in the field of rehabilitation medicine and has offered to provide and staff a T.B. clinic at one of the provincial hospitals.

3. No.

4. See 3.

BOX CARS SHIPPED TO AND RETURNED FROM U.S.

Question No. 265—**Mr. Douglas:**

1. How many Canadian Pacific Railway box cars have been shipped to the United States between August 1, 1965 and December 31, 1965?

2. How many C.P.R. box cars have been returned to Canada during the same period?

3. How many Canadian National Railways box cars have been shipped to the United States between August 1, 1965 and December 31, 1965?

4. How many C.N.R. box cars have been returned to Canada during the same period?

Hon. Judy V. LaMarsh (Secretary of State): 1 and 2. I am informed by the Departments of Agriculture, Finance, Trade and Commerce and Transport that the information is not available.

3 and 4. The management of Canadian National Railways advise as follows: 3. 60,832 Canadian National box cars were shipped to the United States during the period August 1, 1965, to December 31, 1965. 4. 59,208 Canadian National box cars were returned to Canada during the same period.

FEDERAL ROAD EXPENDITURES, MONTREAL

Question No. 525—**Mr. Vincent:**

What has been the federal expenditure on roads, highways and grade separations, in each of the years 1964 and 1965, within the city of Montreal and its metropolitan areas?

Hon. Judy V. LaMarsh (Secretary of State): I am informed by the departments of Public Works and Transport as follows: In so far as the department of Public Works is concerned: Expenditures of the Department of Public Works were limited to contributions on the Trans-Canada highway. Federal payments between the Île-aux-Tourtes crossing at Vaudreuil and the Louis-Hippolyte Lafontaine crossing near Boucherville, including the two crossings, total as follows: 1964, $5,832,125; 1965, $28,732,922.

In so far as the department of Transport is concerned: The Board of Transport Commissioners for Canada advise as follows: The amounts of money expended from the Railway Grade Crossing Fund toward grade separations in the City of Montreal and its metropolitan areas were: 1964, $1,169,007.50; 1965, $405,000.00.

PRISONERS UNDER 16 IN FEDERAL INSTITUTIONS

Question No. 561—**Mr. Macaluso:**

1. How many persons sixteen years of age and under are at present incarcerated in federal penal institutions?

2. By separate offences, in what numbers are they incarcerated?

Hon. L. T. Pennell (Solicitor General): 1. Twenty nine.

2. Breaking and entering with intent and breaking and entering and committing, 1; Armed robbery and theft, 1; Theft of motor vehicle, 4; Theft of motor vehicle and escape, 1; Theft of motor vehicle and causing damage to property, 1; Theft of motor vehicle and possession of property obtained by crime, 1; Assault, 2; Breaking and entering with intent, 2; Breaking, entering and theft, 6; Incorrigible offenders, 2; Possession of property obtained by crime, 1; Theft, 2; Manslaughter, 1; Robbery with violence, escape, attempted theft, breaking and entering and committing and possession of property obtained by crime, 1; Assault causing bodily harm, 1; Escape, theft (2 charges), auto theft (3 charges), 1; Prison break by violence, 1.

PUBLIC RELATIONS PAYMENTS, EXPO '67

Question No. 613—**Mr. Muir (Cape Breton North and Victoria):**

1. Have any members of the press, radio or television received emoluments, financial benefits, payments or retainers from or on account of work performed for the Canadian Corporation for the 1967 World Exhibition?

2. If so, what are the names of such persons, together with the names of the companies, agencies or services by which they are or were employed and what were the amounts paid out in each case (a) in 1964, and (b) in 1965?

3. What amounts were paid (a) in 1964 (b) in 1965 to public relations firms or agencies in respect of services rendered in account with the Canadian Corporation for the 1967 World Exhibition and what were the firms or agencies and what were the amounts involved?

Hon. Robert Winters (Minister of Trade and Commerce): 1. Yes, one.

2. David Crane of the *Financial Post* for the writing of a series of news letters with respect to advertising and promotion. (a) 1964, nil; (b) 1965, $200.

3. The offices of the Canadian Corporation for the 1967 World Exhibition opened in approximately February 1963. The following agencies were appointed around April 15, 1963 and amounts paid to each were as follows: (a) 1964: Publicity Service, $8,545.22; Monty Berger and Associates, $9,048.75; Public and Industrial Relations, $21,666.04; Desroches, Inkel and Poirier, $53,745.33; (b) 1965: Publicity Service, $4,325.00; Monty Berger and Associates, $2,217.50; Public and Industrial Relations, —; Desroches and Associates, (Name was changed), $97,967.87.

DISPLAY WORK, WESTERN CANADA PAVILION, EXPO '67

Question No. 619—**Mr. Knowles:**

1. What firm or firms received the contract or contracts for the display work for the western Canada pavilion for Expo '67?

2. What are the terms and conditions of such contract or contracts?

Hon. Robert Winters (Minister of Trade and Commerce): 1. Contracts in connection with the display work for the Western Canada Pavilion for Expo '67 were not the responsibility of any Federal Government authority. The information requested is, therefore, not available.

2. See 1 above.

FORT CHURCHILL—SUGGESTED OVEREXPENDITURE

Question No. 637—**Mr. Brand:**

Has any correspondence been received from members of the public service of Canada regarding suggested overexpenditure in the Fort Churchill complex and, if so, from whom?

Hon. G. J. McIlraith (Minister of Public Works): Since such correspondence would be of a departmental or interdepartmental nature it is not the practice to make this information public.

COUNCIL OF RESOURCE MINISTERS

Question No. 687—**Mr. Fulton:**

1. Since it was set up on the recommendation of the "resources for tomorrow conference," how many meetings have been held by the Canadian council of resource ministers?

2. When and where were these meetings held?

3. Who was the chairman of each?

Questions

4. Who is the present chairman?

5. Who is at present the Canadian government representative?

6. When will the next meeting be held?

Hon. Jean-Luc Pepin (Minister of Mines and Technical Surveys): 1. Five.

2. First Meeting—Toronto, September 20-21st, 1962, Second Meeting—Montreal, November 19-20th, 1963. Third Meeting—Dalvey, P.E.I., June 22-23rd, 1964. Fourth Meeting—Victoria, B.C., May 13-14th, 1965. Fifth Meeting—Montreal, P.Q., December 14-15th, 1965.

3. First Meeting—Hon. H. W. Spooner, Minister of Municipal Affairs, Government of Ontario. Second Meeting—Hon. Rene Levesque, Minister of Natural Resources, Government of Quebec. Third Meeting—Hon. L. F. Rossiter, Minister of Municipal Affairs and Fisheries, Government of Prince Edward Island. Fourth and fifth Meetings—Hon. R. G. Williston, Minister of Lands, Forests and Water Resources, Government of British Columbia.

4. Hon. R. G. Williston, Minister of Lands, Forests and Water Resources in the Government of British Columbia.

5. Hon. Jean-Luc Pepin, Minister of Mines and Technical Surveys.

6. Probably in May, 1966.

*STAFFS OF INDUSTRY, TRADE AND DEFENCE PRODUCTION DEPARTMENTS

Question No. 704—**Mr. Hales:**

1. What was the total staff, including casual help, employed by the Department of Industry as of March 31, 1964; September 30, 1964; and March 31, 1965?

2. What was the total staff, including casual help employed by the Department of Trade and Commerce as of the above dates?

3. What was the total staff, including casual help, employed by the Department of Defence Production as of the above dates?

Mr. Albert Béchard (Parliamentary Secretary to Secretary of State): Mr. Speaker, the answer to the first part of the question is: The total staff, including casual help, employed by the Department of Industry is as follows: March 31, 1964, 125; September 30, 1964, 321; March 31, 1965, 368.

The answer to the second part of the question is: The total staff, including casual help, employed by the Department of Trade and Commerce is as follows: March 31, 1964, 1,844; September 30, 1964, 1,920; March 31, 1965, 2,042.

[Mr. Fulton.]

The answer to the third part of the question is as follows. The total staff, including casual help, employed by the Department of Defence Production is as follows: March 31, 1964, 1,639; September 30, 1964, 1,845. This includes 84 employees taken on strength of the department from the Canadian Commercial Corporation; the increase also reflects casual employees particularly during the summer months and additions occasioned by recruiting. March 31, 1965, 2,213. This includes 232 employees taken on strength from the procurement, purchasing and stores branch, production branch, the outside printing production branch and the supporting services contained in the departmental secretary's branch, the administrative services branch and the financial services branch of the Department of Public Printing and Stationery.

AERO-MAGNETIC SURVEY

Question No. 706—**Mr. Fulton:**

1. When was the federal provincial aero-magnetic survey scheme first inaugurated?

2. What was the original estimate of the length of time before completion of this scheme?

3. What was the original estimate of total cost and what amount was to be borne by the federal treasury?

4. What has been the cost to date and what has been the amount borne by the federal treasury?

5. What was the area of intended coverage?

6. How many provinces have been completely surveyed?

7. How many provinces have participated or are participating in the program?

8. What is the percentage of completion (a) with respect to individual provinces (b) with respect to Canada as a whole?

9. What is the relationship with the province of British Columbia?

10. How many maps have been published each year?

11. What is the program with respect to the Yukon and Northwest Territories and how much of this has been completed?

Mr. Jack Davis (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Mines and Technical Surveys): 1. 1962.

2. Twelve years.

3. $18,377,000 of which the total federal share was $12,358,000.

4. $5,288,806 of which the federal Treasury has borne $3,374,844.

5. The Canadian Shield and its fringes and parts of the Yukon Territory.

6. Three: Nova Scotia, by the Department and private companies; Prince Edward Island,

by the Department; New Brunswick, 90 per cent by the Department, 10 per cent by Federal-Provincial.

7. Eight: Newfoundland, New Brunswick, Quebec, Ontario, Manitoba, Saskatchewan, Alberta and British Columbia.

8. (a) Newfoundland, Labrador, 10 per cent; Nova Scotia, 100 per cent completed by Mines and Technical Surveys previously; New Brunswick, 100 per cent; P.E.I., 100 per cent completed by Mines and Technical Surveys previously; Quebec, 20 per cent; Ontario, 65 per cent; Manitoba, 60 per cent (Shield area 85 per cent complete); Saskatchewan, 66 per cent (Shield area 100 per cent complete); Alberta, 25 per cent coverage by G.S.C. and Alberta, 45 per cent coverage privately, 30 per cent remains to be flown (Shield area 100 per cent complete); British Columbia (comprised of 70 4-mile map areas), 5 four-mile sheets published by G.S.C., 8 four-mile sheets flown commercially, 20 per cent complete (8 per cent by Canada and British Columbia, 12 per cent privately).

8. (b)

Aeromagnetic Surveys
% Complete* for Canada as a whole

	Land	Sea	Total
Total number of N.T.S. Map sheets 1:250,000	801	261	1,062
Private work complete	69	3	72
Govt. work complete	234	23	257
% complete private	8.6%	1.2%	6.7%
% complete Govt.	29.2%	8.8%	25.1%
% complete private & Govt.	37.8%	10.0%	31.8%

* With present-day instruments.

Note: It is the intention not to duplicate private work where it is up to standard of government surveys. Attempts are made (sometimes successfully) to get private mining and oil companies to donate data for government publication.

9. During the planning stages of the scheme, the British Columbia Department of Mines and Petroleum Resources was invited to send an observer to the meetings but it was pointed out that British Columbia was not included in the scheme because of the technical difficulties presented by the high topographical relief in that province.

In lieu of this, a less formal form of cost sharing scheme on experimental surveys was entered into between the Department of Mines and Technical Surveys and the British Columbia Department of Mines and Petroleum Resources. This program has proceeded satisfactorily since 1961, resulting in published maps giving the results of various methods of aeromagnetic surveying in the mountains.

10. On the average, about 550 maps at a scale of one inch to the mile have been published each year.

11. By 1967 the southern half of the Yukon will have been covered, except for the areas of severe topographic relief.

Contracts for certain areas in the Districts of Keewatin and Mackenzie have been let and are now in progress. A portion of Baffin Island will also be surveyed in 1966. The Northwest Territories are approximately 15 per cent complete.

APPOINTMENT OF CENTENNIAL COMMISSION PERSONNEL

Question No. 718—**Mr. Hamilton:**

Since December 1, 1964, did the commissioner of the centennial have prior knowledge of and did he approve of and endorse all specific recommendations, made by the associate commissioner of the centennial commission respecting the appointment of personnel, which eventually received approval by Governor General in Council?

Hon. Judy V. LaMarsh (Secretary of State): 1. No.

UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE FOR CANADIANS IN U.S.

Question No. 744—**Mr. Dionne:**

1. What, if any, are to date the results of any steps taken by the representatives of the Canadian government with a view to reaching an agreement with the United States authorities in order to make unemployment insurance benefits available to Canadian workers in the United States, especially in the states of Maine and New Hampshire?

2. To the knowledge of the government, what was in 1962-63-64-65, the number of Canadian workers employed in the states of Maine, New Hampshire, Vermont and New York?

3. On what basis of participation were the agreements with the other 47 American states reached on the same subject?

4. With regard to this matter, did representatives of the Canadian government submit any suggestions to the representatives of the states of Maine and New Hampshire?

5. What, if any, are the difficulties hindering such an agreement?

Hon. J. R. Nicholson (Minister of Labour): I am informed by the Unemployment Insurance Commission as follows:

1. In 1942 the Government of Canada and the Government of the United States entered

into a master agreement in substantially the same terms as that existing among the States. The Government of the United States has recommended to each of the States that it carry out the provisions of the master agreement with respect to Canada, but no State can be compelled to participate in the agreement if it prefers not to do so.

The Employment Security Commission of Maine, on 30 October 1963, indicated that it was not prepared to enter into reciprocal arrangements with the Unemployment Insurance Commission of Canada and the same position has been taken by the State of New Hampshire. There has been no change in the situation since then.

2. Information not available in the Commission.

3. Agreements with the other American States were that, so far as possible, the provisions of the reciprocal arrangement already in effect among the States themselves should be extended and applied to Canada.

4. Proposals were submitted to the Employment Security Commission of Maine and of New Hampshire on several occasions by letter, by informal discussions between American and Canadian officials and by discussion at several formal conferences, including meetings in 1959, in 1962 and in 1963.

5. The State of Maine considered that it would be too great an increase in the cost to their Unemployment Insurance Fund. The State of New Hampshire stated that it was not prepared to make the required amendment to its legislation to provide for participation in an agreement with Canada.

LANDED IMMIGRANTS REFUSED READMISSION

Question No. 746—**Mr. Wahn:**

Have any persons holding Canadian landed immigrant status who have left Canada temporarily been refused readmission to Canada and, if so, how many of such persons have been refused readmission in each of the last four calendar years?

Mr. J. C. Munro (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Citizenship and Immigration): Tabulations of the 1965 statistics on deportation are not yet available. From 1961 to 1964 inclusive, no person with Canadian landed immigrant status who left Canada temporarily was refused readmission.

CHARLOTTETOWN, P.E.I.—MAINTENANCE OF CONFERENCE SITE

Question No. 750—**Mr. Stanbury:**

1. What are the arrangements between the governments of Canada and Prince Edward Island for maintenance supervision and public view of the site of the Charlottetown conference of the fathers of confederation?

2. Has any consideration been given, at this historic site, to (a) posting R.C.M.P. officers as a guard of honor (b) ensuring careful preservation and maintenance of the building (c) providing a more adequate program of public education?

[Mr. Nicholson.]

Hon. Arthur Laing (Minister of Northern Affairs and National Resources): 1. The site, the original Legislative Council Chamber within the Province Building, is owned and maintained for public viewing by the Province of Prince Edward Island.

2. This site is under provincial control.

*MR. ALEX WHELAN—CANADIAN GOVERNMENT PRINTING BUREAU

Question No. 789—**Mr. Irvine:**

1. In what capacity is Mr. Alex Whelan employed by the Canadian Government Printing Bureau?

2. Is his employment of a full-time nature?

3. Is he connected with any other business outside the Canadian Government Printing Bureau which is of a similar nature to his work in the bureau and, if so, what business, and who are the other principals?

4. If such other business does exist, has this enterprise received any contracts from the Canadian Government Printing Bureau and if so, what was the amounts of any such contracts?

5. Does Mr. Whelan enjoy the use of any equipment or materials which are the property of the Canadian Government Printing Bureau in the operation of any outside interests?

Hon. C. M. Drury (Minister of Industry): Mr. Speaker, the answer to part one of the question is as follows. A Mr. Alexander Joseph Gérard Whelan is employed by the Canadian Government Printing Bureau as a clerk 4 in the production control division, main plant.

The answer to part two is yes.

The answer to parts three and four is as follows. No, however, on occasions, Mr. Whelan has taken photos, during working hours, with his own equipment for the staff magazine of the Canadian Government Printing Bureau in connection with suggestion award presentations, fire prevention activities and, on the occasions of distinguished visits to the bureau.

Records indicate that from the fall of 1964 to date, he was reimbursed in an amount of $213.35 for approximately 212 photos, sizes 5 × 7 and 8 × 10. Commercial photographers are presently charging between $2.50 and $3 for each photograph.

The answer to part five is no.

DOLLAR VALUE OF DREDGING OPERATIONS

Question No. 801—**Mr. Muir (Cape Breton North and Victoria):**

What is the dollar value of the dredging to be carried out during the fiscal year 1966-67 in (a) the province of Ontario, and (b) the province of Nova Scotia?

Hon. G. J. McIlraith (Minister of Public Works): This information is contained in the estimates for the fiscal year 1966-67 which were tabled in the House of Commons on February 14, 1966 and is expected to be (a) in Ontario approximately $2,500,000 and (b) in Nova Scotia approximately $1,000,000.

IMMIGRATION FROM POLAND

Question No. 811—**Mr. Dinsdale:**

1. Does Canada have an immigration office in Poland?

2. If not, how are intending immigrants to Canada who qualify by reason of education, training and skills, processed?

3. For each year since 1960, how many immigrants came from Poland to Canada (a) on a sponsored basis (b) in their own right?

Mr. J. C. Munro (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Citizenship and Immigration):

1. No.

2. The Immigration Branch of the Department of Citizenship and Immigration is unable to process applications for persons in Poland who might otherwise qualify for admission by reason of their education, training or skills. In Poland, as in a number of other countries, it is not possible to obtain the necessary information to permit a proper assessment of the backgrounds of prospective immigrants. Because of this, immigration from Poland is restricted to people who are sponsored by their immediate close relatives in Canada.

3. (a)

Year	Sponsored immigration from Poland
1960	2,562
1961	2,355
1962	1,545
1963	1,405
1964	1,902
1965	1,923
Total	11,692

(b) No immigrants who qualified in their own right have come to Canada directly from Poland. However, there have been a few Polish immigrants who were not categorized as sponsored. These were persons who came to Canada as non-immigrants and eventually gained Landed Immigrant status while in this country and, to a lesser degree, persons classified as refugees who came to Canada directly from a Western European country. These two groups totalled 357 in the years 1960 to 1965.

*LONDON, ONT.—DISPOSAL OF MEREDITH HOUSE

Question No. 836—**Mr. Irvine:**

1. Has the property known as Meredith House at 565 Talbot street, London, Ontario, formerly used as army officers' quarters, been turned over to Crown Assets Disposal Corporation for disposition?

2. If so (a) were tenders or bids called (b) how many were received (c) what was the amount of each bid (d) who was the successful bidder?

Hon. C. M. Drury (Minister of Industry): Mr. Speaker, in so far as Crown Assets Disposal Corporation is concerned, the answer is as follows: 1. Yes.

2. (a) Yes; (b) three; (c) $45,500, $38,760 and $31,000; (d) W. Junsen Limited, London, Ontario.

ENAMEL & HEATING PRODUCTS LIMITED—AWARD OF CONTRACTS

Question No. 845—**Mr. Coates:**

1. What is the estimated amount of overhaul and repair contracts to be awarded by the Department of Defence Production to Enamel & Heating Products Limited for the fiscal year 1966-67, and (a) what aircraft are involved (b) what is the estimate to be expended on each of the aircraft in question?

2. What was the total amount of contracts awarded to this firm for the fiscal years 1963, 1964 and 1965?

Hon. C. M. Drury (Minister of Industry): 1. It is estimated that overhaul and repair contracts totalling $640,000.00 will be awarded by the Department of Defence Production to Enamel & Heating Products Limited for fiscal year 1966-67. (a) The work covered by the contracts mentioned above applies to aircraft components. No complete aircraft will be allotted to this firm. (b) For planning purposes, Enamel & Heating Products Ltd., have been informed that the following forecasts of DND arisings have been made: Tracker (CS2F), $300,000.00; Argus Neptune & Miscellaneous (including sub-contracts) $180,000.00; MN1A, $160,000.00; Total, $640,000.00.

2. Contracts were awarded to this firm in the total amounts indicated hereunder which are all subject to final audit by Audit Services

Questions

Branch Treasury Department. Fiscal year 1963/64, $861,000.00; 1964/65, $707,000.00; 1965/66, $695,500.00.

NORTHERN AFFAIRS—CONSTRUCTION OF ROADS AND BRIDGES

Question No. 851—**Mr. Orange:**

What are the details of the proposed expenditures in vote 50 of the main estimates of the Department of Northern Affairs and National Resources, Yukon Territory, construction of roads and bridges; the details in vote 50, Northwest Territories and other field services, construction of roads and bridges?

Hon. Arthur Laing (Minister of Northern Affairs and National Resources): Vote 50—Yukon Territory: Construction of roads and bridges.

1. Ross River—Carmacks Road: Complete mile 0-50 Construct mile 92-142 (1st year of 2-year program)	$1,500,000
2. Boundary Road: Reconstruct Mile 0-37	$1,600,000
3. Clinton Creek road: Construct 24 Miles of permanent access road (Representing 2/3 of total cost) Construct bridge over Fortymile river (Representing 2/3 of total cost)	$ 600,000
4. Whitehorse—Keno road: Pre-engineering mile 52-102 and various locations Installation of guide rails at various locations Complete painting Minto bridge	$ 43,000
Complete Willow, Fox and McCabe bridges	$ 72,000
Ease Curve and grade at mile 282	$ 15,000
5. Stewart crossing—Dawson road Replace six wooden bridges and raise grade at various locations and improve drainages	$ 235,500
6. Canol road: Provide Ferry across Pelly river and improve section mile 0-137	$ 250,000
7. General road construction	$ 50,000
8. General surveys for future development roads	$ 100,000
Total	$4,465,500

Vote 50—Northwest Territories and other field services construction of roads and bridges

1. Fort Smith highway Complete mile 97.5 to 157	$ 555,000
Construction of mile 38 to 97.5	$1,300,000
Construct two permanent type bridges over Salt River and Little Buffalo River	$ 200,000
2. Hay River highway Reconstruction of Hay River highway within the municipal district of Hay River	$ 375,000
3. Pine Point—Fort Resolution access road clear right-of-way and construct trail from Little Buffalo River to Fort Resolution	$ 50,000
4. Ingraham trail Reconstruct mile 16 to 20 and 1st year of 2 year construction from mile 20 to mile 80	$ 900,000
5. Fort Simpson airport road	$ 50,000
6. Mackenzie highway Extension of Mackenzie highway from mile 117 toward Fort Simpson	$ 600,000
7. General road construction Mackenzie region	$ 196,500
8. General road construction eastern Arctic areas	$ 114,000
9. Access road from Coral harbour to Snafu beach	$ 150,000
10. General surveys for future development roads	$ 100,000
Total	$4,590,500

UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE COMMISSION—ADDITIONAL SUMMER STAFF

Question No. 860—**Mr. Caron:**

1. How many extra employees were hired for summer positions by the Unemployment Insurance Commission (a) at the head office (b) in the other Ottawa offices, during the summer of 1965?

2. Who recommended these employees?

3. Do they have relatives—father, mother, brothers, sisters, uncles and aunts—who work for the Commission?

Hon. J. R. Nicholson (Minister of Labour): I am informed by the Unemployment Insurance Commission as follows:

1. (a) Three; (b) none.

2. Appointments are made through the Civil Service competitions held under the summer employment program for university graduates and under graduates.

3. None to our knowledge.

*NATIONAL DEFENCE—PENSIONS OF RETIRED OFFICERS

Question No. 869—**Mr. Diefenbaker:**

1. How many officers in the armed forces have retired each year since April 1963?

2. How many of said officers are in receipt annually of retirement pensions of (a) between $4 and $5 thousand dollars (b) between $5 and $6 thousand dollars (c) between $6 and $7 thousand dollars (d) between $7 and $8 thousand dollars (e) over $8 thousand dollars?

3. How many of said officers on retirement were between (a) 40 and 45 years of age (b) 45 and 50 years of age (c) 50 and 55 years of age (d) 55 and 60 years of age?

Hon. Paul Hellyer (Minister of National Defence): Mr. Speaker, the answer to part one of the question is as follows. The number of officers who have retired to pension each year since April 1, 1963 is as follows: April 1 to December 31, 1963, 349; January 1 to December 31, 1964, 803; January 1 to December 31, 1965, 971; January 1 to March 2, 1966, 197.

The answer to part two of the question is as follows. The number of these in each pensions or annuities range listed is as follows: (a) 613, (b) 292, (c) 112, (d) 39 and (e) 33.

The answer to part three of the question is as follows. The number of these in each age bracket listed is as follows: (a) 473, (b) 1,405, (c) 353 and (d) 32.

BANK OF CANADA LOANS

Question No. 875—**Mr. Caouette:**

1. Since the establishment of the Bank of Canada, how many loans or advances have been granted (a) to the government of Canada (b) to each of the ten provinces?

2. On what date was each loan made?

3. On what date was it reimbursed?

4. What was the rate of interest?

5. Were the loans made in the form of cheques, cash or otherwise?

6. From what sources did these sums lent to each provincial government come?

7. Could a provincial government request a loan from the Bank of Canada, and (a) if not, what is the reason (b) if so, under what conditions?

Hon. Mitchell Sharp (Minister of Finance): 1, 2, 3 and 4. The answer to question No. 2553, which appears on pages 11421 and 11422 of *Hansard* for February 17, 1965, gives the information requested, in so far as that information is a matter for public record.

5. The advances were made in the form of cheques or deposit receipts.

6. From the general resources of the Bank of Canada.

7. The powers of the bank with respect to loans or advances to provincial governments are set forth in Section 18(1) (i) and (j) of the Bank of Canada Act.

*PLANS FOR CENTENNIAL YOUTH PARLIAMENT

Question No. 881—**Mr. Dinsdale:**

1. Has the government received the report on plans for Canada's centennial youth parliament?

2. What action has been taken on the report?

Mr. Albert Béchard (Parliamentary Secretary to Secretary of State): Mr. Speaker, the answer to part one of the question is yes. A report by Mr. William A. Fair was received by the Centennial Commission on January 20, 1966.

The answer to part two is, the report is now under study.

INTEREST-FREE DEPOSITS IN CHARTERED BANKS

Question No. 900—**Mr. Hees:**

1. Do the chartered banks have on deposit $100,000,000 on which no interest is paid?

2. Is interest paid to the government of Canada on deposits with the chartered banks on $100,000,000 or over and, if so, what is the rate?

Hon. Mitchell Sharp (Minister of Finance): 1. The accounts of Canada indicate that the chartered banks currently have on deposit $100,000,000 of Receiver General balances on which the banks pay no interest.

Such accounts do not take into consideration cheques drawn on the Receiver General which have been cashed by the banks but not yet presented by them for reimbursement.

2. The chartered banks pay interest on minimum weekly Receiver General balances deposited with them which are in excess of $100,000,000, as reflected in the Receiver General's accounts. Such interest is calculated on the basis of the weekly average accepted treasury bill tender rate for three-month treasury bill less 10 per cent.

*EXTENSION OF VOCATIONAL TRAINING TO SOME EMPLOYED GROUPS

Question No. 918—**Mr. Rynard:**

Will the government give consideration to extending federal assistance now provided for vocational

and other educational training for unemployed persons to those presently employed but whose educational standards are low, in order that they may be able to obtain training which would keep them in employment as automation increases in industry?

Mr. J. C. Munro (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Citizenship and Immigration): Mr. Speaker, a number of courses in the programs operating under the technical and vocational training agreements between the federal and provincial governments are arranged, as the need or demand warrants, at hours specially selected to coincide with the off-duty periods of employed workers. Additionally, the training program in co-operation with industry, program 4 under the agreements, offers a special inducement for the development of in plant training programs, (a) for employees who, without retraining, would otherwise be displaced because of technological or other industrial changes; (b) for basic educational upgrading; and (c) for apprenticeship.

COMPENSATION FOR DISPLACED EMPLOYEES

Question No. 920—**Mr. Caouette:**

1. Is the government contemplating any measures which would make it necessary for employers to compensate workers who are laid off or forced to move elsewhere owing to automation processes or new working methods?

2. If so, what would be the nature of such compensation?

3. If not, will the government give consideration to this question?

[*Translation*]

Mr. J. C. Munro (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Citizenship and Immigration): 1. No.

2. Not applicable.

3. The government has a number of programs operating in co-operation with provincial governments, industry and unions which provide financial and other assistance to workers faced with adjustment to industrial change. Any new programs or revisions of existing programs will be announced in the usual way.

[*English*]

HISTORIC SITES—POINT CLARK LIGHTHOUSE

Question No. 923—**Mr. Loney:**

Has the Department of Northern Affairs and National Resources reached a decision regarding the question of the Point Clark Light Site for a National Historic Site?

Hon. Arthur Laing (Minister of Northern Affairs and National Resources): 1. The question of preserving the Point Clark Lighthouse was studied by the Historic Sites and Monuments Board of Canada at its 1965 meeting. The board felt it could not give an informed opinion on the merits of the structure until comparative data concerning other Great Lakes lighthouses was available. A study to produce such data was undertaken later in 1965 by the Canadian Historic Sites Division and the required information will be submitted to the Board at the spring meeting.

HOLSTEIN-FRIESIAN BREEDERS ON TRADE MISSION

Question No. 939—**Mr. Moore:**

1. Were any breeders of Holstein-Friesian cattle in the western provinces asked to join the trade mission to Japan and Korea arranged by the Department of Trade and Commerce?

2. If so, what breeders were approached, and who selected the personnel of the mission?

Mr. Jean-Charles Cantin (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Trade and Commerce): 1. No.

2. Mission members were selected by the Department of Trade and Commerce in consultation with the Holstein-Friesian Association of Canada.

*AIR CANADA—ROUTE FROM WINNIPEG TO UNITED KINGDOM

Question No. 975—**Mr. Sherman:**

1. In the next annual edition of *Working and Living Conditions in Canada*, will the Department of Labour, for the benefit of prospective immigrants, undertake to produce therein a map which will show (a) the existence of a direct Air Canada route from Winnipeg to the United Kingdom via Hudson Bay (b) the existence of a direct Air Canada route from Winnipeg to Ottawa (c) the existence of a direct transAir route from Winnipeg to Churchill?

2. If not, for what reasons?

Mr. J. C. Munro (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Citizenship and Immigration): Mr. Speaker, the answer to the first part of the question is, the publication *Working and Living Conditions in Canada* has been replaced by a series of brief pamphlets outlining the major features of Canadian working and living conditions. These pamphlets do not contain a map of Canada.

The answer to the second part of the question is, not applicable.

SMALL BUSINESSES LOANS ACT—
TOTAL LOANS

Question No. 991—**Mr. Stefanson:**

1. How many loans have been made under the Small Businesses Loans Act assented to December 20, 1960, to date, giving total amount of loans?

2. How many loans were made and what is the total amount of loans by years as follows: 1961, 1962, 1963, 1964 and 1965?

3. What is the amount of the average loan?

Hon. Mitchell Sharp (Minister of Finance): 1. Since inception to December 31, 1965: number of loans, 14,050; amount of loans $127,116,521.

2.

Year	Number	Amount
1961	2,977	$ 25,582,269
1962	2,833	$ 25,687,434
1963	2,558	$ 23,279,517
1964	2,847	$ 26,534,207
1965	2,835	$ 26,033,094

3. $9,048.

SMALL BUSINESSES LOANS ACT—MANITOBA

Question No. 992—**Mr. Stefanson:**

1. How many loans have been made under the Small Businesses Loans Act assented to December 20, 1960, to date, in the province of Manitoba, giving total amount of loans?

2. How many loans were made and what is the total amount of loans by years as follows: 1961, 1962, 1963, 1964 and 1965?

3. What is the amount of the average loan?

Hon. Mitchell Sharp (Minister of Finance): 1. Since inception to December 31, 1965: number of loans, 714; amount of loans, $5,548,645.

2.

Year	Number	Amount
1961	162	$ 1,230,264
1962	144	$ 1,272,463
1963	127	$ 943,527
1964	143	$ 1,137,445
1965	138	$ 964,946

3. $7,771.

CANADIAN HOMEOWNERS ASSOCIATION—
INCOME TAX

Question No. 1000—**Mrs. MacInnis (Vancouver-Kingsway):**

1. Has the Minister of Finance had correspondence, in regard to income tax deductions, with the Canadian Homeowners Association or any officer thereof?

2. If so, what were the dates of such correspondence?

3. What was the nature of the minister's reply to the correspondence?

Hon. Mitchell Sharp (Minister of Finance): 1. Yes.

2. Letter from the Canadian Homeowners Association dated February 7, 1966. Reply from Minister of Finance dated February 16, 1966.

3. The reply stated that the proposal of the Canadian Homeowners Association would be carefully studied during the review of tax legislation before the budget is presented.

SALES TAX ON REDESIGNED AIRCRAFT

Question No. 1001—**Mr. Forrestall:**

1. Has the government considered the advisability of exempting from sales tax, aircraft designed or modified for agricultural purposes?

2. If not, would the government now consider this matter?

3. If so, what conclusion was reached and what reasons were considered in arriving at that conclusion?

Hon. Mitchell Sharp (Minister of Finance): Requests that aircraft used for spraying crops be made exempt from sales tax, as well as representations on a wide range of other sales tax matters, are being studied during the preparation of the budget.

REPORTING OF PERSONAL TAXABLE INCOMES

Question No. 1007—**Mr. Korchinski:**

1. For the year 1964, how many personal taxable incomes were reported in each thousand dollar category commencing with 0 to $1,000, and up to $15,000?

2. How many reported taxable incomes were there (a) between $15,000 and $20,000 (b) between $20,000 and $25,000 (c) between $25,000 and $50,000 (d) between $50,000 and $100,000 (e) over $100,000?

3. In each of the categories above, how much income tax was paid?

Hon. E. J. Benson (Minister of National Revenue): 1, 2 and 3. Available information is based on classes of total income before exemptions and deductions. Information showing the number of taxpayers and also the tax payable by income classes which correspond very nearly to the classes called for in the question is published annually in Taxation Statistics. The latest year for which such information is available is 1963. This will be found in table form on page 8 of 1965 Taxation Statistics, Part One—Individuals. More detailed information of a related nature will be found on pages 24-33 and on pages 76 and 77.

Questions

POSSIBLE INCREASE IN SEAL QUOTA

Question No. 1,008—**Mr. Tucker:**

Is the government giving consideration to increasing the quota of seals taken in the Gulf of St. Lawrence this season from 50,000?

Hon. H. J. Robichaud (Minister of Fisheries): No.

BELLETERRE, QUE., RADAR STATION

Question No. 1,009—**Mr. Lefebvre:**

1. Has the radar station at Belleterre, Témiscamingue county, been in operation since its construction in 1960?

2. If so, for how long was it in operation and how many employees were there?

3. Is this station no longer in operation and, if so, for what reason?

[*Translation*]

Hon. Léo Cadieux (Associate Minister of National Defence): 1. No.

2. Not applicable.

3. As indicated in *Hansard* 28 Feb. 1966, page 1,858, the decision to abandon the project was taken in April 1964.

[*English*]

*CENTENNIAL CELEBRATION—NAMING OF FEDERAL PROJECTS

Question No. 1,017—**Mr. McCleave:**

Will the government consider, as part of the centennial celebration, that former prime ministers who have died or who are no longer in public life be commemorated by ensuring that each has at least one federal project named after him?

Mr. Albert Béchard (Parliamentary Secretary to Secretary of State): Mr. Speaker, local centennial projects for the construction of projects of a lasting nature in local communities, and confederation memorial projects in the provincial capitals are undertaken under the terms of federal provincial agreements. These agreements do not provide for the naming of centennial projects and since the projects are undertaken by local communities or the provincial governments the responsibility for the selection of names rests with those organizations.

The government will give consideration to naming appropriate federal projects which will be recommended by the appropriate minister, after former prime ministers who have died or who are no longer in public life.

[Mr. Benson.]

FISHERIES REGULATIONS—LANDING OF FISH IN CANADA

Question No. 1,032—**Mr. Crouse:**

1. Do the fisheries regulations applicable to the landing of fish in Canada by a vessel, trawler or dragger registered outside Canada apply to a vessel, trawler or dragger registered outside Canada which is chartered to a provincial crown corporation?

2. If so, will they be strictly enforced?

Hon. H. J. Robichaud (Minister of Fisheries): 1. Yes.

2. Yes.

[*Translation*]

MOTIONS FOR PAPERS

Mr. Albert Béchard (Parliamentary Secretary to the Secretary of State): Mr. Speaker, notices of motions Nos. 104 and 105 are acceptable to the government with the usual reservations concerning confidential documents and subject to the consent of the provincial authorities concerned.

[*English*]

Mr. Speaker: Subject to the reservation expressed by the hon. parliamentary secretary, is it the pleasure of the house that notices of motions 104 and 105 shall be deemed to have been adopted?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

PULPWOOD EXPORT FACILITIES

Motion No. 104—**Mr. Cashin:**

That an humble Address be presented to His Excellency praying that he will cause to be laid before this House a copy of all letters referring to facilities for the export of pulpwood exchanged during 1964, 1965 and 1966 between any federal minister and any minister of the provincial government of Nova Scotia.

Motion agreed to.

NOVA SCOTIA—MUNICIPAL WINTER WORKS PROJECTS

Motion No. 105—**Mr. Asselin (Richmond-Wolfe):**

That an humble Address be presented to His Excellency praying that he will cause to be laid before this House a copy of a letter, dated July 2, 1965, sent by the Minister of Labour to the province of Nova Scotia concerning municipal winter works projects for the winter of 1965-66, and for a copy of any reply.

Motion agreed to.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Albert Béchard (Parliamentary Secretary to Secretary of State): Would Your Honour be kind enough to call notices of motion Nos. 100 and 101?

[*English*]

ORDERS IN COUNCIL SUMMONING PARLIAMENT

Motion No. 100—**Mr. Bell (Carleton):**

That an humble address be presented to His Excellency praying that he will cause to be laid before this house a copy of the order in council, instrument of advice or other document summoning parliament for the sittings thereof commencing on November 12, 1953, January 8, 1957, October 14, 1957, May 12, 1958, September 27, 1962, May 16, 1963 and January 18, 1966.

ORDERS IN COUNCIL DISSOLVING PARLIAMENT

Motion No. 101—**Mr. Bell (Carleton):**

That an humble address be presented to His Excellency praying that he will cause to be laid before this house a copy of the order in council, instrument of advice or other document dissolving the House of Commons before the general elections of June 10, 1957, March 31, 1958, June 18, 1962, April 8, 1963 and November 8, 1965.

He said: Mr. Speaker, after discussion with the Prime Minister (Mr. Pearson) and the President of the Privy Council (Mr. Favreau), I realize that these two motions will not produce the information in the form in which I desire it. Therefore I would ask leave of the house to withdraw the two motions, without prejudice to my right to put a question or questions on the order paper which would elucidate the constitutional problem.

I would like to express my appreciation for the courtesy of the Prime Minister and the President of the Privy Council in the discussion.

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Mr. Speaker: Is it agreed that motions 100 and 101 be dropped?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Albert Béchard (Parliamentary Secretary to Secretary of State): I would ask, Mr. Speaker, that the other notices of motion stand.

[*English*]

Mr. Speaker: Is it agreed that the motions stand?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

INDUSTRY

HEAVY WATER—REQUEST FOR STATEMENT ON SECOND PLANT—SASKATCHEWAN OFFER

On the orders of the day:

Right Hon. J. G. Diefenbaker (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, I should like to direct a question to the Minister of Industry, and ask him whether or not representations have been received from the government of the province of Saskatchewan offering to enter into a partnership for the construction of a heavy water plant in Saskatchewan? Has the minister had such a communication from Premier Thatcher? Has the government given any consideration to that suggestion in determining the matter that is now under consideration?

Hon. C. M. Drury (Minister of Industry): Mr. Speaker, as this jurisdiction now falls under my colleague the Minister of Mines and Technical Surveys, I will turn the matter over to him.

Hon. Jean-Luc Pepin (Minister of Mines and Technical Surveys): Mr. Speaker, yesterday I answered a similar question asked by the hon. member for Moose Mountain (Mr. Southam). At that time I said that the three months allowance permitting discussion between Canadian General Electric and the provinces and municipalities interested in seeing this heavy water plant established in their territory, normally would end on Friday. So the decision should come the day after tomorrow. I do not think I can say anything more.

Mr. Diefenbaker: Mr. Speaker, that is not the question I asked. The question is, did the premier on behalf of the government of Saskatchewan offer to proceed with the plant in the form of a partnership whereby the equity capital required to build the plant would be provided by a guarantee of the bonds of a company by the provincial government?

Mr. Pepin: I am not aware of such negotiations, Mr. Speaker, but I think they would interest only Canadian General Electric and the government of Saskatchewan. The government of Canada is interested in getting a contract with Canadian General Electric for the production of heavy water. The kind of contract Canadian General Electric has with Saskatchewan is, I believe, their own business.

Mr. Diefenbaker: Just one more question, Mr. Speaker. Was this suggestion not made by the Premier of Saskatchewan to the federal government?

Mr. Pepin: It was not made to me, anyway.

Mr. Drury: Perhaps I might clarify this matter, Mr. Speaker. There was some earlier discussion between myself and the Premier

of Saskatchewan along these lines. It was pointed out to the Premier of Saskatchewan that for the time being the federal government was endeavouring to negotiate an agreement with Canadian General Electric and we would prefer to wait and see how this turned out before proceeding with alternative schemes.

Hon. Marcel Lambert (Edmonton West): A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. May I ask the Minister of Industry whether this was a salvage operation?

Mr. Drury: No, this was a constructive operation.

TRADE

REQUEST FOR INTRODUCTION OF NATIONAL CO-OPERATIVE LEGISLATION

On the orders of the day:

Mr. T. C. Douglas (Burnaby-Coquitlam): Mr. Speaker, I should like to direct a question to the Secretary of State of which I have given her notice. In view of the fact that on May 4 last her predecessor indicated that a committee of his department had been set up to draft a National Co-operative Act, I should like to ask the minister whether that committee has finished its work and if the National Co-operative Act will be introduced at this session of parliament.

Hon. Judy V. LaMarsh (Secretary of State): Mr. Speaker, I should like to thank my hon. friend for giving me notice of his question, particularly since I had not heard of the matter before. I am glad to inform the house that a committee of four was established, as was reported earlier, to study the type of legislation needed to meet the requirements of co-operatives and to indicate the provisions of such legislation in sufficiently detailed form to allow preparation of a bill.

This committee has apparently held regular meetings, and substantial progress I am informed is reported. It is hoped that the committee will be in a position to report to the government within a reasonable length of time, but as yet I am advised that no fixed date can be established because of the complexity of the problem.

Mr. Douglas: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Is the committee working on this draft legislation holding conferences or discussions with co-operative organizations who, it would seem to me, could give a good deal of useful information in framing such legislation?

[Mr. Drury.]

Miss LaMarsh: I am not aware of the answer to that question but I should be glad to make inquiries and advise my hon. friend.

[*Translation*]

LABOUR RELATIONS

RECOGNITION BY C.B.C. OF C.N.T.U.

On the orders of the day:

Mr. Gilles Grégoire (Lapointe): Mr. Speaker, in the absence of the Minister of Labour, I should like to direct a question to the Minister of Citizenship and Immigration.

In view of the statement promised for early March on the Canada Labour Relations Board concerning the C.N.T.U. application to be certified as bargaining agent for the employees of the French network of the C.B.C., can the minister tell us when it will be made and when he will report on this application of the C.N.T.U. to be recognized and certified as bargaining agent by the Canadian Labour Relations Board?

Hon. Jean Marchand (Minister of Citizenship and Immigration): Mr. Speaker, I am sorry, but the Canada Labour Relations Board is under the jurisdiction of the Minister of Labour and I cannot say when he will be in a position to make a statement.

Mr. Grégoire: Mr. Speaker, I have a supplementary question for the minister. Can he tell us whether he is using his influence with the Minister of Labour to settle this matter?

Mr. Speaker: Order. This question is unacceptable and against the rules.

Mr. Grégoire: Mr. Speaker, I should like to put my supplementary question in another way.

Mr. Speaker: Order. The hon. member is aware of the fact that a question to the Minister of Labour should be put to that minister, and not to another one.

[*English*]

EXTERNAL AFFAIRS

VIET NAM—MR. CHESTER RONNING—ROLE OF INTERNATIONAL CONTROL COMMISSION

On the orders of the day:

Mr. R. N. Thompson (Red Deer): Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the Secretary of State for External Affairs. I think hon. members of this house and all Canadians have been proud to hear the reports concerning Mr. Chester Ronning's mission in the Far East as a special envoy of the government. In view of the fact that Mr.

Ronning has returned to Canada and it is reported that he has had meetings in both Hanoi and Saigon, could the minister tell us something of this report and what the success of his mission has been?

Hon. Paul Martin (Secretary of State for External Affairs): Mr. Speaker, my hon. friend will remember that last week a question was asked of me in this context by the hon. member for Chapleau (Mr. Laprise), and I asked him at that time if he would be good enough not to press his question. It is clear that the Canadian government, along with the other governments on the International Control Commission, has been anxious to ascertain whether or not in the opinion of countries concerned there is a role for the Commission to play in trying to bring about negotiations. Mr. Ronning will be reporting to the government in due course. Beyond that there is nothing I can add.

Mr. W. B. Nesbitt (Oxford): A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. I was wondering whether the minister could tell us if Mr. Ronning will be available to appear before the house committee on external affairs, which will probably be meeting very shortly, even if Mr. Ronning should have to appear in camera.

Mr. Martin (Essex East): Mr. Speaker, it must be apparent that Mr. Ronning, who has been in Saigon and Hanoi, was not sent on a joy ride. I think my hon. friend will recognize that in order to achieve what is intended, there is a time for disclosure of what is being attempted, and I must say that now is not that moment.

Mr. Nesbitt: A further supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Perhaps the Secretary of State for External Affairs did not hear all my question. I asked him whether it would be possible for Mr. Ronning to appear at an in-camera meeting of the house committee on external affairs.

Mr. Martin (Essex East): I would think at this moment that it would not be desirable.

MAINLAND CHINA—POSSIBILITY OF RECOGNITION

On the orders of the day:

Mr. E. R. Schreyer (Springfield): Mr. Speaker, may I address a question to the Secretary of State for External Affairs. Several days ago, in a written reply to a question asked by the hon. member for Sherbrooke, the minister used these words, and I quote:

> The Canadian government continues to recognize the government of the Republic of China at its present seat of government.

I would ask the minister whether the inclusion of that last qualifying phrase was meant to imply that the Canadian government is entertaining some thoughts about a two China concept?

Mr. Speaker: Order. I believe this is a question which should be placed on the Order Paper.

[*Later:*]

Mr. Schreyer: Mr. Speaker, may I direct a further question to the Secretary of State for External Affairs. I would ask the minister what he meant when he said that Canada recognized the Republic of China but only at its present seat of government?

Mr. Speaker: Order. I do not believe that question can be asked in its present form.

[*Translation*]

NATO—POSSIBILITY OF MEETING FOLLOWING DECLARATION BY FRANCE

On the orders of the day:

Hon. Martial Asselin (Charlevoix): Mr. Speaker, I should like to direct a question to the Secretary of State for External Affairs.

Could he tell the house if the NATO member-countries will soon meet in order to study the recent stand taken by France toward that organization?

Hon. Paul Martin (Secretary of State for External Affairs): Yes, Mr. Speaker, consultations have taken place with our allies. A meeting is being held at the present time in Paris; there will be another one on Friday and we keep continuously in touch with the countries concerned.

[*English*]

NATO—PROPOSAL TO PLACE CANADIAN TROOPS UNDER FRENCH COMMAND

On the orders of the day:

Right Hon. J. G. Diefenbaker (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, I have a supplementary question to the Secretary of State for External Affairs. Yesterday I asked him a question regarding the note sent by President de Gaulle to the several countries comprising NATO, and there was an indication in his

answer that it was not available. In view of the fact that the note was set forth verbatim in the New York *Times* of March 13, one note being sent to the United States and a similar one to all the other countries of NATO, would he care, the note having been made available, to table a copy?

Hon. Paul Martin (Secretary of State for External Affairs): No, Mr. Speaker. Until the government has had an opportunity of considering that note I think my right hon. friend would agree that it would not be proper to table it. The note which appeared in the New York *Times* is not in the precise terms of the note addressed to Canada.

Hon. Marcel Lambert (Edmonton West): A supplementary question. In just what terms might it be different and why is there a delay in time? Do we also receive it by slow boat?

Mr. Martin (Essex East): Mr. Speaker, my hon. friend has forgotten that last Friday I said that the note had been received the day before. The note refers to matters which are of special interest to France and Canada, matters that concern Canadian bases, that concern aspects which involve our bilateral relationships in NATO—

Mr. Lambert: Bilateral?

Mr. Martin (Essex East): Of course. My hon. friend knows that there are two Canadian bases in France, and the French government has indicated that it is prepared to negotiate as to the modality of implementing its policy with regard to those bases. But these are Canadian bases, not United States bases. Therefore the note deals with matters of special concern to Canada.

Mr. Lambert: A further supplementary question. It was my understanding, though I may have been wrong, that these were Canadian NATO bases in France and therefore our relationship with France was on a multilateral basis. The minister denied the other day that we were dealing with them on a bilateral basis—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

Mr. Lambert: —so which is the true position now?

Mr. Speaker: Order.

[Mr. Diefenbaker.]

ELECTORAL BOUNDARIES COMMISSION ACT

ALBERTA—REQUEST FOR ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS

On the orders of the day:

Hon. Marcel Lambert (Edmonton West): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Secretary of State. On January 24 I filed questions Nos. 202 and 212 with respect to the Electoral Boundaries Commission in the province of Alberta. Could I ask the minister whether it is the intention of the government to answer the said questions; and if not, why not?

Hon. Judy V. LaMarsh (Secretary of State): Of course it is the intention of the government to answer all questions. I assume in this case, as in every other case, officials of my department sent along to the Electoral Boundaries Officer, Mr. Castonguay, a request that this information be provided and that he then got in touch with the province of Alberta's commission so far as both these questions are concerned. The fact that the questions have not yet been answered simply means that we have not yet heard, I assume, from Alberta.

Mr. Lambert: A supplementary question. Is the message going by walk or by dog team?

Miss LaMarsh: The difficulty is not how slowly the message goes but how quickly the answer comes back.

Mr. Lambert: Either.

OLD AGE SECURITY

INCREASED PENSIONS—REPORT OF SENATE COMMITTEE

On the orders of the day:

Mr. G. H. Aiken (Parry Sound-Muskoka): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Prime Minister. Has the government made any decision on the implementation of the report of the Senate committee on aging or in connection with old age pension increases generally?

Right Hon. L. B. Pearson (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, this very important report is under very urgent consideration.

CROWN ASSETS

HARMON BASE—REQUEST TO WITHHOLD SALE OF HEAVY EQUIPMENT

On the orders of the day:

Mr. J. R. Keays (Gaspé): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Industry.

As it is indicated that a sale of heavy equipment which entered Canada free of taxes and originated at the Harmon air force base is imminent, would the minister give consideration, if the quantities are substantial or alarming, to withholding parts of the sale so as not to cause an adverse impact of such surplus disposals on the Canadian market?

Hon. C. M. Drury (Minister of Industry): Mr. Speaker, I am sure the hon. gentleman would not want me to answer so hypothetical a question.

[*Later:*]

Mr. Keays: May I ask a supplementary question of the Minister of Industry. I wonder how hypothetical my question could be when the C.A.D.C. says that the sale is imminent.

[*Translation*]

AGRICULTURE

FLUCTUATION OF PORK PRICES

On the orders of the day:

Mr. Henri Latulippe (Compton-Frontenac): Mr. Speaker, may I direct a question to the Minister of Agriculture?

Is the minister aware of the steady decrease in prices, or can he tell the house whether his department is watching closely the excessive variation of market prices for pork?

Mr. Speaker: This question is somewhat general and I think that the hon. member might put it on the order paper.

[*English*]

IMMIGRATION

RESTRICTION ON CANADIAN WORKERS ENTERING U.S.—REQUEST FOR CORRESPONDENCE

On the orders of the day:

Hon. R. A. Bell (Carleton): Mr. Speaker, may I direct a question to the Minister of Citizenship and Immigration? Yesterday, by leave, he laid on the table certain regulations dealing with alien employment. He did so in response to an undertaking he had made on February 24. Looking at *Hansard* for that date, I see that what the hon. gentleman then undertook to do was to table correspondence with what he described as the United States Consul here in Ottawa in relation to this matter. He undertook to do so at the request of the hon. member for Mégantic. I wonder whether the minister would table the correspondence which he then undertook to table?

Hon. Jean Marchand (Minister of Citizenship and Immigration): Mr. Speaker, I think the hon. member is right. That is what I said. We were discussing the regulations concerning Canadian workers crossing the border and asking for work in the United States. I did not table the letter which transmitted the regulations because I was told that before tabling such a letter I would have to have the agreement of the United States Consul who supplied me with the regulations. If you want me to ask for that permission, I am ready to do so. However, the letter simply transmitted the regulations.

Mr. Bell (Carleton): In the minister's interests I should like him to clear the record in relation to this matter.

CANADA PENSION PLAN

COMPENSATION TO EMPLOYERS FOR OVERPAYMENT

On the orders of the day:

Mr. A. D. Hales (Wellington South): Mr. Speaker, I should like to direct a question to the Minister of National Revenue. Can the minister advise the house what progress he has made with regard to a formula or system whereby employers will be paid for over-contributions to the Canada Pension Plan?

Hon. E. J. Benson (Minister of National Revenue): None, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Hales: Does the minister expect to formulate some plan in the near future?

Mr. Benson: The United States government has been trying to do this for 20 years. We are looking into the problem but we do not expect to settle it in a few months.

Mr. Hales: Does the minister feel we should have to wait 20 years as in the United States?

INDUSTRY

POSSIBILITY OF RETAINING EMPLOYMENT FOR STUDEBAKER WORKERS

On the orders of the day:

Mr. William Dean Howe (Hamilton South): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Industry. Has a specific date been set for a meeting with U.A.W. representatives concerning the situation of Studebaker employees?

Hon. C. M. Drury (Minister of Industry): Mr. Speaker, there was a meeting arranged by my colleague, the Minister of Citizenship and Immigration two days ago, I think, at

which the question of what could, should and would be done in relation to Studebaker employees was thoroughly canvassed during the course of almost the entire morning.

HAMILTON, ONT.—ALTERNATIVE USE FOR STUDEBAKER PLANT

On the orders of the day:

Mr. Joseph Macaluso (Hamilton West): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Industry. Has the minister received a request from the mayor of the city of Hamilton to discuss some alternative use for the Studebaker plant?

Hon. C. M. Drury (Minister of Industry): Mr. Speaker, I hope to see the mayor of Hamilton on this subject tomorrow morning.

THE CANADIAN ECONOMY

STEPS TO DEAL WITH RISING PRICES AND INCREASING COSTS

On the orders of the day:

Right Hon. J. G. Diefenbaker (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, I should like to address a question to the Prime Minister. In view of the serious situation resulting from the ever-rising cost of living and the detrimental effect it has on people with fixed incomes and pensions, I ask if there have been any communications from the federal government to the provinces, in view of the constitutional powers in the British North America Act, for a joint effort to meet this serious situation?

Right Hon. L. B. Pearson (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, if my right hon. friend could wait for a few days—I know how important this question is to him and to all of us—I am sure the Minister of Finance, when he introduces his budget, will be able to deal with the question and explain to the house the steps that have been taken.

Mr. Diefenbaker: When the Prime Minister says, "in a few days", does that mean the budget is going to be brought down in a few days?

Mr. Pearson: Yes, in a few days.

[*Later:*]

Mr. T. C. Douglas (Burnaby-Coquitlam): Mr. Speaker, may I ask a supplementary question of the Prime Minister? Some time ago the Prime Minister asked the Economic Council if they would look into the question of rising prices to ascertain whether or not they were warranted. How soon can we expect a report from the Economic Council on this matter?

Mr. Pearson: I have made, I think, two inquiries since my hon. friend asked the question and have urged on them the desirability of getting this study completed as quickly as possible. I will get in touch with them again.

Mr. Douglas: Would the Prime Minister consider providing staff, if that is what is necessary, to get this report to the government at as early a date as possible?

Mr. Pearson: If it is a matter merely of a shortage of staff, I am sure that can be corrected for a temporary purpose like this. I doubt that that is the difficulty, but I shall inquire.

THE BUDGET

INQUIRY AS TO POSSIBLE DATE OF PRESENTATION

On the orders of the day:

Hon. Michael Starr (Ontario): Mr. Speaker, I should like to direct a question to the Minister of Finance. Has he set the date yet for the presentation of his budget?

Hon. Mitchell Sharp (Minister of Finance): Mr. Speaker, I have set the date in my own mind but I have not yet cleared it with my colleagues.

PUBLIC WORKS

CO-OPERATION OF PROVINCES IN CUT-BACKS

On the orders of the day:

Hon. Marcel Lambert (Edmonton West): Mr. Speaker, in view of the government's announced cut-back in public works projects, has the government, in pursuance of its policy of co-operative federalism, enlisted the support of the provinces in this particular activity? I ask this question in view of the increased budgets of the provinces for public works.

Right Hon. L. B. Pearson (Prime Minister): Yes, Mr. Speaker, this matter has been taken up with the provinces.

Mr. Lambert: With what results?

CANADIAN BROADCASTING CORPORATION

SITUATION RESULTING FROM INTERVIEW WITH GERDA MUNSINGER

On the orders of the day:

Hon. Marcel Lambert (Edmonton West): Mr. Speaker, may I direct a question to the

Prime Minister? In view of the representations by the hon. member for Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands with regard to a certain television program that was scheduled to appear yesterday and in view of the fact that such television program did appear, are we now to accept the fact that judicial inquiries and other judicial processes are to be replaced by trial by television?

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

PUBLIC SERVICE

JOHN KROEKER—REQUEST FOR REVIEW OF PENSION RIGHTS

On the orders of the day:

Mr. G. H. Aiken (Parry Sound-Muskoka): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Secretary of State. Is the government considering a review of the pension and other rights of Mr. John Kroeker who was dismissed from the Civil Service for expressing views concurred in by many Canadians?

Hon. Judy V. LaMarsh (Secretary of State): Mr. Speaker, I have not been considering it.

Mr. Aiken: May I ask a supplementary question? Would the minister consider such a request now?

Miss LaMarsh: I am not aware that any such request has been made. I saw the gentleman in question yesterday on the hill outside the building, but I am not aware nor have I been informed by the Civil Service Commission that he has made any such request.

CANADA ELECTIONS ACT

SUGGESTION TO SHORTEN LENGTH OF CAMPAIGN

On the orders of the day:

Mr. Stanley Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Mr. Speaker, may I ask the Prime Minister if he can indicate why it has taken so long to answer my starred question No. 927, which I filed almost two weeks ago at the suggestion of the Chair?

Right Hon. L. B. Pearson (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, I will certainly give immediate personal consideration to this question. It is one, I think, that should be answered very quickly.

Inquiries of the Ministry

EXPO '67

PERFORMANCE BY ROYAL CANADIAN MOUNTED POLICE BAND

On the orders of the day:

Mr. Joseph Macaluso (Hamilton West): Mr. Speaker, may I direct a question to the Secretary of State in her capacity as minister for culture. Has the minister's attention been drawn to the discriminatory practice being used by the vice president of the American Federation of Musicians in not allowing the Royal Canadian Mounted Police band to be recorded at Expo '67?

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. Certainly the way the question is put by the hon. member it cannot be accepted because whether or not the minister's attention has been drawn to the particular situation to which the hon. member is referring cannot be considered an urgent matter.

Mr. Macaluso: Ten o'clock, according to Provisional Standing Order 39A.

NATIONAL DEFENCE

McGILL UNIVERSITY RESEARCH PROJECT

On the orders of the day:

Mr. R. N. Thompson (Red Deer): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of National Defence. Can the minister explain today's report that the Canadian government has withdrawn support from McGill University's high altitude research project while United States military support is being extended?

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. I believe this is a question which should be placed on the Order Paper.

AGRICULTURE

REQUEST FOR ANNOUNCEMENT OF DAIRY POLICY

On the orders of the day:

Mr. W. B. Nesbitt (Oxford): Mr. Speaker, I have a question I should like to direct to the Minister of Agriculture. Can the minister give us the approximate date when he intends to announce the government's dairy policy for the coming year?

Hon. J. J. Greene (Minister of Agriculture): Mr. Speaker, the government's proposals with respect to dairy policy will be announced shortly, certainly before April 1 which is the commencement of the dairy year.

Inquiries of the Ministry

CROP INSURANCE—POSSIBILITY OF MEETING WITH PROVINCIAL MINISTER

On the orders of the day:

Hon. J. J. Greene (Minister of Agriculture): Mr. Speaker, while I am on my feet may I answer another question.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Speaker, in answer to the question asked yesterday by the hon. member for Chapleau (Mr. Laprise), I wish to inform him, as I indicated to the hon. member for Lotbinière (Mr. Choquette) on February 22 last, that a conference took place on February 17 with representatives of all the provinces, to discuss matters pertaining to crop insurance.

At that meeting, hon. Mr. Courcy and his advisers, spoke to us about the Massicotte report.

[*English*]

INQUIRY OF THE MINISTRY

On the orders of the day:

Mr. Ralph Cowan (York-Humber): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Secretary of State for External Affairs of which I have given him notice. Can he advise the house whether or not any members of the ministry, all of whom have sworn loyalty and fealty to Her Majesty the Queen, will be attending the reception tomorrow at the embassy of Southern Ireland to commemorate the 50th anniversary of the Irish rebellion of 1916?

NATIONAL DEFENCE

PAY INCREASES FOR AIR FORCE PERSONNEL

On the orders of the day:

Hon. Marcel Lambert (Edmonton West): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of National Defence. The other day I raised with him the question of pay for pilots in the air sector of our defence forces. Is he now in a position to tell us why certain members of the air force were told that they were getting a pay increase?

Hon. Paul Hellyer (Minister of National Defence): No, Mr. Speaker.

R.C.A.F.—CURTAILMENT IN FLIGHTS OVER FRANCE

On the orders of the day:

Hon. Paul Hellyer (Minister of National Defence): Mr. Speaker, while I have the floor, yesterday my hon. friend asked me two questions with respect to the curtailment of R.C.A.F. over-flight privileges in France. I am informed by the staff of the Department of National Defence that the answer to both those questions is no.

FISHERIES

PROVISION FOR DEVELOPMENT OF COMMERCIAL FISHERIES

Hon. H. J. Robichaud (Minister of Fisheries) moved that the house go into committee to consider the following resolution:

That it is expedient to introduce a measure for the development of the commercial fisheries of Canada; to provide, in connection therewith, that the Minister may undertake federal projects or participate in federal-provincial projects and make payments in consequence thereof; to provide also for the establishment of advisory committees for carrying out the purposes of the Act and the remuneration and expenses of their members; to provide further that all expenditures for the purpose of the said measure shall be paid out of money appropriated by Parliament therefor.

Motion agreed to and the house went into committee, Mr. Batten in the chair.

Mr. Robichaud: Mr. Chairman, in January of 1964, slightly over two years ago, I had the honour of convening in Ottawa a federal-provincial conference on fisheries development. The outcome of that conference was that the representatives of the federal government and the ten provinces agreed to co-operate in the formulation and implementation of a national development program. Such a program, it was decided, would include measures to expand available resources, measures to improve the technique of catching and processing and to facilitate their adoption, measures to diversify products and improve quality, measures to expand markets and reduce price uncertainty—in short, measures to bring about greater productivity and efficiency in all phases of the fishing industry.

We of the federal government, together with those responsible for fisheries in the provinces, have now had two years in which to formulate and implement, in part, a program to carry out the stated aims of the conference. It need hardly be said that the development and expansion of the fishing industry are rooted in productive capacity at the primary level. To harvest the resources of the seas around us and all our fresh water areas it is necessary that our fishing force, which is large and industrious, be well equipped for its trade. It must also be well trained in both the old methods of operation and in the newer ones which have been introduced in the past few years, and others now being explored.

• (3:50 p.m.)

To enable the fishing force to obtain the more modern, mechanized equipment—the vessels and gear—that they need, a number of forms of financial assistance already in existence have had to be improved upon and others have had to be inaugurated.

Much has been done in the past two years on development projects and much more is planned with a view not only to the further utilization of the traditional fisheries but also the exploitation of species of fish which are not now taken by Canadian ships. On the Pacific coast, we are encouraging the utilization of the offshore groundfish resource and exploring ways and means of making use of such species as dogfish to provide a new source of income for fishermen. We foresee also a very substantial development in the herring fishery, particularly in the Atlantic, where our fishing fleets, inshore, near offshore and deep sea, are undergoing the expansion and modernization which is imperative if we are to meet the increasing market demand for our fish products.

A new fishery is shaping up in the form of a substantial tuna development which is being established in New Brunswick. This in itself is unique in that it inaugurates what we might call the first far distant fishing operations by Canadians.

I could list scores of projects which are under way or planned for fisheries development. Some of these are being carried out by my department at 100 per cent federal cost, while others are joint endeavours in co-operation with the provinces and the industry.

I must emphasize that our total fisheries development program will stand or fall on the availability of qualified fishing crews both in the inshore and offshore fisheries. This very real manpower problem is presenting a major challenge to the provincial as well as the federal authorities. However, we are determined to meet it head on and to this end there is close federal-provincial co-operation not only in the design of vessels and improved fishing methods generally but in what we hope will be effective vocational training activities.

Development of the resource itself is fundamental to any development or expansion of the fisheries. I am gratified and impressed with the total response of our resources development personnel in all parts of Canada to the intricate demands which confront them in this regard. I say "intricate" demands for it is in this field that we attempt to improve upon the natural environment of the fish and try to reduce or eliminate the damages caused by industrial and other uses of water resources. I shall have much more to say in this regard, Mr. Chairman, when the estimates of the Department of Fisheries are discussed before the Standing Committee on Fisheries.

The addition of industrial and other wastes to fresh water contribute to massive changes in plant and animal life up to and including the fishes. These changes are not really understood and, I am pleased to say, the Fisheries Research Board of Canada is to carry out a program in the area to identify what these changes are and why they occur.

This particular program is just one of many which will be launched by both Canada and the United States under reference to the International Joint Commission.

In keeping with the vigorous industrial and resource development programs there has been simultaneous and effective expansion of the technological and biological programs of the Fisheries Research Board of Canada. In other words, development of the fisheries and broadening of scientific research have gone hand in hand as they must.

Today there is virtually no part or aspect of fisheries which does not come under the influence of science. As fishing techniques and methods of processing and of handling fish change, and as we seek to move out into new areas and to develop untapped resources, the active support of science becomes ever more vital. I am impressed that the Fisheries Research Board has found it possible to cope with its increased work load which has taxed its men and facilities to the utmost.

The excellent reputation which our Canadian fish products enjoy on the domestic market and in the many countries to which they go is indicative, I think, of the efforts of our industry to diversify their products and to maintain high standards of quality. It reflects also, I think, the contributions in the inspection field which my department has made in promoting high standards.

A major advance was accomplished with the passing of fresh and frozen fish plant registration legislation which became effective April 1, 1965. Excellent co-operation has been received from industry in meeting the requirements for construction, equipment and the sanitary operation of some 220 fresh and frozen fish processing plants.

The products of our fisheries generally are now enjoying excellent markets; the demand

is good both at home and abroad and prices are strong. The problem now is one of supply rather than demand, and it is to assure the supply that this Fisheries Development Act, which I now expect to have the privilege to introduce, has been prepared.

Mr. Crouse: Mr. Chairman, I listened with interest to the comments of the Minister of Fisheries, as he announced the details of a measure for the development of the commercial fisheries of Canada. This will certainly be a measure that is of considerable importance to Canada and to the Atlantic provinces in particualr.

Since I was first elected as a member of parliament in 1957 I have not been able to avoid feeling that in some parts of Canada the fishing industry is looked upon as being of little or no importance. Fish was something tolerated in the central and western Canadian provinces and on Friday, known as fish day, there was much rejoicing if an alternative to fish could be found. As a result of this attitude the consumption of fish in Canada is still only approximately 13 pounds per person, which is regretable in view of the high nutritional value of high quality sea food.

I welcome the minister's statement and I point out to him that the commercial fishing industry is vitally important not only to the economy of the Atlantic provinces but to Canada as a whole. Last year this industry reached a new peak of production. Nearly 925,900,000 pounds of fish were landed by Maritime fishermen, at a landed value of more than $65 million. When one realizes that marketed values are approximately twice the landed values, it then becomes apparent just how important these dollars are to the Maritime area and to the economy of Canada as a whole.

One cannot help but be impressed by the progress which has been made by the industry in recent years and by the growth of the larger long-liners, draggers and trawlers, which can only be described as bringing about a complete transformation of the industry. Unavoidably this has brought many new problems requiring solutions. A shortage of skilled manpower, as mentioned by the minister, for new ships is already developing. The training of new recruits and of adult fishermen is a problem in itself. In fact, in my opinion the future of the fishing industry in Canada will be jeopardized unless some 10,000 men are trained and added to the industry within the next ten years in addition to those who are now engaged in the industry.

• (4:00 p.m.)

The minister has stated he is aware of this problem but I should like him to be more definite when he outlines the government's program to assist in the training of these men. If we can develop the same progressive approach to manpower policies as we are now developing with regard to the design and construction of ships for the fishing industry, we can be assured of a bright future for this industry. I think the time has arrived for upgrading the industry. The fishermen of Canada's east coast have never had a status in society commensurate with the risks they undertake, the labour they perform and the contribution they make to the economic life of the nation. The income of a fisherman has never been a true reflection of, or a realistic reward for, the risks he undertakes in his profession. However, things are changing, and this measure would indicate that the importance of the fisherman as a producer is being realized not only by the industry but by all levels of government.

I would point out to the minister that the proper management of larger plants and larger fleets of ships is becoming a major problem. The present expanded industry has inherited the facilities of the much older inshore and salt fish industries and there are many communities which have not yet been able to achieve the transformation and equip themselves with the plants, harbours and wharves that a modern, highly competitive industry and trade require. There is a great opportunity in this area for the Minister of Fisheries, in co-operation with the Minister of Public Works, to provide extensive dredging, new wharves and breakwaters which are urgently required and are an integral part of a growing and expanding fishing industry.

Nearly three-quarters of the earth's surface is covered by water. It is the last great frontier on earth. In view of the foreseeable needs of humanity it is not a moment too soon to begin a serious and systematic study and exploration of the potential of the sea.

Our North America fishing industry is still somewhat primitive from a technological point of view. For example, the Soviet Union has increased its fishing production within the past year by 25 per cent. To put Canadian fishermen in their rightful place in world fisheries we must apply advanced technology to the industry without delay. We must tell

our problems to the scientists and enlist their aid in solving them. We must search the world for new markets. How many people are aware, for example, of the staggering tonnage of fish which is caught and then shoved overboard because in our western society the catch is considered unmarketable? Surely the industry, the scientist and the technologist can work together to utilize these species for the benefit of humanity as well as providing profit to the industry. Methods of fishing, types of boats and gear not yet used in the Atlantic provinces are proving to be successful elsewhere. There are resources of fish that the Atlantic provinces have not yet tried to exploit, products for which a good price may be obtained; yet no effort has been made so far to produce and sell them.

We must carry out greater studies of the ocean floor along our entire continental shelf. We must study the effect of ocean currents on our fish population. We must study the possibility of developing fish farms especially for the rearing of lobsters, to help improve our inshore stocks which are rapidly being depleted. I suggest that a special "sea grant" be made to our colleges. Such a grant would help to further the studies of those interested in marine science and technology and lead to the increased knowledge by which man will one day, it is hoped, begin to tap more of the untold riches of the sea.

I welcome the measure which the minister has introduced. He has told us his department has adopted improved methods of inspection in the fisheries plants throughout Canada. I commend him for this move because I am sure it is of vital importance that strict enforcement be carried out. It is perhaps one result of slack enforcement in former years that fish were exported or sold in Canada in a condition which only served to blacken the name of a product so vitally important to the economy of Nova Scotia and the Atlantic provinces generally.

I cannot impress on the minister too strongly the need for maintaining strict fisheries inspection. It is essential to the entire industry. We welcome this move. I reserve the right to make further comments when the bill is before us at a later stage.

Mr. Barnett: Mr. Chairman, the minister in his opening remarks gave us a brief summary of the modest program which is being carried out by his department and its agencies since the federal-provincial fisheries conference of January, 1954. What disturbed me was that as far as I could follow him the hon. gentleman gave no indication at all of what it is proposed to accomplish through the legislation to follow this resolution apart from what is already being done according to him, by his department in co-operation with the provinces in some cases. I hope that before the present measure is passed the minister will do something to rectify this situation.

The minister said that joint projects had been undertaken since the conference. He mentioned participation in measures for training the work force in the fishing industry. He mentioned research programs by the Fisheries Research Board of Canada. He mentioned also the growing interest which he suggested would be taken in the control of water pollution involving measures which would have a beneficial effect on certain of our fisheries.

But I had been looking forward to hearing something more from the minister in connection with this resolution. His statement, as he himself indicated, was only a brief summary of what is being done or has been done. I was looking forward to a statement about the additional work which would be undertaken as a result of the introduction of the legislation which this resolution precedes. I had the pleasure of being in Ottawa at the time that conference was held, and it was apparent there was a desire on the part of some of the provinces to give greater recognition in the future to the potentialities for economic expansion of Canada's fisheries.

• (4:10 p.m.)

In considering what legislation may be introduced as a result of this resolution we should pay attention to Canada's position in respect of the world fishery. World fishery production has more than doubled within a relatively short period of years, but if one looks at the statistics, curves and graphs indicating Canada's position it is apparent that over a long period of time our total volume has remained almost static at a level of approximately 1 million metric tons per year compared with total world production of 40 million metric tons. The volume of production of many other fishing nations has increased drastically, in some cases doubling, tripling and quadrupling.

I do not say this merely to be critical of the minister, but when the government introduces a resolution such as this we have the right to expect that it foreshadows a major

expansion in Canadian production through the efforts of the federal government and those of some of the provinces. A number of the provinces have been showing an increasing interest in participating in the expansion of the fishing industry. According to figures I have seen the most impressive progress has been made in Nova Scotia.

Some figures recently incorporated in a brief presented to the government of British Columbia indicated that between 1963 and 1965, the figure for 1965 being only preliminary, fishery landings in Nova Scotia increased from 425,000,000 lbs. to 592,000,000 lbs, with the landed value increasing from $36 million plus to $48 million plus. The figures for my own province of British Columbia show a decline in the volume of fish landings for the same period and the increase in the landed value has been very small, relatively speaking.

Before this legislation is passed in its final form I hope the minister will give us a detailed picture of the participation which the various provinces have indicated they are prepared to take in expanding the industry. If he cannot do it now, perhaps he can do it when the Fisheries Committee is considering his estimates.

The question of what is being proposed in this new legislation still bothers me. Is it to introduce a new program that could be compared in any way to the ARDA program? Perhaps I should remind the committee again of the suggestion contained in a letter from the Prime Minister to the Premier of Newfoundland in February, 1963, when the Prime Minister, who was then leader of the opposition, outlined the basic position and approach which would be taken by a government that he hoped to form after April 8 of that year. He indicated that after taking office he would promptly call a federal-provincial fisheries conference.

That undertaking was carried out with fairly reasonable dispatch, but the Prime Minister further suggested in his letter that the conference would work out a federal-provincial program for fishery development to be founded on the principle that national action for fisheries should parallel the action already being taken with respect to agriculture. This basic theme was reiterated before the federal-provincial conference by the Premier of Newfoundland when he presented his government's brief.

[Mr. Barnett.]

But I suggest the program of action outlined by the minister today could hardly be said to parallel the programs currently in effect in the field of agriculture. I do not suggest that such programs can be exactly parallel in every respect. Naturally there will be differences of approach because of the different natures of the industries, but I hope the minister will indicate that this resolution heralds something much wider and broader than the programs that have been developed since the federal-provincial conference was held.

• (4:20 p.m.)

I am somewhat concerned about the question of whether the government of B.C. is showing any great sign of interest in the future of the fishery resources of that province. I know it has a two-man subsection concerned with fisheries and that a fisheries report was recently published under its auspices. But the present budget of the province of B.C. makes provision for only $32,872 for the commercial fisheries branch, which amounts to five one hundred thousandths of 1 per cent of the budget of the province of B.C. That is less money than the amount budgeted for the operation of the minister's office in the department of recreation and conservation of British Columbia. Naturally I am concerned about what effect the proposal which the Minister of Fisheries is putting before the house will have on the fisheries of British Columbia. I also am interested in what indications there are that the government of British Columbia is prepared to participate in federal-provincial projects as suggested by the resolution.

I think some of us were encouraged by the relative interest which was displayed at the federal-provincial fisheries conference by the governments of some of the inland provinces of Canada. To me there appears to be a real desire on the part of the provinces of Manitoba, Saskatchewan and Alberta that there should be a future for their inland fisheries. I should like to know whether, under the proposal that is being made here, anything will be possible in the field of fish farming which has been suggested as one of the ways in which our inland species of fish could be developed to greater levels of commercial importance.

There are many questions one could ask. However, my principal concern after having listened to the minister is that he did not appear to indicate in any way how this resolution would either expand or change the

programs which have been initiated in various parts of the country since the federal-provincial fisheries conference was held. He also gave us no idea, so far as I was able to determine, what order of expenditure he envisaged might be sought from parliament by the government for the purpose of carrying out what is suggested in the resolution.

These are some of the questions that need to be answered. Until they are answered it really is impossible for us to determine whether or not in fact the legislation which the minister suggests should be introduced will be worth while.

Mr. Patterson: Mr. Chairman, I do not know whether there is any disposition on the part of the committee to conclude the discussion on this resolution before five o'clock but in case there is I propose to make my remarks comparatively brief. We have listened with interest to the statement made by the Minister of Fisheries outlining in a rather brief way the progress which has been achieved over the past two years. I am sorry the minister did not go into more detail concerning the plans for the future and just what he hopes to achieve in say the next two years.

So far as the resolution is concerned, it does not present in any detail whatsoever the proposals of the minister with regard to the measure which will be introduced following this discussion. I note that in the Speech from the Throne reference was made to the fact that measures would be introduced in the current session to assist the commercial fishing industry of this nation. I am wondering whether there will be just the one bill introduced or whether the minister has a series of measures which he feels will be necessary to achieve the objectives he has in mind so far as the fishing industry of Canada is concerned.

We do not have to speak at any length on the value of the fisheries resource to our nation. Reference was made a few days ago by the hon. member for Comox-Alberni, I believe, to the statement which is set out in the Canada Year Book. He pointed out at that time that the situation was rather static so far as the fishing industry was concerned in that the total market value was about $250 million. To emphasize the fact that this is of interest not only to our own nation the Canada Year Book points out that only about one third of this output is used domestically and that the remainder is shipped abroad in fresh, frozen, canned, salted, dried or otherwise preserved forms.

It is also indicated that Canada is one of the major suppliers of fish and fish products to world markets, being surpassed by only Japan and Norway in respect of the value of such exports. So far as our over-all national economy is concerned, even though relatively speaking the fishery does not come anywhere near the economic value of some other industries, this resource does have a substantial influence and effect upon our economy.

The hon. member for Queens-Lunenburg referred to the food value of this product and the fact that the consumption of fish production in Canada was very light indeed. I think this is regrettable because on many occasions it has been pointed out how important fish products are in so far as health is concerned.

I should like to refer to one statement found in a pamphlet, "Facts On Fish", dated October 7, 1964. It quotes these words of Dr. F. J. Stare, chairman of the department of nutrition, Harvard University:

> The nutrient composition of fish makes it an extremely valuable food in terms of the present day concepts of nutrition in relation to better human health. This is because fish are really excellent sources of good quality protein, of many minerals and vitamins. Fish as compared with most high quality protein foods are generally low in fats, and the fat that is present in fish has a generous proportion of the polyunsaturated fats.

This points out not only the importance of this industry commercially but also its importance so far as the health of our people is concerned.

Mr. Crouse: Mr. Chairman, would the hon. member permit a question?

Mr. Patterson: Yes.

Mr. Crouse: Did I understand him to say that I misrepresented the nutritional value of fish?

Mr. Patterson: Certainly not, Mr. Chairman. I did not mean to leave that inference at all. In fact, I understood the hon. member to be emphasizing the importance of it. I referred only to the fact that the hon. member had stated that the per capita consumption of fish products in Canada was very low indeed.

Mr. Crouse: Thank you very much.

• (4:30 p.m.)

Mr. Patterson: It is also pointed out in so far as the employment picture in respect of our fish resource is concerned that more than

80,000 commercial fishermen operate in Canada and more than 13,000 persons are employed in the fish processing industry. I think that no matter what criteria we use in assessing the importance of this industry this points up very well that we ought to give active consideration not only to the maintenance of the industry but to its development in every part of our country.

I should like to refer to the fact, as has been pointed out already by the hon. member for Comox-Alberni, that in British Columbia the Pacific fisheries are not in a very healthy condition. The brief presented by the United Fishermen and Allied Workers Union on February 20, 1966, refers to the problems of the Pacific coast fishing industry as representing a crisis. To point up the situation that exists they go into some detail in dealing with the problems that are encountered in the fishing industry in the province of British Columbia.

I shall not deal in detail today with these problems because no doubt on some future occasion we will be able to deal at some length with some of the problems mentioned in that brief. We should like to emphasize and re-emphasize the seriousness of the problems that face the west coast fishing industry as well as fishermen in other parts of Canada. No doubt the problems in other parts of the country are different but nevertheless all these areas are faced with peculiar and particular problems which require concentrated effort in order to find solutions.

As I mentioned, in the Speech from the Throne reference was made to the introduction of measures to assist in the development of our commercial fishing industry. Reference has been made this afternoon to the dominion-provincial conference held some two years ago at which many aspects of the fishing industry were considered and endeavours were made to work out joint programs and joint attacks on problems that are inherent in the industry.

I hope this co-operation will continue and will be expanded because we all realize that there must be co-operation at the various levels of government in order to achieve the desired results. While we acknowledge the fact that the federal administration has a tremendous responsibility so far as the fisheries of Canada are concerned, the provincial administrations must also assume some responsibility and work in co-operation with the federal government in regard to various programs and plans.

[Mr. Patterson.]

I do not propose to deal at greath length with the various areas concerned and the issues in regard to which joint programs are essential. They have been pointed out by the minister and mentioned by other members. But in all these fields I believe there must be close co-operation in order to apply sound principles of conservation, development and marketing and have regard to all the other factors that enter into this very important industry. We look forward to the introduction of the bill when we will have much more information and will be able to assess the various proposals which the minister will bring before us. We shall reserve further comment for that occasion.

Mr. Keays: Mr. Chairman, I shall take only a few minutes at this time to discuss the resolution before us. I would be very remiss in my duty if I did not speak on the resolution at this time in view of the fact that approximately 5,000 people in the province of Quebec earn their living from the sea. Sadly enough, there are approximately 1,100 who earn less than $3,000 a year. Fifty eight per cent of that $3,000 comes from payments such as unemployment insurance, unemployment assistance and family allowances. Therefore these fishermen are earning from their trade approximately $1,000 to $1,200 per year. I am referring to the inshore fishermen of whom there are quite a few and for whom from year to year it is much harder to earn a living.

Many changes have been made in deep sea fishing in the last few years. There is now the need to consider more help for these fishermen because of the technological advances that have been made. The fishermen must be aware of these new systems and must understand their operation. They must have a knowledge of the equipment with which they are working. I am sure that in this field alone the government can help in co-operation with the provinces and do much to alleviate the situation existing at the present time. There is a need for the fishermen to have technological knowledge and assistance in the realm of education. I hope that included in the bill to follow the resolution there will be a program along this line. There has to be research into conservation, preparation of fisheries products, sources of supply and species.

I hope the government will give consideration to extending some of the existing fisheries establishments. I refer to the one at Grand River. This is a biological station at which some seven or eight years ago the staff

numbered approximately ten or twelve but is now reduced to two or three. The minister may say they have concentrated most of their efforts at Halifax and St. Andrews-by-the-Sea, but I hope these establishments are retained where most of the fishermen of the province live and that consideration will be given to providing these people with more responsibility in the fields of research and study and to encouraging the local people to get in touch with them more often.

I am very happy to note that this is the first time in the history of Canada that we are worrying more about supply in this industry than demand. I believe this is very encouraging to the fisherman who has been so long forgotten and is now hoping to receive additional attention. When we think of the fisherman we think of a person wearing a rain hat and rubber boots, always subject to the winds and the elements of nature, the man who has been the stalwart of the industry and of whom we should be very proud.

I hope that in the legislation which will be introduced there will be measures to improve the lot of those living in such sordid and lamentable conditions as the inshore fishermen in many areas with which I am familiar. I believe the government has already allotted some $400,000 for the relocation of fishermen in the province of Newfoundland. I commend the government for doing this. I think it was a necessity, and this is one of the problems we must face today when considering the plight of the inshore fisherman.

• (4:40 p.m.)

I hope that when this bill is presented it will contain some provisions that will aid fishermen living under conditions such as I have just described and which are of a nature to discourage others from entering this industry. I hope that through the co-operation of the Department of Fisheries and the Department of Public Works in complying with small requests for $500 or $1,000 for dredging operations, repairs to slipways and so on we will be able to work for the betterment of the life of the fishermen.

Very often people like to accuse fishermen of being uneducated and of being lazy in many cases. Personally I know of many fishermen who have never had a chance to participate in the industry because the facilities have not been there for them. I hope that more co-operation will be given by the various departments of government so that all means possible will be undertaken to improve the living conditions of the fishermen and permit them to share in the wealth of the ocean and in the economy of our country.

Mr. Macquarrie: Mr. Chairman, it is infrequently that we have the opportunity to discuss this most important industry. For two or three minutes, I should like to address myself to this important resolution. Naturally I am delighted with it. My colleague, the hon. member for Queens-Lunenburg, has spoken for all of us in our party. He has presented some excellent ideas. I think that anything we can do to improve the efficiency of the industry and to narrow the great risk which many of the fishermen of the country must undergo should be encouraged.

I agree generally with what the minister has said about the excellent state of the markets. There are some exceptions to which I hope he will direct his attention. For example, I am thinking of mackerel and smelts. These are two delicious fish and when the quantity is high it is difficult for fishermen to find markets.

What has brought me to my feet has been the suggestion by my colleague in connection with higher research. I refer to his idea of grants at the university level to bring more of our bright young people together to concentrate their knowledge and their attention upon fisheries research. This is a most excellent idea. I hope we will have a chance to develop it further, whether through some of our existing institutions or through an extension of the Institute of Oceanography. No matter which way it is done I think it would be well for the federal Department of Fisheries to assist in recruiting the ideas of young people in this sort of project. I should like to see a lot of our young people encouraged to engage in the pure and practical aspects of the kind of scientific work which will allow them to assist in the important work of conservation and redevelopment of our fishing industry.

We have not, for instance, found anyone bright enough to revive some of the excellent clam beds that we used to find in certain parts of the Atlantic provinces. The sand clam is a most important item of food and a very important economic item. I am told that the problem is very complicated and requires great knowledge in that particular field of biology. So I commend my colleague for this suggestion. I know great things have been accomplished in the training centres which the provinces are operating, in some cases

with federal assistance. I should like to support this further extension of the idea, and I look forward to the introduction of the bill. I hope we will find much in it to support but like all others we will, of course, say it should go further. This is to be expected.

Mr. McCleave: Mr. Chairman, I have a question for the Minister of Fisheries and I will make my remarks brief. In listening to the minister I was not quite sure whether he had any program in mind that would assist what to me is a very important element of the fishing industry. I refer to the small fishing villages along the coast of Nova Scotia. I have a large number of them in Halifax riding and I am sure other members have as well. One of the problems that has been encountered there has been the lack of freezer facilities both for the catch and for bait. It is simply not possible for these fishermen to raise even the minimal amount of capital necessary for building such facilities under the present program of the government. If Canada is to do a proper job in helping to keep these small fishing villages going, I think the department will have to go into that field. My question is, does the minister intend to?

Mr. Robichaud: Mr. Chairman, my remarks will be very brief. First, I want to thank the hon. members who have offered constructive ideas on the introduction of the bill. I hope I will be prepared to answer the points that have been raised when I move second reading. In so far as the hon. member for Halifax is concerned, I am sure that when he sees the bill he will find his wishes are being carried out.

Mr. Alkenbrack: Mr. Chairman, I rise to discuss a few points this afternoon related to this resolution. It is a most interesting and most timely resolution. It is good to see that we are going to undertake to participate in federal-provincial projects regarding fisheries and to make payments in consequence thereof. There is one question which comes to my mind immediately. During the last election campaign the Prime Minister was reported to have said that he would encourage marine installations in aid of fisheries and industries connected therewith.

For example, I have a letter here from a fishing camp in my constituency, and it sets out this question:

> Do I understand the government is willing to help tourist camps and fishing camps to extend their docking facilities?

[Mr. Macquarrie.]

We all recall the promise made by the Prime Minister in the last campaign. This is the question I should like the minister to take up in his capacity as the man responsible for the fishing industry.

How far will the government go to help our small fishing camps, some of which also have landing facilities for commercial fishing? They accommodate many of our tourists from the United States during the summer. This is a question that needs an answer as soon as possible in our part of the country.

I noticed there was a great deal of discussion this afternoon about ocean fisheries but not one word was said regarding our inland fisheries. I point out to the minister that one of the greatest sources of revenue for the balancing of international trade is our Lake Ontario fishery, a good share of which is carried on in my riding of Prince Edward-Lennox.

• (4:50 p.m.)

Mr. Stefanson: And Lake Winnipeg.

Mr. Alkenbrack: I hear an hon. member say that Lake Winnipeg is another important inland contributor to the international balance of payments position. I know the fishermen in my part of the country supply and benefit from the New York market to which they send fish overnight. They contribute tremendously in their own right to our international balance of payments position.

We have heard a lot of comments and opinions regarding our fishing industry ranging from seals to salmon and ciscoes to smelts. All of this concerns ocean fishing, but not very much time has been devoted in the house to the interests of the inland fishermen. Our inland fisheries, especially in Lake Ontario, are in a sorry state.

At this stage I should like to quote from a communication I received from the chairman of the Association of Commercial Fishermen of Eastern Ontario, Mr. Bruce Cooper. I will not read the whole letter but I should like to place this important paragraph on record:

> The commercial fishing industry in this area is in a very critical condition and we feel that the time has come for a general airing of our problems.

I wish to point out to the minister that we cannot have development of our fishing industry and give proper assistance to that industry, as mentioned in this resolution, unless we have a program of public works which goes along hand in hand with it, one which will give our fishermen access to the

waters and ensure better safety and services both at sea and on shore.

A second letter which I received from Mr. Cooper reads in part as follows:

—there lies an area in Lake Ontario, from Brighton to Kingston, a shoreline distance of approximately 95 miles without a harbour that would shelter a boat with a draft over 5 feet. This 95 mile stretch is one of the most rugged, dangerous and formidable stretches in Lake Ontario. For example, it contains Salmon Point Reef, Main Duck and False Duck Reefs and Point Petre. These areas are notoriously known for the many shipwrecks in the past. There have been two groundings of lake ships in this area within a year.

The most central location for a harbour and one to offer the most protection after a vessel had reached the harbour entrance is at Wellington, Ontario. Once inside the breakwater at Wellington, a vessel or hundreds of vessels could seek haven in West Lake. Also, there is a government dock inside the harbour at Wellington that was practically rebuilt in 1965. Unfortunately, the breakwaters at Wellington have deteriorated considerably, having been washed away by heavy seas and ice, and sand has almost blocked the harbour entrance for a distance of 300-500 feet.

I pause here, Mr. Chairman, to say that when this debate began I telephoned an officer of the Department of Public Works, who informed me that the harbour is completely blocked by sand. However, the Department of Public Works promised to dredge it as an emergency measure so that the smelt fishing boats which are now marooned at the dock can sail out of the harbour for the spring smelt catch. I am glad that the government is co-operating there and I commend and thank them for dredging Wellington harbour as an emergency measure which will be acted upon, I am assured, within the next two or three days.

Mr. Cooper goes on to say:

At this time two commercial fishing tugs are trapped in the harbour—

As I have previously stated.

—because of the sand situation. During the second world war this harbour at Wellington was kept open to a depth of 12 feet from which the R.C.A.F. crash boats operated. Also at one time there was a commercial fishing fleet of 10 or more tugs operating from the Wellington area. The building of two new breakwaters and the opening of the entrance to West Lake would not only serve as a haven for lake vessels, but would add a great many more dollars to the tourist trade of the county and be an added attraction to the village of Wellington. West Lake is widely known for its great yellow pike and muskellunge fishing. If this harbour was open, boats would come from Toronto, the U.S.A., etc. At the present time when the yellow pike spawning migration from Lake Ontario starts in March, a single heavy blow could block the West Lake entrance and this prevent the fish from reaching their spawning beds...

With the fishing industry in such a drastic slump, some measures must be taken now to aid these fishermen. If the Wellington harbour were open and navigable now, some of the best smelt fishing could be done in the West Lake area. This area is almost free of ice and commercial fishermen could operate practically all winter when smelts are at a premium price. This would boost the income for the fishing industry by $30,000-$50,000. This would be a Godsend to the commercial fishing, especially since the fishermen have been experiencing such poor years for some time now.

That is all the time that I can spend on communications of that kind.

In Lennox we have the Hay Bay District Tourist Association and the Hay Bay District Fishing Association, both of which have handed me their recommendations with the request that they be placed on record for the consideration of the minister. This will give him an idea of the relationship between the commercial and game fishing industries in my part of the country. Hay Bay is internationally well known as a great game fishing ground and the home of sports fishing for pickerel and muskellunge.

The following recommendations were made at the February 27, 1964 meeting of the joint committee of the Hay Bay District Tourist Association and came up for review as to their present disposition:

1. That the opening date of the fall 4½-inch mesh gill net fishery in the Bay of Quinte commence on October 15, 15 days later than the present opening date.

2. That the taking of pike and pickerel by any means be prohibited during the month of April in the Bay of Quinte and eastern Lake Ontario, east of the 78th meridian.

3. That carp gill net mesh size be raised from 8 inches to 9 inches stretched measure.

4. That an increase in the studies of pollution in the Bay of Quinte and eastern Lake Ontario be instituted.

I will just mention one more matter, Mr. Chairman, in summing up. To have an effective program which will be useful to and productive for our inland fisheries, first of all we must have an effective anti-pollution program, which goes hand in hand with the terms of this resolution. Second, we need more generous appropriations for fisheries research, as has been mentioned by other hon. members. Third, we must continue to wage war on the lamprey eel. I believe that we are not losing this war. I have received good reports from some other stations along the shore of Lake Ontario which have been studying the nature of this pest and ways of

eradicating it. I believe we are winning the war against the lamprey eel.

• (5:00 p.m.)

Fourth, effective programming of public works, as I said before, goes hand in hand with the combined interests and use of the game fishing industry, the commercial fishing industry and the tourist industry. These three industries are first cousins. They will co-operate among themselves. These three industries, game fishing, commercial fishing and tourism, ought to be given the support they need right now. These industries contribute very much, I remind the minister, to our international balance of trade which means so much to this nation.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Mongrain: Mr. Chairman, I only need one minute to put a question to the minister and make a suggestion to him. In my area there is a unique type of fishing which is practised, tommy cod fishing. It is practised in winter, mostly in January. This species of fish comes to spawn in the rivers.

In the last few years, this type of fishing has taken on so much that thousands of cabins are seen on the river, throughout January and part of February; streets are laid out, electricity and restaurants are provided. It attracts tourists from all over.

Here is my suggestion to the minister: many people interested in tommy cod fishing, which promotes the tourist industry in our area and represents a very profitable activity since it has become a commercial operation, are beginning to worry about the disappearance of this fish, because, for all practical purposes, the entrance to the rivers is being blocked. Those people wonder whether sooner or later, tommy cod fishing, which represents a gold mine for us, is not in danger of decreasing alarmingly or of disappearing.

If I am wrongly informed, I hope the minister will correct me, but could he tell us whether the province of Quebec is in a position at present to conduct extensive research on the habits of tommy cod and on the threat, if any, of their decrease or disappearance? Then, can the minister tell the house whether his department has the required facilities to carry out research on the habits and future of tommy cod?

I imagine, of course, that the matter comes under provincial jurisdiction, but perhaps I am mistaken, because it may come under the federal department. At any rate, whether it comes under the jurisdiction of one or the other, I should like to know whether the minister has the required facilities to conduct intensive research and reassure the people concerned with the future of tommy cod, in order to ascertain if there is an actual threat and if some precaution might be taken to remove that threat.

[Mr. Alkenbrack.]

Mr. Robichaud: Mr. Chairman, we are prepared to co-operate with the provincial authorities.

[*English*]

Mr. Roxburgh: Mr. Chairman, I do not want to take up any extra time in the committee. Indeed, hon. members will be surprised that I have risen to say a few words on the subject of fisheries. I want to draw to the attention of the minister and members of the House of Commons that the largest inland fishing port in the world, not in Canada, not in the United States but in the world, is in my constituency. I refer to Port Dover.

I want to support the hon. member for Prince Edward-Lennox in drawing to the attention of the minister the fact that when this legislation is put into force—and I want to congratulate him on this motion—the inland fishermen must not be forgotten. I might point out that out of Port Dover hundreds of thousands of dollars worth of perch and smelt are sent directly to New York and the financial implications with respect to our trade balance are great. I wanted to bring this point to the attention of the minister. That is all I want to say.

Resolution reported and concurred in.

Mr. Robichaud thereupon moved for leave to introduce Bill No. C-145, to provide for the development of the commercial fisheries of Canada.

Motion agreed to and bill read the first time.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: It being five o'clock the house will proceed to the consideration of private members' business as listed on today's order paper, namely, notices of motions and public bills.

DIVORCE

MOTIONS TO REFER RESOLUTION AND BILL TO JOINT COMMITTEE

Mr. J. B. Stewart (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Public Works): Mr. Speaker, I would ask the unanimous consent of the house to make motions referring the subject

matter of a certain resolution and the subject matter of a certain bill to the Special Joint Committee on Divorce. May I have that permission?

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order, please. It is requested that the subject matter of certain bills be referred to the Committee on Divorce.

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Does the house give permission for the hon. member to move the necessary motions?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Mr. Stewart: I move:

That the subject matter of Private Member's Notice of Motion No. 11 (Mr. Scott) be referred to the special Joint Committee on Divorce.

Motion agreed to.

Mr. Stewart: I move:

That the subject matter of Bill C-133 be referred to the Special Joint Committee on Divorce.

Motion agreed to.

CANADIAN CITIZENSHIP ACT

SUGGESTED AMENDMENTS FOR BENEFIT OF APPLICANTS

Mr. David Lewis (York South) moved:

That, in the opinion of this House, the government should give consideration to the advisability of amending the Canadian Citizenship Act and the regulations made thereunder to provide that (a) an applicant whose application for citizenship is refused be provided with full particulars of the reasons for such refusal (b) a Citizenship Review Board or similar body be established to which an applicant whose application for citizenship has been refused may appeal such refusal (c) Courts of Citizenship be established in more centres across Canada than is now the case (d) Courts of Citizenship should be open during evenings and on Saturdays and, generally (e) landed immigrants should receive much more encouragement and assistance in preparing themselves to become citizens at the earliest possible date after they become qualified therefor.

• (5:10 p.m.)

He said: I cannot describe to you, Mr. Speaker, the relief one feels on rising to speak on a subject which is, I am sure, entirely non-partisan and which concerns every member of the house. There may be differences of opinion on details as to the best manner in which to accomplish a common objective but I am certain the objective is common to all of us.

May I suggest, first of all, that I am one who is perhaps particularly suited to raise the question of citizenship. I happen myself to be a naturalized Canadian, having been naturalized by my late father back in 1929 as a youngster, and I happen to have gone through in my boyhood after I was 12 the experience of learning a new language and adjusting myself to a new country and a new environment. Accordingly, I have some appreciation of what is involved.

This subject was drawn to my attention particularly during the election campaigns of 1962, 1963 and 1965 in my own constituency and in other constituencies. I have the pleasure to represent a constituency in which there is a very large number of new Canadians, most of them of Italian origin. I found that more than half of these new Canadians who were eligible to be Canadian citizens had not become Canadian citizens. When we started a campaign, I looked at the situation in the riding and was certain there would be many thousands of new Canadians on the voters list. But when the list appeared there were fewer than half the number that might have been expected. When I went around the constituency, having learned a few words of Italian to converse with these people, I found that many of them were frightened about applying for Canadian citizenship because of the qualifications which appeared to be demanded of them before thay can attain citizenship status. It was brought home to me then that we ought to take another look at the requirements as we express them and at the machinery we have provided for those wishing to obtain citizenship.

I say this not because I think any one of us in any corner of this house would have been wiser had we drawn up the original regulations but because I think we should profit by the experience which has now been gained. I wish to make it clear that I do not want to relax the solemnity with which the taking of citizenship should be surrounded. I do not want to relax any of the symbols which should be used to convey to a person about to take citizenship the seriousness and value of this act. I have had the experience, as have other members, of travelling to other countries, in Europe many years ago and more recently in Central and Latin America. During these visits I had an opportunity to see how very highly a Canadian passport is regarded and valued in foreign lands. I say this not in any jingoistic spirit but in a sense of, I hope, pardonable pride. Frequently while walking through the streets of foreign

countries, or at their customs barriers or immigration gates, the fact that one has a Canadian passport proves to be of great value, and the men or women you meet on such occasions show great respect for it.

For this reason it is important to surround the attainment of citizenship with all the sensible and reasonable solemnity which is necessary to make it a fact of importance to the psychology of the person concerned. But this does not mean we should have provisions in our laws which frighten people. I draw attention, first, to subsections (e) and (f) of section 10(1) of the Canadian Citizenship Act where we say that a person can become a citizen only if he has an adequate knowledge of either the English or French language. Well, Mr. Speaker, I know a great many people born in this country whose mother tongue is one or the other of those languages, yet whether or not they have an adequate knowledge of it depends on one's definition of "adequate". I have met a good many new Canadians and asked them why they had not applied for citizenship. They have replied: Look at the words in the act calling for an adequate knowledge of English or French; you can listen to me, talking in broken English; I obviously do not have an adequate knowledge of English, so why apply to become a citizen?

A provision of this sort does not make sense in a Canadian Citizenship Act. It is the wording which frightens the average person. We must remember that many people who come from other parts of the world may not have had an opportunity of attending school and may not have come here with any great literacy even in their mother tongue. For this reason they may not be equipped to acquire a new language in a way which would satisfy any interpretation of the term "adequate knowledge". But do not misunderstand me. I am not saying that the courts generally impose too strict a definition, though I do think that in many instances the courts have not been very wise about it either and have demanded, in my part of the country, a greater knowledge than is really necessary or sensible. But the words themselves frighten new Canadians; they think they have to know more than, in fact, they need to know.

In my years in Canada since September, 1921, I have known hundreds of excellent Canadian citizens who have lived here for many years with only a very limited knowledge of either of the two Canadian languages.

[Mr. Lewis.]

This does not necessarily make them less useful or less devoted citizens of this country.

Then we have another requirement which frightens these people. The Act provides that in order to become citizens they must have an adequate knowledge of the responsibilities and privileges of Canadian citizenship and intend to comply with the oath of allegiance set forth in the second schedule. I do not know how many people have an adequate knowledge of the responsibilities and privileges of Canadian citizenship, or indeed, exactly what that term means. I often wonder whether the 20 or 25 per cent of Canadian citizens who do not go to vote on election day are accepting all their responsibilities as Canadian citizens. Yet they are already citizens, either natural born or naturalized. We do not need such statements as these in the Act.

• (5:20 p.m.)

Let me indicate to the house this simple proposition: that even if a person is not a citizen, if he resides in Canada and is permitted to work here and carry on business here and undertake obligations, responsibilities and liabilities under the laws of Canada to which he is subject, that person is a Canadian in every sense except the important sense of being a citizen, having the right to vote, having the right to carry the Canadian insignia in the form of a passport or whatever document he carries with him when he goes to another country, and having the right to the protection of Canada and the Canadian authorities when he is in a foreign land. We ought to make becoming a citizen easier rather than harder, and I draw a distinction between the solemn act of becoming a citizen and the requirements for becoming a citizen.

Unless I am very much mistaken, my late father became a citizen in 1929 by merely filing an application in the required form, going through a few minor formalities and obtaining a certificate. All of his generation, all of the very large number of people who came to Canada after the first world war and who have made such a tremendous contribution to this country, were not required, as I recall the law and I hope I am not mistaken, to have the knowledge as the language in the act unnecessarily describes it.

My next point, Mr. Speaker, is that at the present time the regulations require an effort on the part of the applicant for citizenship which again, perhaps not entirely reasonably,

prevents him from becoming a citizen. Normally he has to take three days off work. He has to appear at the place where he gets the application form. He signs it there. He has to swear an affidavit, and he is expected to appear in person which means one day away from work.

As I read the regulations they require him to appear in person. I think it is subsection 5 of regulation No. 5 which states that a person who resides 50 miles away from the nearest court can make out his application in triplicate and forward it by mail but if he lives within the court area he is expected to appear, make out the application and swear the affidavit. He is then required to appear in court at the hearing of his application. That is a second day away from work. Then he has to appear as a rule in the same court to be sworn in, to take his oath of allegiance, before he can obtain his certificate. That is a third day away from work.

Without exaggeration, Mr. Speaker, I met dozens of men in my constituency during the election campaign whom I asked, "Why have you not applied for your citizenship when you have lived here eight, ten or twelve years?" The answer I received was usually, "Yes, I make up my mind to go and become a citizen but on the appointed day I cannot get there. My work does not let me go and I cannot afford to lose the money."

If a man earns as little as $1.50 or $2 an hour on a construction job which may not be unionized, he will lose 10 hours pay that day, some $15 to $20, and that is why he does not become a citizen. There is no reason why that should be so. There is no reason in the world why Citizenship Courts should not be open evenings or Saturdays or even Sundays. Surely there is no more solemn act, religious act if you like, than the act of swearing allegiance to a new country, and there is nothing incompatible between doing that on the Sabbath and doing any other thing that is holy on a Sunday. There is no reason why we should present difficulties of this sort to the new Canadian who desires to become a citizen. He should not have to take three days off work in order to go through the procedures that are required.

Mr. Aiken: Would the hon. member consider that one of these occasions should require a formal court appearance, if not the other two?

Mr. Lewis: I quite agree, Mr. Speaker. I do not think that three appearances are necessary. The reason I did not suggest that two of them be done away with, although I would like to see them made more voluntary, is that I think if the new Canadian does appear to make out his application in an office specially set aside for that purpose and has a few words with the registrar or whoever may be in attendance, he can receive some explanation of the form he is filling out, something which may be strange to him. That is a useful introduction to the citizenship idea. I do not object to bringing him in and making him feel a part of the machinery, of the procedure, but I do object to having him come in at times which are onerous and costly to him. Certainly there should be a mandatory appearance when he swears the oath of allegiance and becomes a citizen.

I am sure the people in the Department of Citizenship and Immigration, who have had much more experience than I can claim, will be able to think of a dozen other ways by which the procedure and the machinery can be improved. I merely plead with the minister and all those concerned with this aspect of the work that they take a very serious look at present procedures for citizenship, and in particular a look at the language in order to make it less onerous sounding to the new Canadian who wants to become a citizen.

I have had an applicant for citizenship come back to me and say, "I did not make it. You know why? They asked me what was the capital of British Columbia and I said Vancouver. Then they told me it was not, it was Victoria." I will bet you, Mr. Speaker, if I may use this expression with respect, dollars to doughnuts that if you ask people outside this building on Wellington Street here in Ottawa, as you buttonhole them walking along the street, nine out of ten would say Vancouver.

Mr. Deachman: Good for them.

Mr. Lewis: Well, Mr. Speaker, there is one member of the house who is apparently father to the thought and who himself would say Vancouver out of rivalry. The people on Wellington Street may not know any better but that does not make them any the less good Canadians. I would be surprised if some members of this house did not on occasion forget the precise names of some capitals that are close to them. Yet there are people who

feel that the refusal of their citizenship application was due to the fact that they did not have this sort of knowledge.

Mr. Knowles: What is the capital of New Brunswick?

Mr. Lewis: The hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Knowles) asks what is the capital of New Brunswick. Again I am sure dozens of people passing along Wellington Street would indicate Moncton or Saint John rather than what I hope it is, Fredericton. This kind of thing is unnecessary, Mr. Speaker. There is no reason why people who want to become citizens should know that Fredericton rather than Moncton and Victoria rather than Vancouver are the capitals of the respective provinces.

In our entire general education structure we pay far too much attention to irrelevant fact than to relevant principle. More important for the new Canadian is that he be given a sense of the principle of citizenship, of his duty to the community, of his heart and soul as a Canadian, rather than that he know the name of some capital of the English word for some word in his native language which can have very little relevance to his being a decent, good and valuable citizen.

In the remaining few minutes at my disposal I want to speak on the second part of my resolution, which deals with the fact that too many people are refused citizenship without being given a reason and without having recourse of appeal from such refusal. I have here in my own file three other such cases, which one of my colleagues was good enough to let me study, dealing with people who were refused citizenship during the last few years and had to go through all sorts of convolutions in order to find out what was wrong, what was the basis on which their applications were refused.

• (5:30 p.m.)

Therefore I suggest we ought to take a look at our statute to see whether or not we can provide at least more particulars, if not full particulars, in respect of any refusal of an application for citizenship, and above all that there be a citizenship review board or a similar body established to which a person who has had his application refused may come by way of appeal. When I am told of cases in respect of which the refusal of citizenship is based on security reasons, which I am sure occasionally is the case, then my answer is, Mr. Speaker, that there have been errors on that score as well and that the review body is needed in such cases just as well as in any other case. The procedure of the review body in a case of security may be different and perhaps the hearing might have to be in private but in such cases, as well as in others, it is needed.

Mr. Munro: Mr. Speaker, may I ask a question?

Mr. Lewis: Certainly.

Mr. Munro: In your suggestion concerning appeal and in your motion are you suggesting that if such an appeal board were set up—and I agree with many if not all of the things the hon. member states—the board's authority would be absolute once they made their ultimate determination or are you still going to reserve the final stamp of approval for the executive or the government?

Mr. Lewis: I would think the latter. I am not a great expert or even an expert at all in this field. However, I would think the granting of citizenship in cases where there may be some doubt should be the responsibility of the executive in the final stage, although if the minister acted contrary to the finding of the review board he would have to give a pretty good explanation for so doing. If it is thought that the review board should have more authority than this, I have no objection. I do not have any strong feeling on that score.

I conclude, Mr. Speaker, by saying that I place this resolution on the order paper and spoke today not merely to have a resolution to speak to but because it is a fact that literally tens of thousands of new Canadians in Canada today, as I speak to this house, are eligible to become citizens so far as their residence in Canada is concerned but are not citizens for no other reason than that the present law and procedures either frighten them or make it difficult for them to obtain their citizenship. I think it is unjust to invite people to come to our country and then place obstacles on the road to their becoming citizens. We ought to vest the obtaining of citizenship with all the solemnity, all the respect and all the aura of importance that we can symbolically put together, but we ought to remove every vestige of the kind of thing which places unnecessary obstacles in the way to citizenship for those who have joined our country.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Welland.

Mr. Walker: Mr. Speaker, may I ask the hon. member a question?

Mr. Speaker: Order. The time allotted to the hon. member for York South has expired.

Mr. D. R. Tolmie (Welland): Mr. Speaker, as the member for Welland, a very cosmopolitan riding, I know something personally of this problem and I know how important it is. Generally speaking I am in favour of the motion. The essence of the motion is that we should encourage immigrants to become citizens and not only should we encourage them to become citizens but that we should improve the procedures. However, this observation should be qualified by the statement that since the inception of the Canadian Citizenship Act in 1947 the machinery for obtaining citizenship by and large has been adequate and on most occasions very fair.

There are many strong reasons why people wish to become citizens. They want to be able to vote, they want to be able to participate in government, they want to be able to feel they are a part of the community and part of the country. However, at the same time there are many factors working against their desire to become citizens. Most of these people come from countries where they have seen much governmental control. They are afraid of signing forms, they are afraid of judges and they are afraid of anything pertaining to courts. The language barrier itself militates against many people applying to become citizens. To counteract these forces I believe that not only the government but also every citizen has a role to play.

I should like to go on record as stating also that our government has not been completely lax in respect of preparing people to apply for citizenship. We do have citizenship seminars. We have lectures provided in most urban and rural centres. There are lectures on history, geography and on the responsibility of citizenship. We have booklets on citizenship. I grant that these perhaps could be improved. However, I should like it to be mentioned that we do have facilities to encourage people to become citizens.

I have mentioned that the government, of course, should encourage immigrants to become citizens, but I think we as Canadians ourselves have a great responsibility. These people are shy and timid and we should in most cases encourage them. We should make them feel welcome. We should help to dispel their fear of courts and procedures. This is our duty as good citizens also.

The suggestion with regard to the need for more courts, of course, is a laudable one. There is, however, always the question of cost and time. I think what is even more important is not the number of courts but the location of the courts. I can cite a very concrete example. At the present time we have a centralized system of Citizenship Courts. We have one in Hamilton, with a branch office in St. Catharines. In my riding we have the cities of Welland, Port Colborne, Niagara Falls and the town of Thorold. These are very cosmopolitan urban areas. There are many people who are seeking citizenship. At one time we had a Citizenship Court in Welland but it was moved to St. Catharines. I know as a matter of record that many possible applicants will not travel to St. Catharines in order to become citizens. This may seem peculiar, but people who are wavering between making a decision and not making a decision make the decision not to go. Therefore I would suggest that a Citizenship Court be re-established in the city of Welland.

One of the prerequisites of obtaining citizenship is an adequate knowledge of the English language, and I think this is right and proper. It is a matter of degree. I do believe that hardship is worked upon older people who would like to become citizens. Again from personal knowledge I know there are many older people of 55, 70 or 75 who would like to become citizens but cannot do so because of the language barrier. I think this is one area in which we certainly should do some revision and provide some remedy.

• (5:40 p.m.)

In respect of the actual hearing of these cases it has been my experience that by and large the ceremony is impressive and although the procedure is perhaps strict in some cases it is fair and proper. The Citizenship Court judges are on the whole experienced people. They realize how to handle witnesses and on the whole the procedure is carried on with efficiency and dignity. In regard to the submission that reasons for dismissal of an application should be given, I would contend that this is not a practical suggestion. This is not a court of law in which there are litigants and where reasons for judgment are given. This is an application for citizenship and the basic reason for people being denied citizenship is a lack of

adequate knowledge of the English language. In that case the application is adjourned and the person tries to improve his knowledge of the language and comes back at a later date.

Mr. Lewis: He has to wait two years.

Mr. Tolmie: Not according to my information. As I have stated before, I think the application of the language barrier is perhaps a major weakness. I believe that generally speaking our Citizenship Courts and procedures are fair and just. Naturally any regulation and procedure can be improved upon. I think one of the major areas for improvement in this respect is the location of the courts. In addition, as I stated previously, the question of language should be re-examined and the rule made less stringent.

In conclusion I should like to emphasize that the government has a responsibility to facilitate citizenship applications but we as Canadian citizens have an even greater responsibility. If we wish to smooth the way for these people to become citizens of this country, it behooves all of us as Canadian citizens, regardless of political persuasion, to welcome our new Canadians, befriend them, encourage them and make them feel that becoming a Canadian citizen is worth while.

Mr. Walker: Mr. Speaker, could I ask the hon. member a question? Does the hon. member agree with me that we might well consider the automatic granting of citizenship to people who have resided in Canada for five years as long as their record is clean and they have demonstrated good citizenship in those five years?

Mr. Tolmie: No, offhand I cannot say that I do. The reason is simply that I think any person who wishes to become a Canadian citizen should go through a certain formal procedure. It should not be so stringent and narrow that to become a Canadian citizen is made difficult but it should be important and impressive enough to make the person feel that citizenship is worth obtaining.

Mr. G. H. Aiken (Parry Sound-Muskoka): Mr. Speaker, I want to say a few words at this time to indicate agreement with the general proposition that procedures for citizenship applications should be eased. I should like to begin by quoting from the conclusion of the Sedgwick report on immigration which came into our hands just yesterday. While this report deals with immigration rather than citizenship, I think this conclusion applies. At page 20 the report says:

> I think the Act should state clearly that admission to Canada, either as an immigrant or non-immigrant, is a privilege and is not to be construed as a right.

I adopt those words in connection with the question of citizenship. Citizenship in this country is a privilege and not a right. At the same time I think that those who would become citizens should not have unnecessary blocks placed in the way. The two hon. members who preceded me mentioned in particular the Citizenship Courts in urban areas. There is another problem that concerns those in rural areas. It is the fact that we do not have Citizenship Courts which are easily accessible to the person who wants to become a citizen.

In the rural areas one has to go to the county or district court office and there apply for citizenship papers. Then one must appear at the formal sessions of the county or district court, be examined by the judge and then be formally admitted as a Canadian citizen. I think this also is an impressive procedure. But there is one shortcoming in this respect, the infrequency of sittings of county and district courts. In Ontario particularly, of which I have knowledge, most of the county and district courts sit only twice a year. If one happens to miss the proper time it may be more than a year before an application for citizenship can be heard, whereas in the Citizenship Court in urban areas applications can come on very quickly.

I should like to mention one matter here that I think is not too well known. Applicants in rural areas have an alternative. They can apply to the County Court and go through the usual procedure or they can go to the nearest Citizenship Court and there take advantage of the fairly quick procedure that is adopted. I think many people delay making application because they are afraid it will take too long and they will become lost in the legal red tape.

I believe that while ease of access to the Citizenship Courts and the formal courts should be maintained, we should never forget the fact that citizenship is a privilege. I think we should make sure that the citizen is received with some formality and has a feeling that he has become, through some official act, a citizen of this country. While the proposition the hon. member put forward today would help, I think we need to give these people a feeling of acceptance and of

the solemnity of the occasion, which is most important.

The question of language has been raised and this also is a problem in many rural areas. I believe that in the areas outside metropolitan centres in which many languages are spoken, it is more difficult for an immigrant to become a citizen. The standard of language is much higher in a rural area where either English or French is spoken mainly and other languages are not used. I believe that particularly in the case of elderly people who come to this country late in life it is difficult, and the language requirement for such people ought to be eased.

I feel that people wishing to become citizens of this country must have a basic knowledge of either English or French. They must have sufficient knowledge to enable them to speak, be well understood and understand what is being said to them. I believe this is essential. But older people in my opinion should be given a break. I think it is more important in many of these cases that the people have a sense of belonging, of being part of Canada, than it is to make provisions with which it is difficult for them to comply.

I wish to make just one more point in closing, Mr. Speaker. In the rural areas I think more assistance ought to be offered to people desirous of becoming citizens. In the urban areas there are Citizenship Courts. The staffs of these courts are there and there are people of the immigrant's own language and ethnic background to help him. These people are able to help because they have been through the procedure before. They know where to go, what to do, what the questions are likely to be and what the answers are.

• (5:50 p.m.)

It is different in the rural areas because many of those who make applications come from isolated areas. They do not have the assistance and the friendship of people that those who live in urban sections have. I feel that such people require assistance from the government and also require assistance from their member of parliament. I believe this is one duty to which we should pay more attention. Most people who come to this country seem to believe that a member of parliament is a person to whom they cannot have easy access or a person who is not sufficiently interested in them. I think they would find most members of parliament are extremely interested in them, especially when it comes to their first vote. Of course, it is a fact that when they do become citizens they are entitled to vote.

I urge all members of the house to make a special effort to give assistance. I think one of our problems is that in many cases we do not know who is applying. There have been occasions on which Citizenship Courts or county and district courts have helped by giving members lists of people who are about to apply. This is most helpful. I think this is all I want to say. I do agree that the procedures ought to be improved and I approve in principle of the resolution that has been presented.

[*Translation*]

Mr. J.-A. Mongrain (Trois-Rivières): Mr. Speaker, I, too, am almost in complete agreement with the notice of motion of the hon. member for York South (Mr. Lewis) except as concerns the provision stipulating that

> An applicant whose application for citizenship is refused be provided with the full particulars of the reasons for such refusal—

I think there are many reasons to refuse an application and the government should have the privilege of withholding its reasons. Obviously, I do not have the time to elaborate on this point. If I recall what my hon. friend said a while ago, to the effect that admission of an immigrant to this country remains a privilege, I believe that, in all cases, the government should not be required to give to the applicant, at his request, full particulars or reasons for such refusal. Reasons may be given by the government, but to require that they be given could, to my mind, be dangerous.

I have listened to the hon. member for York South who seeks to facilitate the entry of immigrants into the country. If he means to facilitate the naturalization of immigrants who have been staying in this country for a number of years, I am in agreement with him. On the other hand, I think we should make entry of immigrants into Canada more difficult.

I should like to mention instances which have occurred in my province, not to bring up those in other provinces, even though I may leave myself open to suspicion, and I accuse my own province. In Quebec, over the last few years, it has been noted that most troublemakers, who have caused regrettable events reported in the press, were immigrants.

If the officials of the immigration office had conducted a more thorough investigation into their cases, they might have discovered they were already agitators in their countries. Not so long ago, a lady of virtue, who was refused entry into the United States, was accepted in Canada. It is hard to take: The Americans are harder to please than we are. I think we should make it more difficult to enter the country in order to get the best people, and I am referring to their moral value.

Of course, I am not ruling out the possibility of security in some cases which could eliminate even outstanding people. Once again, I am against making it too easy to enter into the country. I would agree with some of my colleagues who claimed that immigration offices are not well organized. Judging by the situation in my city, there is only one officer in charge in our immigration office. He is away from the office most of the time. Immigrants and businessmen who could hire some immigrants are unable to reach him. There should be at least a staff of three persons in that office. If it is the same throughout the country, I feel the government is not organized as it should be to deal with our immigrants.

In my opinion, the soundest argument of my colleagues—I accept all the rest of the notice of motion—is that they advocate extending the services provided to immigrants after they reach the country. They should be given language courses, in French or in English, a bare minimum, in short, a small stock of 50 or 60 words to enable them to shift for themselves. They should be given lessons in citizenship, so that they might know what living conditions to expect. Why could those offices not be open for a few hours on Sunday afternoon, so that the immigrants might not waste any time? For, though Sunday is the Lord's Day, the ceremony which solemnizes the granting of a Canadian citizenship certificate is closely related to the religious services held on that day.

These are measures which could be adopted so that the immigrants might feel at home, and feel that type of warmth they lacked back home.

But I maintain that it would be unwise to lower the standards for entry to this country. On the contrary, I feel they should be a little more stringent so that we might be sure of welcoming only the best.

[Mr. Mongrain.]

Similarly, I would not want to create difficulties for the government by forcing it to reveal all the reasons which might justify refusal of entry, for I feel that if the rest of the motion were applied—there would be representations made to the court, in an endless process, that would cause considerable embarrassment.

Therefore, I support the motion of the hon. member for York South, except for those details.

[*English*]

Mr. Speaker: The hour for the consideration of private members' business has now expired.

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE

Mr. McIlraith: Mr. Speaker, I think it might be useful if I were to indicate the business the government proposes to submit for the consideration of the house for the next few days. It would be our intention, tomorrow and Friday, to consider a few smaller bills and resolutions preceding bills on the Order Paper and the automotive agreement resolution. These items would be for Thursday and Friday of this week. On Monday we would call a supply motion. On Wednesday we would expect to make time available for private members to discuss the abolition of capital punishment bill.

Having said that, I should like to indicate the order of business for tomorrow and Friday. Perhaps it would be useful if I gave a rather extended list in the hope that some of the resolutions preceding bills could be passed and the bills made available to hon. members for consideration later.

The first item of business we would call tomorrow would be item 24, second reading of Bill No. S-15, an Act to authorize the construction of a bridge. We would then call item No. 23, second reading of Bill No. S-2, to incorporate the Ottawa Terminal Railway Company; then item No. 12, a resolution that it is expedient to introduce a measure to amend the Northwest Territories Act; then item No. 13, a resolution that it is expedient to introduce a measure to amend the Yukon Act.

• (6:00 p.m.)

We will then take item No. 4 on the Order Paper, a resolution that it is expedient to introduce a measure to amend the Research Council Act; item No. 15, a resolution that it is expedient to introduce a measure for the establishment of a Science Council of

Canada; item No. 5, a resolution that it is expedient to introduce a measure to establish a fund for the economic and social development of special rural development areas; item No. 6, a resolution that it is expedient to introduce a measure to amend the Agricultural Rehabilitation and Development Act; item No. 9, a resolution that it is expedient to introduce a measure to amend the Aeronautics Act; item No. 26, second reading of an act to amend the Bills of Exchange Act, and then item No. 7, second reading of an act to amend the Bretton Woods Agreements Act. If by any chance we have time we would then take item No. 3, a resolution approving the agreement concerning automotive products between Canada and the United States.

I have given a rather full list, Mr. Speaker, in the hope that hon. members may find in the list resolutions which might go rather quickly. These could be put forward and the legislation made available to hon. members.

Mr. Douglas: May I ask the minister whether it is the intention to call item No. 3 having to do with the U.S.-Canada auto agreement only after all these other items have been disposed of?

Mr. McIlraith: Not necessarily. We can consider that when we reach the last item concerning second reading of the Bretton Woods Agreements Act. But since discussion of item No. 3 is likely to be a debate which will take some time, because it is a matter hon. members might want to go into rather thoroughly, we might put these other resolutions forward so that the legislation will be available to us.

Mr. Starr: May I ask one question for clarification purposes? Did I understand the house leader to say that the capital punishment debate will commence one week from today?

Mr. McIlraith: Yes, Mr. Speaker, that is what I indicated.

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

HOUSE OF COMMONS

Thursday, March 17, 1966

The house met at 2.30 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS

ST. PATRICK'S DAY—STATEMENTS BY MEMBERS

Mr. R. R. Southam (Moose Mountain): Mr. Speaker, on a question of privilege which I am sure will be appreciated by all hon. members of the house, in view of the fact that many thousands of our Canadian citizens are proud to trace their ancestry to Ireland's emerald isle, I feel sure that all members would wish to join with them in paying homage to Ireland's patron saint on this 17th of March.

Hon. J. J. Greene (Minister of Agriculture): Mr. Speaker, may I join in those noble sentiments expressed by the hon. member.

Mr. Richard Cashin (St. John's West): Mr. Speaker, as the representative in this house of the constituency with the largest number of Canadians of Irish origin, I would like to join in the sentiments already expressed.

Mr. Terence Nugent (Edmonton-Strathcona): Mr. Speaker, may I say it would certainly be most appropriate if the house could be peaceful and orderly on St. Patrick's day.

GRAIN

OATS AND BARLEY—ORDERS IN COUNCIL AND PRESS RELEASE RESPECTING FINAL PAYMENTS

Hon. Mitchell Sharp (Minister of Finance): Mr. Speaker, may I ask leave of the house to table orders in council 1966—484 and 1966—486 relating to the final payments on oats and barley for the crop year 1964-65, together with copies in English and French of the press release being made at this moment by the Canadian Wheat Board in Winnipeg.

Mr. Speaker: Does the hon. member have leave to table the documents in question?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

INDIAN AFFAIRS

ANNOUNCEMENT OF RESERVE IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM

Hon. Arthur Laing (Minister of Northern Affairs and National Resources): Mr. Speaker, I should like to inform the house of some recent developments in Indian affairs. It is recognized that many Indian communities do not have adequate homes, either in quality or in number, and that many reserves lack facilities and services such as electricity, running water, bathrooms, sewage disposal systems or good roads.

I am pleased to inform the house that an extensive Indian reserve improvement program, to cost about $112 million in the next five years, will be undertaken. Under the program Indians will receive assistance to provide better housing, safe water supply, sanitation facilities, electrification of homes and improved roads in their communities.

• (2:40 p.m.)

A comprehensive study of housing conditions on reserves was completed in February, 1965, indicating a need for 12,000 new houses over the next five years to meet the backlog of approximately 6,000 houses required now, and new family formations of about 1,250 a year. In addition, community services are required on many reserves.

Many of the Indian leaders, as well as others, have been suggesting what would amount to a crash program to raise living conditions in Indian communities, particularly housing. The situation was discussed with the national Indian advisory board which met in Ottawa from January 10 to 12 this year. The board called for an accelerated program to eliminate the problem in the shortest time.

Under the accelerated program the objective is to build 12,000 houses in five years. Apart from what may be met from band funds and personal contributions, about $75 million in public funds will be required. The program will be flexible to meet the wide variety of reserve conditions across Canada, but will recognize four general areas of need:

First, there are those who are widowed, aged, indigent, disabled, or otherwise unable to make more than a token contribution toward their homes. Suitable housing will be provided for them largely at public expense.

Second, there are those Indian families living in marginal economic areas who must be helped in some way to provide homes for their families which are of minimum standards for decent living.

Third, there are those Indian families who live on reserves where economic conditions and prospects are favourable, where through wages or self employment they earn sufficient income to be able to contribute to the cost of their homes. Some assistance will be provided to enable them to acquire a higher standard of home.

Fourth, there are Indian families who wish to take advantage of employment opportunities off the reserve and may even wish to live permanently off the reserve. In order to help these families to obtain and hold jobs away from the reserve, financial assistance will be provided so they will be able to take advantage of normal lending facilities available to Canadians generally for the purchase of homes.

The expanded housing program, therefore, is intended to provide support to Indian families not only to obtain reasonably satisfactory houses but also to upgrade the level of Indian housing across Canada. Of great importance is the supply of safe drinking water and proper sewage disposal. Vast improvements in this field are needed if Indian people are to have the advantages enjoyed by most Canadians. Some $10 million will be spent for this purpose.

It is quite evident that progress on many reserves has been seriously hampered by the lack of electricity. It is necessary to bring electricity to reserves if Indian children are to obtain full advantage from the school program, and if the amenities of life are to be made available and economic opportunities are to be furthered. Power is essential to so many of the facilities we use daily and take for granted. Therefore a rural electrification program will be undertaken using existing public utilities wherever possible. The cost of this program over the next five years is expected to be $7 million and will be directed mainly to communities where Indians lack band funds necessary to extend facilities.

Transportation is of vital importance to provide access to and from reserves, for school children, employment opportunities and economic development. Improved roads on many reserves are a necessity. To this end some $17 million will be spent in co-operation with Indian band councils and other levels of government.

In order to achieve the best results from the expenditure of public funds it is necessary to co-ordinate all aspects of the reserve improvement program. Community planning is essential. This has been undertaken on a number of reserves, and scores of other communities will be examined as the needs and priorities are considered and established by the Indian communities.

Of particular importance—and on which in large measure the success of the program will depend—is the total involvement and participation of Indian band councils and the Indian people themselves.

Hon. W. G. Dinsdale (Brandon-Souris): Mr. Speaker, I think this is the first major announcement on Indian affairs policy that has been made by the Minister of Northern Affairs and National Resources in the house since he assumed responsibility for this important department. As I listened to his presentation, Mr. Speaker, it seemed to me that there was a strong northern affairs influence in the policy he outlined.

It is well known to all members of this house as well as to the people of Canada generally that one of our most neglected groups, and one of the most neglected areas of social responsibility in Canada has been in the realm of our attitude toward what we sometimes refer to euphemistically as our first Canadians.

It is encouraging to note that in the past few months there has been an upsurge of public interest in this question which is now reflected in the anouncement which has just been made by the minister of northern affairs.

Housing, of course, in Canada is one of our basic problems. That is why the Department of Northern Affairs and National Resources gave primary consideration to the needs of the Eskimo population in this connection. In more recent years there has been a problem of increasing proportions, in that good housing programs were available for our Eskimo population but at the same time our Indian population was sadly neglected.

I am sure, Mr. Speaker, that with this program announced by the minister the two groups will now be able to move along parallel lines. What the minister proposes will mean a tremendous improvement in the family and community life of our Indian people.

We must, of course, recognize that a house is not necessarily a home. I am glad to see that the minister has included in the basic housing program the necessary services and amenities which provide for a reasonable standard of living. I refer of course to amenities such as power, water, sewerage, and the necessary access roads.

All this is a good beginning. I would point out to the minister that several of the provinces have seized the initiative in dealing with the larger problems of our Indian population, and have taken leadership in the community development concept. If we are going to really rehabilitate our Indian reservations, which exist at the present time largely as depressed ghettos, I think we have to expand as rapidly as possible the community development concept which makes it possible for the people on the reserves to have a sense of belonging to a community. When our Indian people have that sense of belonging it will give to them that initiative and that motivation to improve which is so necessary to them, as they have lived under the cloud of paternalism for too long.

I trust that in administering this program, Mr. Speaker, we will not forget the special housing needs of Indians off the reserve. I think I detected a hint in this direction when the minister suggested that the special housing needs of our Canadian Indians who are moving away from the reserve system will be taken into consideration. Those people are not able to qualify under the terms of the Central Mortgage and Housing program at the moment, and this fact has constituted a discouraging factor in preventing them from moving into a position of responsibility and equality in the larger Canadian community.

I congratulate the government for taking the initiative in this program. It has been recommended by the National Indian Council for years, and more recently by the newly formed Indian Advisory Council. I should also like to pay tribute to the Indian-Eskimo Association, which has had its eye on this target for the past number of years. I hope it is the beginning of a more dynamic, broader approach to all the basic social problems of our first Canadians.

Mr. Colin Cameron (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands): Mr. Speaker, in the absence of my colleague from Skeena (Mr. Howard), who is unfortunately unable to be here today, I am making so bold as to comment on the minister's statement, because in my constituency are a great many of our native Indian population.

I think there is no doubt but that the minister is to be congratulated on this move which is being made to correct some of the abuse under which our native Indian population has suffered ever since the white man came to the country. While I commend the minister for the action he has taken, action which is long overdue, I hope he will not take it as a criticism of that action when I suggest there are still many things which need to be done.

• (2:50 p.m.)

In the first place, I wish he could have expanded on the question of Indian education. I think we should have some idea of the government's policy in this field. I realize there are difficulties with regard to jurisdiction where education is concerned, but I think the department should make every effort to encourage the attendance of Indian children at our public schools and to integrate them into the population. To this end I believe arrangements should be made with the local school authorities concerning school attendance, the provision of transportation and so on.

Another matter which I believe should be brought to the attention of the minister is this. The level of welfare and social assistance now granted to Indians by the federal authority is greatly below the level of social assistance granted by the provinces, at least by my own province of British Columbia and I imagine by other provinces too. It has long been a sore point with Indians that they are not eligible for the same level of social assistance and welfare aid as their white compatriots.

Something else occurs to me. While it is commendable to make every effort to see that our native population is well housed, we should also realize that the best of houses is inadequate if there is no income upon which to maintain it. There are areas in my own province where there are no employment opportunities of any particular value in close proximity to the Indian reserves, and I wonder whether the minister might not consider sponsoring or initiating the development of employment possibilities on or close to these reserves.

Before I sit down I think it is proper to do something I had intended to do at another point in our proceedings, that is to comment on the death yesterday of an extremely eminent member of our native Indian population, Rev. Peter Kelly of the city of Nanaimo. Peter Kelly was a member of a chiefly family of the Haida Indians of Queen Charlotte Islands.

Mr. Speaker: Order. The hon. member will allow me to remind him of the terms of the standing order under which ministerial statements are made and comments expressed by representatives of opposition parties. The

standing order requires hon. members to limit their comments to the statements or explanations put forward by the minister, and it does seem to me that the hon. member is now going beyond the terms of the statement itself.

Mr. Cameron (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands): I beg your pardon, Mr. Speaker.

[*Translation*]

Mr. C. A. Gauthier (Roberval): Mr. Speaker, our party is quite satisfied with the statement made by the Minister of Northern Affairs and National Resources (Mr. Laing), that, under a five-year program, the federal government will make available to Indian reserves more than $100 million for the construction of decent homes, street repairs and the building of sewage and water systems.

I hope that the Indian population in the riding of Roberval and especially that of the Pointe Bleue reserve will benefit more than the last few years from the sums allocated by the federal government.

It is inconceivable indeed that nowadays, in the centre of the Lake St. John area, in the heart of our civilization, there should still be Indians living in tents.

It is to be hoped that the amount provided under this new program will enable each Indian to have at least his own home.

The minister's statement on improvements referred to the building of sewage and water systems. I should like to bring to his attention that with regard to the Pointe Bleue reserve, they will have to start from scratch because there are no sewers, no sidewalks and no paved streets there. There is quite a job to be done in this field.

I should like also to remind the minister that each Indian living on a reserve should profit from the money that will be spent. Labour should be hired in the reserves and not from outside, as was done in previous years. I think that Indians are bright and skilful enough to build their own homes and look after the improvements. There is no need to go and get a group of white people to build those homes and sewers in the reserves.

I think there is room for improvement in this field. Besides, I shall raise the matter again when the estimates of this department are considered, because we have many requests to make for the Pointe Bleue reservation, especially from the administrative point of view.

[Mr. Speaker.]

[*English*]

Mr. A. B. Patterson (Fraser Valley): Mr. Speaker, I would like to state that we in the Social Credit party are very appreciative of the announcement which has been made this afternoon. In a period in our history when great emphasis is being placed upon the importance of adequate housing and the other amenities so far as the general population is concerned, it is only fitting and proper that we should make a particular effort to see that these things also are brought within the reach of the Indian people.

I would like to refer to three matters in this connection. First of all, as possibly has been mentioned, in the program of construction I think it is essential and desirable that the Indian people themselves be fused into the labour force, not only as a means of providing assistance to them but also to give them the training that is necessary.

Second, in order that these homes be maintained, possibly an important aspect of this program would be to see that domestic training is given to them to enable those who occupy the homes to maintain them and make use of the facilities. Third, in the program of building homes for the Indian people, perhaps care should be exercised in relation to some of the isolated areas where reserves are very far removed from employment opportunities, and consideration given to just going slowly in those particular areas. I am sure the minister will take cognizance of this fact.

We appreciate the announcement which has been made today and compliment the minister on his initiative in this field.

Mr. W. B. Nesbitt (Oxford): Mr. Speaker, as chief of one of the bands of the Ojibway people I would like to tell the minister I welcome this announcement and advise him that from information I have received that it is already taking effect. I am sure this is the result of representations made to the department over the last three years by many hon. members including myself. Again I would like to congratulate the minister.

[*Translation*]

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE

WITHDRAWAL OF MOTION FOR PRODUCTION OF PAPERS

On the orders of the day:

Hon. Jean Marchand (Minister of Citizenship and Immigration): Mr. Speaker, with

the agreement of the hon. member for Winnipeg North (Mr. Orlikow), I would like to ask the consent of the house to strike out from the order paper notice of motion No. 3 for production of papers which had been transferred for debate, since the hon. member agrees to its withdrawal.

[*English*]

Mr. Speaker: Is it agreed?

Mr. David Orlikow (Winnipeg North): Mr. Speaker, I agree if this means that the government will table the information requested.

Mr. Marchand: Of course, according to the agreement we have.

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Order discharged and motion withdrawn.

FISHERIES

SEALS—REPRESENTATIONS BY NEW BRUNSWICK SOCIETY

On the orders of the day:

Right Hon. J. G. Diefenbaker (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, I wish to direct a question to the Minister of Fisheries, asking him whether he has received a communication from the New Brunswick Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals regarding seal hunting, a copy of which was sent to the Prime Minister. If so, does he agree with the suggestion made therein that this seal hunt, referring to this latest event, represents an utterly cruel and barbarous practice completely irreconcilable with humanitarian standards in Canada?

Hon. H. J. Robichaud (Minister of Fisheries): Mr. Speaker, the report referred to by the right hon. gentleman was just placed on my desk as I was coming down to the house and I did not have a chance to read it. I wish to state at this time, however, that I do not agree with the reference made in the report as stated by the right hon. gentleman. I have the responsibility of introducing regulations to prevent any cruelty taking place during the seal hunt. At no time would I consider cancelling this hunting altogether, because it is necessary and has to be carried on.

Mr. Diefenbaker: Mr. Speaker, no one is asking that it be cancelled altogether, but does the hon. gentleman agree that during the hunt at which he was present the seals gave every evidence of terror and distress; that the white coats were often killed in front of the mothers' eyes, and after the whitecoat had been flayed the mother seal would come up and sniff and nuzzle at the dead carcass?

Mr. Robichaud: I do not agree with that statement.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. I suggest that this question should not be asked at this time as being urgent because it seems to me, as far as I have been able to gather, the seal hunting is finished for this year.

FINANCE

FUNDS RAISED BY U.S. IN CANADA FOR EUROPEAN EXPANSION

On the orders of the day:

Mr. T. C. Douglas (Burnaby-Coquitlam): Mr. Speaker, may I direct a question to the Minister of Finance arising out of his announcement yesterday. Has there been any evidence of a large scale sale of securities or an intention to offer for sale large amounts of United States securities in order to use Canadian capital to meet United States investment requirements elsewhere?

Hon. Mitchell Sharp (Minister of Finance): Mr. Speaker, the announcement I made yesterday including a request to investors was designed to prevent any large scale movement of funds from Canada to be used for financing projects in foreign countries. There had been some evidence of offers for sale of securities of this kind, but the information we have indicates that up to this time at least not very many of them have actually been purchased by investors. It was the purpose of my statement to prevent such a development from occurring.

Mr. Douglas: I have a supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Has the minister received any assurance from the financial community of Canada that there will be co-operation in support of the minister's request of yesterday?

Mr. Sharp: Mr. Speaker, I have had no evidence to the contrary, and I am now in the process of signing some hundreds of individual letters to members of the investment community which I am sure they will treat seriously. I have always had from the investment community while I have been minister, as I know my predecessor had while he was in office, co-operation in matters of this kind. I expect there will be co-operation and it is my intention later to find out how much co-operation has been forthcoming.

Inquiries of the Ministry

NATIONAL DEFENCE

CYPRUS—CONTINUED PARTICIPATION IN PEACE KEEPING FORCE

On the orders of the day:

Mr. R. N. Thompson (Red Deer): Mr. Speaker, I should like to direct my question to the Minister of National Defence, and perhaps I should direct it also to the Secretary of State for External Affairs. In view of the fact that yesterday the United Nations voted to extend the Cyprus peace keeping force for three months, and because our Canadian defence forces make up the major portion of that force on the basis of a donation from the Canadian government as far as costs thereof are concerned, I should like to ask whether the government of Canada was consulted prior to this decision. If not, has the Canadian government indicated its willingness to continue this vital but expensive operation?

Hon. Paul Martin (Secretary of State for External Affairs): Mr. Speaker, as this is a matter of interest to my department as well as to the Department of National Defence, the Minister of National Defence has suggested that I might reply. Yesterday the Security Council did renew the mandate of the United Nations force in Cyprus for a period of three months, from March 27 to June 26, and the government decided this morning that Canada would continue to participate in that force.

Hon. Marcel Lambert (Edmonton West): I have a supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Will the Secretary of State for External Affairs tell us whether he anticipates that between now and June a solution to this problem will be found, or whether the mandate should not have been extended for a realistic period of time?

Mr. Martin (Essex East): Mr. Speaker, the resolution of the Security Council expressed the hope that the parties concerned would make every effort to find a solution to this problem which has been before the United Nations since March, 1964. The governments of Cyprus, Turkey and Greece, in acknowledging with appreciation the decision of the Security Council to renew the mandate, have indicated their determination to do all they can to find a solution.

Right Hon. J. G. Diefenbaker (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, will the minister indicate what efforts have been made to have other countries contribute? Why should Canada make such a contribution on its own, and what is the estimated cost of this continuing contribution for the next three months, which ought to have been accepted by other nations rather than be the responsibility of Canada alone?

[Mr. Sharp.]

Mr. Martin (Essex East): I agree, Mr. Speaker, that other countries in the United Nations should accept their share of the responsibility for the operation of this peace keeping force. Canada, along with other countries, has urged member states in that organization to contribute to the voluntary fund, but participation in the force is circumscribed, of course, by the willingness or the consent of the host country as to participants.

The estimated out of pocket costs to Canada for participation in the United Nations force in Cyprus from March 27 to June 26 is $849,000. I share fully my right hon. friend's misgivings in this regard, but I am sure he will agree with me that notwithstanding the failure of some countries to bear their full share of the cost and to participate in making this force effective, Canada has pursued, and continues to pursue as a member of the UN organization, the right course in its decision to try to use the peace keeping machinery of the United Nations to keep the peace in Cyprus.

Mr. Diefenbaker: Yes, but it is pretty hard on Canadian taxpayers to be singled out in this regard.

Mr. Martin (Essex East): It has been very hard on the taxpayers, and I admit that; but I am sure we will all agree that in this matter the Canadian people would prefer to spend their money in keeping the peace thus discouraging the kind of situation that might lead to a more serious conflict.

CANADIAN PACIFIC RAILWAY

MEETING WITH WESTERN MAYORS RESPECTING REDUCTION IN SERVICE

On the orders of the day:

Mr. Jack McIntosh (Swift Current-Maple Creek): Mr. Speaker, I should like to direct my question to the Acting Prime Minister. A short time ago the mayors of eight western cities asked permission to meet with the cabinet in regard to the discontinuance of the train known as the Dominion. I was informed this morning that the request has been refused. I wonder whether the Acting Prime Minister can give us the reason for that refusal.

Hon. Paul Martin (Acting Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, I will be very frank with the hon. gentleman. I was so pleased with my reply to the right hon. gentleman that I was not paying attention to his question.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh.

Right Hon. J. G. Diefenbaker (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, may I at once pay tribute to the hon. gentleman and say that in both cases he was equally informative.

Mr. Martin (Essex East): In all fairness to the hon. gentleman, if he will repeat his question I will try to answer it.

Mr. McIntosh: Mr. Speaker, my question was this. A short time ago permission was requested by eight mayors of western cities to meet with the cabinet in regard to the discontinuance of the passenger train known as the Dominion, and I was informed this morning that their request had been refused. I wonder whether the Acting Prime Minister would tell the house why their request was refused by the cabinet.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. The Chair has had the opportunity to hear the question a second time, which has given me a chance to reflect on its legality. I suggest to the hon. member that it should not be asked at this time.

LABOUR CONDITIONS

DESIGNATED AREAS—REQUEST FOR INCLUSION OF INDIAN RESERVES

On the orders of the day:

Mr. Robert Simpson (Churchill): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Northern Affairs and National Resources. In view of the welcome announcement of the minister relating to a program of greatly needed improvements on Indian reservations, and keeping in mind that these improvements can be expected to assure our Indian people staying on many of these reservations, will the minister consider asking his colleague the Minister of Industry to give consideration to including as many of these reserves as possible in the designated areas program, in an effort to improve the economy as well as the living conditions on these reserves?

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. This is a question of general policy which I am sure, having been suggested to the hon. minister in question, will be taken into account.

INDIAN AFFAIRS

INQUIRY AS TO ACCESS ROADS TO RESERVES

On the orders of the day:

Mr. Walter F. Foy (Lambton West): Mr. Speaker, I should like to direct a question to the Minister of Northern Affairs and National Resources. I was very much interested in his announcement regarding Indians, and would refer to a private motion by the hon. member for Lambton-Kent (Mr. McCutcheon)—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. The hon. member should ask his question.

Mr. Foy: The question I should like to ask has reference to that part of the minister's announcement in which he mentioned access roads to Indian reserves. If the reserve is an island, does this include a bridge to the island?

Mr. Speaker: This is the same type of question as the one asked previously. Perhaps the hon. member would wish to get in touch with the minister and receive a reply.

Mr. Foy: Eleven o'clock.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh.

EXPO '67

APPOINTMENT OF U.S. COMMISSIONER GENERAL

On the orders of the day:

Mr. Robert C. Coates (Cumberland): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Trade and Commerce of which I have given notice. Is the minister in a position to comment on the appointment by President Johnson of Hon. Stanley R. Tupper, the congressman for Maine, as commissioner general for the United States exhibit at Expo '67, with the status of ambassador?

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. Although the hon. member gave notice of the question to the minister in charge of Expo '67, I do not think it is a matter of urgency that the minister be required to comment on such appointment.

EXTERNAL AFFAIRS

GHANA—RECOGNITION BY CANADA OF NEW GOVERNMENT

On the orders of the day:

Mr. W. B. Nesbitt (Oxford): Mr. Speaker, I wish to direct a question to the Secretary of State for External Affairs. Has the government of Canada as yet extended recognition to the new de facto government in Ghana?

Inquiries of the Ministry

Hon. Paul Martin (Secretary of State for External Affairs): Mr. Speaker, about eight or nine days ago the government indicated to its high commissioner in Ghana our intention to carry on normal relations with the government of Ghana. That information has been communicated to the head of the government of Ghana.

EDUCATION

STUDENT MEANS SURVEY—FURTHER FEDERAL ASSISTANCE

On the orders of the day:

Mr. John Loney (Bruce): Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Minister of Finance. It arises from the report of the Canada student means survey, to which the Department of Finance has contributed $14,500. Since the survey declares a deficit of $18,000, would the minister inform the house whether consideration is now being given to further assistance to this cause?

Hon. Mitchell Sharp (Minister of Finance): Mr. Speaker, I should like to take notice of that question.

[*Translation*]

FINANCE

REPORTED DECREASE IN BANK LOANS TO BUSINESSES

On the orders of the day:

Mr. Gaston Isabelle (Gatineau): Mr. Speaker, I should like to put a question to the Minister of Finance.

Can the minister tell us whether it is true that since the increase in the Bank of Canada interest rate, chartered banks have been compelled to reduce in a manner I would term as dangerous for the country's economy, the number of loans to businessmen, contractors and industry?

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member might wish to put his question on the order paper.

[*English*]

PUBLIC SERVICE

COLLECTIVE BARGAINING—INQUIRY AS TO LEGISLATION

On the orders of the day:

Mr. Stanley Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Mr. Speaker, in the absence of the Prime Minister may I direct this question to the Acting Prime Minister. In view of the fact that legislation was introduced yesterday that will provide for collective bargaining for provincial civil servants and municipal workers in Ontario, can the Acting Prime Minister say when we may expect the legislation that will provide for collective bargaining for the federal civil service?

[Mr. Nesbitt.]

Hon. Paul Martin (Acting Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, soon.

Mr. Knowles: Good.

OLD AGE SECURITY

INCREASED PENSIONS—REPORT OF SENATE COMMITTEE

On the orders of the day:

Mr. Eric A. Winkler (Grey-Bruce): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of National Health and Welfare. Inasmuch as we have been endeavouring to find out what the government has in mind in regard to increased old age security, I wonder whether the minister could inform the house if such action will be taken on the Croll report, possibly before Easter?

Hon. A. J. MacEachen (Minister of National Health and Welfare): Mr. Speaker, all I can tell my hon. friend is that this matter is under consideration. Because it is a matter of policy, it will be announced in the usual way.

IMMIGRATION

INQUIRY AS TO STATEMENT ON SEDGWICK REPORT

On the orders of the day:

Mr. Andrew Brewin (Greenwood): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Citizenship and Immigration. I would ask him if he can inform the house whether he proposes to make a statement on motions in regard to the report on immigration by Mr. Sedgwick, which was tabled the other day, so that members of other parties may comment on this important report.

Hon. Jean Marchand (Minister of Citizenship and Immigration): Mr. Speaker, based on the Sedgwick report a memorandum was prepared by the department and submitted to the cabinet. This memorandum is before the cabinet, and as soon as it is approved we shall decide how we are going to introduce it in the house.

Mr. Brewin: Could I ask the minister a supplementary question. In the Sedgwick report there is a proposal to limit sponsorship to spouses and dependant minors. I think this will cause great anxiety among Canadian citizens seeking to bring their relatives to Canada—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. Would the hon. member ask his question.

Mr. Brewin: Can the minister undertake that sponsorship of immigrants will not be confined simply to spouses and minor dependants?

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. I understood that the hon. member wanted to discuss this question at ten o'clock.

Mr. Marchand: Mr. Speaker, I will take the question as notice.

LABOUR CONDITIONS

ATLANTIC REGION—STEPS TO IMPROVE UNEMPLOYMENT SITUATION

On the orders of the day:

Mr. Heath Macquarrie (Queens): Mr. Speaker, I should like to direct a question to the hon. Minister of Labour. It is based upon the unemployment statistics just released, which show the Atlantic region with a rate at least twice that of the national average. Can the minister advise whether the government has any concrete plans to reduce this persistent and painful disparity?

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. This is a question of general policy which should not be asked and perhaps cannot be answered at this time.

Mr. Macquarrie: Ten o'clock.

[*Translation*]

MONTREAL—PROTEST AGAINST DECISION OF LABOUR RELATIONS BOARD

On the orders of the day:

Mr. Maurice Allard (Sherbrooke): Mr. Speaker, I should like to put a question to the Minister of Labour with regard to the public demonstration of the C.N.T.U. in Montreal to protest against a decision of the Labour Relations Board. Could the minister tell the house whether he will meet very shortly with representatives of the C.N.T.U. and whether he intends to introduce in the house amendments to the Industrial Relations and Disputes Investigation Act?

[*English*]

Hon. J. R. Nicholson (Minister of Labour): Mr. Speaker, with regard to the first part of the question, I do hope to meet again at an early date with representatives of the C.N.T.U. to pursue discussions that I have had with them. I might add that since my last meeting with them I have met with representatives of the Canadian Labour Congress and of the Railway Brotherhoods. We have further meetings arranged with them for early next week, and the further meeting about which the hon. member has just inquired will not take place until the preliminary ones have been held.

With regard to the second part of the question, if and when the government has any changes to propose to the labour legislation, they will be announced in due course.

FISHERIES

REPORT OF INQUIRY INTO FRESH WATER FISH MARKETING

On the orders of the day:

Mr. Eric Stefanson (Selkirk): Mr. Speaker, I have a question that I intended to direct to the Prime Minister, but in his absence I will direct it to the Minister of Fisheries. Can the minister inform the house when the government expects to receive the report of the commission of inquiry into fresh water fish marketing, which commission is headed by Mr. George H. McIvor, a former chairman of the Canadian Wheat Board, and which held hearings in Manitoba last fall?

Hon. H. J. Robichaud (Minister of Fisheries): Mr. Speaker, I understand that the preliminary report has been received from Mr. McIvor, but I have no indication as to when his final report will be presented.

NEGOTIATIONS RESPECTING ESTABLISHMENT OF FISHING ZONES

On the orders of the day:

Mr. Lloyd R. Crouse (Queens-Lunenburg): Mr. Speaker, I should like to direct a question to the Minister of Fisheries. In view of the fact that a bill to establish exclusive coastal fishing rights up to 12 miles off shore has been introduced in the United States, which indicates an awareness in that country of the necessity for claiming jurisdiction over a larger section of sea coast, will the minister inform the house of the progress presently being made in implementing all the clauses of Bill S-17, and when we can expect the Canadian 12 mile fishing limit to be imposed?

Mr. Speaker: Order. It seems to me this type of question is of a general nature. The hon. member is asking the minister to comment on the progress that has been made in the imposition or realization of certain clauses of a bill, or of legislation. This is so wide ranging that I think it should not be the subject matter of a question at this time.

Inquiries of the Ministry

Mr. Crouse: Mr. Speaker, with due deference to your ruling I would point out that Bill S-17 was introduced into this house almost two years ago. I believe it was in May, 1964; and in view of the fact that it has not been implemented, the fishing industry is eagerly awaiting some action on the part of the government. I believe some statement is in order at the present time.

Mr. Speaker: Perhaps a statement might be made on motions, or the hon. member might place the question on the order paper. If we have waited two years we might wait another short while.

HEALTH AND WELFARE

ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON HEALTH RESOURCES EXPENDITURES

On the orders of the day:

Mr. P. B. Rynard (Simcoe East): Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct a question to the Minister of National Health and Welfare, and ask him whether an advisory committee has been set up to look into the expenditures in connection with the $500 million health resources fund. If it has been set up, have any doctors been appointed to that committee?

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. Perhaps this question should be placed on the order paper.

EXPO '67

INQUIRY AS TO INVITATION TO RUSSIA

On the orders of the day:

Mr. K. H. More (Regina City): Mr. Speaker, I wish to direct a question to the Minister of Trade and Commerce, who is responsible for Expo '67. When our official party visited Russia the former Speaker of this house extended an invitation to Russia to bring some of the Hermitage treasures to Expo for display in 1967, and I know he reported that the government of Russia seemed to look on the invitation favourably. Has the government officially extended an invitation to the government of the U.S.S.R., or have Expo officials followed this up; and will these treasures be available for Expo?

Mr. Speaker: I would invite the hon. member to place this question on the order paper.

EXTERNAL AFFAIRS

CANADIAN PARTICIPATION IN ASIAN DEVELOPMENT BANK

On the orders of the day:

Mr. R. N. Thompson (Red Deer): Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the Secretary of State for External Affairs in his capacity as Acting Prime Minister. In view of the fact that President Johnson yesterday approved a bill providing for participation of the United States government in the Asian Development Bank, which he termed "an economic Magna Carta for the diverse lands of Asia", would the minister inform the house when the government expects to bring forward legislation that would provide for Canada's participation, as indicated in the Speech from the Throne?

Hon. Paul Martin (Acting Prime Minister): Just as soon as the legislative program will permit, Mr. Speaker. As my hon. friend knows, Canada has subscribed $25 million to the capital fund of the Asian Development Bank. My colleague the Minister of Labour signed the agreement on behalf of Canada, and ratification will come before the house.

COMBINES

NEWSPRINT—INVESTIGATION INTO PRICE INCREASES

On the orders of the day:

Mr. David Orlikow (Winnipeg North): Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct a question to the President of the Privy Council in his capacity as the minister in charge of combines legislation. I ask him whether his department is looking at the large and uniform increases in the prices of newsprint announced by Canadian pulp and paper companies.

Hon. Guy Favreau (President of the Privy Council): Mr. Speaker, may I take this question as notice.

COMMONWEALTH RELATIONS

CANADIAN DELEGATION TO CONFERENCE ON TRAINING OF TECHNICIANS

On the orders of the day:

Mr. Robert Stanbury (York-Scarborough): Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct a question to the Minister of Citizenship and Immigration and ask him whether he has made a decision about the representation of his department's technical and vocational training branch on the Canadian delegation to the forthcoming commonwealth conference on the education and training of technicians? The urgency of the matter arises out of the fact that I understand the composition of the delegation was required to be completed by today?

Hon. Jean Marchand (Minister of Citizenship and Immigration): I have not made a decision yet, Mr. Speaker.

THE CANADIAN ECONOMY

INQUIRY AS TO SPECIAL POLICIES FOR ATLANTIC PROVINCES

On the orders of the day:

Mr. Robert C. Coates (Cumberland): Mr. Speaker, I wish to direct a question to the Minister of Finance. Is he in a position to inform the house of any special policies he plans to implement with regard to the Atlantic provinces, to offset the effect of the government's tight money policy in that area?

Mr. Speaker: This is again a question of a very general nature.

AGRICULTURE

REQUEST FOR ANNOUNCEMENT OF DAIRY POLICY

On the orders of the day:

Mr. E. R. Schreyer (Springfield): Mr. Speaker, I would like to address a question to the Minister of Agriculture. Has he this day received a telegram from the "l'union des cultivateurs catholiques" alleging that the problem of inadequate milk prices is taking on critical proportions? Also I would ask the minister whether he has an announcement to make at this time in that regard.

Hon. J. J. Greene (Minister of Agriculture): Mr. Speaker, I have not had that particular wire drawn to my attention. The government's dairy policy for the ensuing year will be announced before April 1.

Mr. Speaker: Order, perhaps the Chair should make an ex post facto ruling on the question asked, though I have already made a ruling along these lines. Hon. members should not ask ministers whether they have received a resolution, letter or telegram. In any event, perhaps the second part of the question was in order.

AIR TRANSPORT

CHANGE IN REGULATIONS RESPECTING AIR CORRIDORS ACROSS ATLANTIC

On the orders of the day:

Mr. Colin Cameron (Namaimo-Cowichan-The Islands): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Transport but in his absence I was going to address it to his parliamentary secretary. However, I see he has been called out, so I must address it to the Acting Prime Minister. It arises out of the question I asked the minister on March 4 regarding the recent decision to narrow the air lanes across the Atlantic.

Inquiries of the Ministry

Two days ago the minister was good enough to forward me a memo on this question, and my question is based on the contradiction between this memo and the statement that appears in the *Globe and Mail* with regard to the position of the International Federation of Air Line Pilots Associations who, at Auckland, New Zealand, the day before yesterday announced they were opposed to this and urged all their members not to use the narrower lanes. In the memo forwarded by the minister to me—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. This is not a question. The hon. member is saying there is a disagreement or discrepancy between a memorandum he has received and another statement. That might be a grievance. It might even be a question of privilege, but it seems to me it is not a question that could be asked at this time.

Mr. Cameron (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands): With all due respect, Mr. Speaker, if you allow me to finish you will realize I have to do this to ask the question I wish to ask.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. The question should be posed or asked as quickly as possible.

Mr. Cameron (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands): May I ask the Acting Prime Minister whether the government is now prepared to make representations to the International Civil Aviation Organization, which has made this ruling, and point out that our own Canadian Air Line Pilots Association, in concert with all other air line pilots' associations in the world, have rejected this idea.

Hon. Paul Martin (Acting Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, I shall draw this question to the attention of the Minister of Transport. If there is any contradiction I am sure my hon. friend will agree that the Minister of Transport will not have any difficulty extracting himself from the alleged contradiction.

[*Translation*]

INQUIRY OF THE MINISTRY

On the orders of the day:

Mr. Marcel Prud'homme (Saint-Denis): Mr. Speaker, may I direct a question to the minister of human resources, better known as the Minister of Citizenship and Immigration?

Has the minister received protests from the hon. member for Royal (Mr. Fairweather) about the very unkind remarks made by Commissioner Sedgwick on page 18 of the

Inquiries of the Ministry

English version and on page 15 of the French edition of the first report?

Mr. Speaker: Order. This question is out of order.

[*English*]

NATIONAL DEFENCE

McGILL UNIVERSITY HIGH ALTITUDE RESEARCH PROJECT

On the orders of the day:

Hon. R. A. Bell (Carleton): Mr. Speaker, may I direct a question to the Acting Minister of Defence Production and Industry and ask whether the HARP project—an appropriate name to mention on St. Patrick's day—the high altitude research program of McGill University at Barbados is being delayed by lack of government support, and may have to be taken over by the government of the United States, as reported by the dean of engineering of McGill University?

Hon. Paul Hellyer (Minister of National Defence): Mr. Speaker, I am not sure who the acting minister is, but this question was asked within the last day or so, and the Minister of Defence Production said the matter was now under consideration.

WINTER WORKS

WINNIPEG—REQUEST FOR EXTENSION OF PERIOD

On the orders of the day:

Mr. Stanley Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Mr. Speaker, may I direct a question to the Minister of Labour. Is consideration being given to extending the deadline for the winter works program in the Winnipeg area because of delays in house building caused by the weather? I refer to the extension requested by the Winnipeg House Builders' Association.

Hon. J. R. Nicholson (Minister of Labour): Mr. Speaker, consideration is being given to the request in so far as it applies to the winter house building program. With regard to the other winter works programs, I am afraid that the answer will have to come from my colleague, the Minister of Citizenship and Immigration. I do not know what the answer is going to be in the case of the housing incentive but the matter is being considered.

Mr. Knowles: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Do I understand from the Minister of Labour that the representations that were made to him by the Winnipeg House Builders' Association are being considered?

[Mr. Prud'homme.]

Mr. Nicholson: They are.

Mr. A. D. Hales (Wellington South): A supplementary question to the Minister of Labour. With the great shortage of skilled labour and help, is the department giving consideration to withdrawing this winter works program?

ST. CROIX RIVER BRIDGE

STRUCTURE TO CONNECT NEW BRUNSWICK AND MAINE

Hon. Paul Martin (Secretary of State for External Affairs) moved the second reading of Bill No. S-15, to authorize the construction of a bridge across the St. Croix River between the province of New Brunswick and the state of Maine.

Mr. D. S. Macdonald (Parliamentary Secretary to Secretary of State for External Affairs): Mr. Speaker, I think hon. members will find Bill No. S-15 to be relatively straightforward and therefore no additional statement of great length should be required at this time. However, I will make available to hon. members one or two further details which will not appear from the bill itself.

The government of the province of New Brunswick wishes to build this bridge between the town of Milltown, New Brunswick, and the city of Calais in Maine. This, of course, would be an international bridge between Canada and the United States. Under the provisions of section 92 (10) (a) of the British North America Act, this will be a work extending beyond the limits of one province and therefore it is a work falling under the authority of the parliament of Canada. For this reason the province of New Brunswick has come to this parliament to receive authorization for the construction of the work.

The bridge will be constructed, operated and maintained by the government of the province of New Brunswick in co-operation with the government of the state of Maine. Each of these governments would pay half of the cost of constructing the bridge and the entire cost of all approach works and right of way within its own borders. The two governments would share the cost of maintenance and operation of the bridge once it is completed on the same equal basis. The federal government would make no financial contribution to the bridge and it is intended that the bridge should be toll free.

I should explain, Mr. Speaker, that this bridge is going to replace one already existing approximately 65 feet from the site of the proposed bridge. From a procedural standpoint there is to be an agreement between the province of New Brunswick and the state of Maine which would cover the points arising in connection with the proposed construction, the ones I have just mentioned and such other questions as may arise.

In order to give this agreement its proper status there will be at an appropriate time an exchange of notes between the Secretary of State for External Affairs (Mr. Martin) on behalf of Canada and representatives of the United States government in Ottawa, which will indicate the approval of the two federal governments to the conclusion of the agreement.

As I have stated, Mr. Speaker, I believe the bill is relatively straightforward, but I would be pleased to answer any questions from hon. gentlemen when we reach the committee stage.

Motion agreed to and bill read the second time.

Mr. Speaker: The Secretary of State for External Affairs (Mr. Martin), seconded by the Minister of National Defence (Mr. Hellyer), moves that the said bill be referred to the Standing Committee on Transport and Communications.

Mr. Bell (Carleton): With respect, Mr. Speaker, I think the bill goes to the committee of the whole house. I have had the opportunity of piloting such a bill at other times and certainly that was the procedure then.

Hon. Paul Hellyer (for the Secretary of State for External Affairs) moved that the house go into committee on the said bill.

Motion agreed to and the house went into committee, Mr. Cameron (High Park) in the chair.

On clause 2—*Approval of bridge.*

Mr. Bell (Carleton): Mr. Chairman, may I put two or three questions to the parliamentary secretary. The first is this. Has the government in mind any general bridge legislation? I believe it has been in contemplation for some time and it does seem to me that ought not to be necessary to come before this house each time an international bridge is to be constructed. It should be possible to set forth in general legislation the principles of management and the procedures of undertaking of these international works. I would appreciate it if the parliamentary secretary could tell the committee to what stage the government has gone in respect of this proposal.

The parliamentary secretary indicated that this bridge is to be toll free. I do not see any specific suggestion to that effect in the legislation except the use in line 13 of the words "for the free use and passage". Is that the only expression in the bill which makes it toll free?

Third, there is no provision in the bill that I am able to see, as I think there is, for example, in the Peace Bridge bill, for the management of the bridge. Is this to be a matter of equal right or equal representation of the two nations? By whom will the managers be appointed, the provincial authority in New Brunswick, the federal government, or by whom? The situation varies from international bridge to international bridge. We should have, I think, a clear understanding as to the authority that will appoint the body which is going to manage this particular bridge.

Finally, Mr. Chairman, the parliamentary secretary spoke of an agreement between the province of New Brunswick and the state of Maine. This is a matter which interests me. I should like him to explain in his capacity as parliamentary secretary by what technique such an agreement is reached as between a province and a state. Is this to be authorized by some action on the part of this parliament or have we some new technique whereby there is direct contact between a province and a state rather than it being an international affair conducted by the government of Canada?

Mr. Macdonald (Rosedale): Mr. Chairman, perhaps I can deal with the hon. member's final question first because the answers to the other two questions which he has raised flow out of it. The procedure that was followed in this particular case was the following. As I mentioned on second reading, there is already in existence a bridge approximately 65 feet upstream from the proposed site, which bridge is operated under an existing agreement between the state of Maine and the province of New Brunswick.

• (3:40 p.m.)

After some preliminary discussions were held between the province and the state of Maine with respect to replacing the existing

bridge, the request was made by the government of New Brunswick to the government of Canada for authority to enter into more definitive arrangements with the state of Maine with respect to replacing the bridge. The government of Canada authorized the province of New Brunswick to enter into discussions with the state of Maine on several conditions. The first of these was that the draft agreement which it was proposed that the parties should enter into should be submitted first for the approval of the Department of External Affairs. Second, after the agreement was entered into and the appropriate legislation was passed by this house, a contemporaneous exchange of notes would take place between the two international persons, in this case the government of Canada and the government of the United States, whereby the international arrangement between the two countries would be consummated.

I might say that the draft agreement has in due course been submitted by the province of New Brunswick to the government of Canada, and after consideration the government of Canada has authorized the province of New Brunswick to enter into arrangements with the state of Maine in accordance with the terms of that agreement. Under the terms of that agreement it is stipulated that the bridge shall be toll free. Since it will be toll free the question which arose in connection with the Blue Water Bridge—and I think the hon. member mentioned the Peace Bridge at Niagara Falls—of establishing an international public authority to superintend operation and maintenance does not arise in this particular case.

The ownership of the bridge will rest in the entity on each side, in this case the province of New Brunswick and the state of Maine, up to the international boundary. The operational costs will be taken care of in accordance with the terms of the agreement and paid on a *pro rata* basis by the two lesser governments. As I have said, this undertaking is in the agreement which has been approved by the government of Canada that it is to be toll free.

The hon. member raised the question whether this was a new departure or whether an agreement had been entered into between the province of New Brunswick and the state of Maine whereby in some way the action of this parliament had been circumvented. I would point out to the hon. member, with respect to the treaty making power, that that

[Mr. Macdonald (Rosedale).]

of course is done by executive act in Canada, and it was in acting pursuant to this executive power that the government of Canada authorized the province of New Brunswick to enter into these arrangements. I believe I am correct in saying that the form followed here is substantially the same as the form followed by this parliament in the two bridge bills put through in 1958 and 1959.

The hon. gentleman asked me whether there was any general bridge legislation in contemplation. I know that there has been some discussion about the setting down of general principles with regard to international bridges, but I am not in a position to say if general bridge legislation will be coming forward in the very near future or at all.

Mr. Bell (Carleton): Mr. Chairman, my recollection is that an interdepartmental committee was studying bridge legislation. Does the hon. member know whether that committee is still in existence and whether it is engaged in the active study of the question of general bridge legislation? Second, would the hon. gentleman be good enough to undertake to lay upon the table of the house at a later date the exchange of notes or whatever other documents there may be which have given approval to the agreement between the province of New Brunswick and the state of Maine?

Mr. Macdonald (Rosedale): I regret to say to the hon. gentleman that I cannot advise him of the current status of the discussions of the interdepartmental committee. I must confess I have not been privy to those. I think I can undertake to table in due course, when they have been executed and properly engrossed, the exchange of notes made between the two sovereign authorities.

Mr. McLean (Charlotte): Mr. Chairman, I should like to say a few words about this bridge. I have been chasing this bridge around for the last six or seven months and I have at last caught up with it. The hon. member who introduced the bill made a slight mistake. The bridge is not between Calais and Milltown. It is between Milltown, New Brunswick, and Milltown, Maine. There is already a bridge existing between Calais and St. Stephen.

It seems to me it is important that this bill should go through at once because the fire departments go back and forth across the river and the present bridge cannot carry the equipment. They have to go down the river, across the St. Stephen Bridge and then up the river again.

I was informed by a letter that several lives were lost in a fire. If the fire departments had been able to get their equipment there sooner these lives would not have been lost. I urge the committee to get this bill through as quickly as possible.

Clause agreed to.

On clause 3—*Authority.*

Mr. Ryan: Mr. Chairman, I should like to ask the parliamentary secretary why it is that power is given in clause 3 to construct the bridge either alone or in conjunction with the appropriate public authority in the United States? Why is the province given the power to construct this bridge alone? Could it not be that such power might prove embarrassing to the federal government?

Mr. Macdonald (Rosedale): I think the hon. gentleman would recognize that the parliament of Canada can only extend the authority to build a bridge to the territorial limits of Canada. If the United States had chosen to do so I presume that it could have authorized New Brunswick to build the entire bridge, or rather the portion on the American side of the boundary. The alternative mentioned in the section would give the necessary authority to New Brunswick.

The actual arrangement proposed between Maine and New Brunswick was for each of the parties to build the portion of the bridge on its side of the boundary. In fact the proposal is that on our part we shall be responsible for constructing the bridge out to the international boundary, and I think we can rely on the prospect that it will be constructed in such a way that when the bridge is built from the other side the two ends will meet.

Clause agreed to.

Clauses 4 and 5 agreed to.

On clause 6—*Approval required for assignment.*

Mr. Bell (Carleton): May I ask the parliamentary secretary if clause 6 is the usual clause in this type of bill? It seems to me rather unusual that the question of assignment or delegation should be left with the governor in council. I would think if the power to operate and maintain the bridge were to be assigned or delegated the matter should come back to this parliament.

Mr. Macdonald (Rosedale): May I point out to the hon. member that there was no provision at all in the 1958 and 1959 bills restricting the power of the entities in that case to assign or otherwise delegate the control of the bridge to any other entity. It seems to me that the chief purpose of the clause is to prevent the assignment at some future date of the Canadian interest in the bridge to some authority not a public authority. Therefore, in answer to the hon. member, this is an innovation in that sense. It is an innovation in favour of stricter control by the federal government rather than less strict.

Mr. Bell (Carleton): I would approve of that, Mr. Chairman. I would venture to suggest to my hon. friend and to the authorities of the Department of Finance and the Department of External Affairs that when they are next considering any such bill they consider whether it would not be wise that this power be exercised only with the consent of parliament and not with the consent of the governor in council.

Clause agreed to.

Clause 1 agreed to.

Title agreed to.

Bill reported.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: When shall the said bill be read the third time? Now, or at the next sitting of the house?

An hon. Member: By leave, now.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: By leave, now?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Mr. Hellyer (for Mr. Martin, Essex East) moved the third reading of the bill.

Motion agreed to and bill read the third time and passed.

• (3:50 p.m.)

OTTAWA TERMINAL RAILWAY COMPANY

Hon. Paul Hellyer (for the Minister of Transport) moved the second reading of Bill No. S-2, to incorporate the Ottawa Terminal Railway Company.

Mr. J. A. Byrne (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Transport): Mr. Speaker, I have a brief statement to make which I hope will answer all possible questions in relation to this matter.

Ottawa Terminal Railway Company

By Bill No. S-2 the National Capital Commission together with Canadian National Railway Company and the Canadian Pacific Railway Company are endeavouring to implement the terms of an agreement made between them for the relocation of railways in the Ottawa area, dated October 17, 1963, which provides for the incorporation of a terminal railway company to consolidate and carry out rail terminal operations in the Ottawa area. This agreement was made not at the instigation of the railways but as a step in implementing the National Capital railway relocation plan.

I believe I can summarize in the interest of expedition. The bill was before the other place in 1965 when representations were made by those objecting to the wording, and again this session, the trucking companies objected to certain words which indicated that the railways might be taking over trucking in the Ottawa area. The bill has now been amended to make sure that the railway companies will only operate the normal pick-up and delivery services. There is an arrangement whereby both railway companies will share in the buildings and in the operation costs on a 50-50 basis.

A further objection was raised by railway employees who would be required to transfer to the new terminal railway company. This issue has been satisfactorily negotiated between the companies and the employees concerned so I believe I can now assure the house that all matters dealt with in the bill meet with the approval of all those who are concerned.

Mr. Arnold Peters (Timiskaming): Mr. Speaker, the remarks made by the parliamentary secretary when introducing this bill may, as he suggested, have been all-embracing and sufficient to explain all the problems arising in connection with the measure before us. However, I doubt that this matter can really be settled so easily.

The house may recall that this bill was before us a year ago. The provisions of the measure do, indeed, give effect to its purpose but the method of doing so has caused severe dislocation of traffic in many areas and raises the whole question of the National Capital Commission plan in relation to railways and other transportation arteries throughout the area.

One of the problems presented by the bill is that it seeks to give legality to something which has already been done. The railway terminal we are talking about has already been developed and is due to be opened very shortly. There is in Ottawa at the present time, as will be seen from the newspapers, considerable discussion about whether or not a stay of execution can be granted for the present station in the downtown area because of its possible usefulness during the centenary year and because of the architecture of the building and the desire of some to retain it.

The fact that people will no longer be able to reach the central part of Ottawa by rail is a *fait accompli*. Any effort to change this situation is in my opinion bound to be ineffective. There is therefore no point in making a great issue of it. Nevertheless I think we should bear in mind when considering this bill that for many years we as members of parliament have had no opportunity to discuss with any thoroughness the affairs of the National Capital Commission and the relationship of the transportation system to the needs of this city and to the needs of the whole area within which the commission operates. The plan as set up by the National Capital Commission with the assistance of Mr. Greber many years ago has been modified, changed and discarded. This is only one, small example. It is proposed to set up now a company with capital stock of $30 million to be operated jointly by the Canadian National and the Canadian Pacific Railways.

What does this really amount to? So far as passenger service is concerned there will be no operations of the Canadian Pacific Railway to be considered in relation to the terminal railway company. The only reason the C.P.R. is interested in this agreement is that there are one or two other joint terminal railway companies already established in various parts of Canada.

Since this bill was first presented circumstances have changed. The C.P.R. no longer provides passenger service between Toronto and Ottawa. It has only one train, the Canadian, coming into Ottawa. The indication given to the Board of Transport Commissioners is that the Canadian Pacific intends to ask for the discontinuation of all its passenger services in Canada. Should such a request be granted the company will no longer wish to operate a service in conjunction with anyone else. As I have pointed out, the situation in which the National Capital Commission is interested has changed and will change still more.

Some hon. members are aware that when the new station is completed there will no longer be a Hull railway terminal. The city of Hull will be without rail transportation when the provisions of this bill are fully implemented. I am surprised there are not more representatives of Ottawa and Hull here today because this is a matter which affects the people who live in these two cities. There are many agencies and groups in Ottawa and Hull who are very interested in the move to set up the Ottawa Terminal Railway Company because they know it will affect the whole railway passenger operation and the provision of passenger facilities. If the National Capital Commission is telling the house that this bill is a means of moving the railway out of the downtown section of Ottawa so that it can be located in a less congested part of the city, I suggest the commission is being unrealistic. In fact they have moved the railway lines only about four miles to the Alta Vista area which is growing rapidly. In the last five years the population in the Alta Vista area and the area adjacent to Industrial Avenue has doubled or trebled and possibly more.

• (4:00 p.m.)

In my opinion, from the National Capital Commission's point of view there really is no plan in conjunction with the city of Ottawa to establish the type of development in this area that would be necessary to maintain a freight yard complex such as the Walkley terminal. In my view the National Capital Commission, for which we are responsible has really failed to do anything concrete in respect of the moving of the railway terminal. I am aware of the fact that the federal government really never has given consideration to what we are going to do with our national capital. How are we going to face this fact? I would think that some of the members, particularly those from this area, would be concerned about this matter.

You will be aware of the fact, Mr. Speaker, that one of my colleagues, the hon. member for Skeena (Mr. Howard), the other night spoke of the potholes in the city of Ottawa and the fact that the National Capital Commission had not done much about it. I read a most idiotic statement in the press the other day made by Mr. Heit, a member of the board of control, to the effect that the member for Skeena should either shut up or put his money where his mouth is.

I am not sure whether he expects the hon. member for Skeena, who I think has property in this town, to finance the road building program himself. I do not know whether that is what he expects, but certainly the board of control in conjunction with the National Capital Commission really never has decided what it is going to do with the city. The situation is disgraceful in many respects so far as the public are concerned, and it is nothing to be proud of so far as the National Capital Commission is concerned. We are now compounding the problem by moving the railway terminal three miles from downtown Ottawa. Somebody has said that it only takes you a minute in your car to go downtown on the Queensway. That is true, but if you are riding on a train you have not brought your car in your pocket. I do not see what transportation by automobile has to do with railway transportation. If you travel by train you do not have your car with you, nor do you if you travel by airplane.

It is just as easy now to go by train from downtown Ottawa to downtown Montreal as it is to go from downtown Ottawa to Ottawa airport, fly to Dorval airport and then go from the airport to downtown Montreal. Do we have to be as stupid as the National Capital Commission? I do not know; maybe we do. I do not think anybody here is interested in this bill. I think we will pass it without hardly any comment. I am sure one or two of the Ottawa members will have to say something about it, but I really believe we do not care. I believe we have not given any consideration to this matter. We stupidly move the terminal three miles from downtown Ottawa and allow agencies of the government to put up our money for the building. The bill was not passed last year because the Liberal government did not have the guts to pass it when the committee added to the bill a provision that two members of the board of directors had to be French. This meant that the Canadian Pacific Railway had to be instructed that at least one of their directors would have to be a French Canadian. That was stupid. It has nothing to do with the bill or the National Capital Commission's decision in respect of where the terminal should go.

We went ahead and spent the money and built the building. It will be opened in a few months. We put it three miles from downtown and not in the heart of the industrial section. The street is called Industrial Avenue and has on it, I believe, Loeb's wholesale, a

couple of other small wholesalers and possibly a fruit provisioner, but who would call this the industrial part of Ottawa? I would be suprised if anyone would. We have moved the station three miles from downtown so that one has to hire transportation to get there when we already had the facilities downtown not two blocks from the parliament buildings and the main business section of the city. We did not think about the matter at all. We paid no more attention to the Ottawa terminal location than we paid to the moving of government facilities to Tunney's Pasture and to Confederation Heights, and to all the other stupid moves we allowed the National Capital Commission to make.

Members can pass this bill if they wish. They can modify it or do what they like with it. But I think the people who come after us are going to wonder about members of this parliament being so stupid that they did not ask the N.C.C. for a revision of the plan to bring it up to date. Mr. Greber probably is dead, if he is possibly he will turn over in his grave. The situation is a little like the matter of a house I built. The contractors looked at the plan I used and just did not believe it. Not knowing very much about plans, I modified them and in the end the plan I had bore no relation to the house I finally ended up building. As a result of modifying it here and there, it had no relationship to the plan the architect drew. I am sure Mr. Greber would feel this way about his plan in respect of the city of Ottawa and the whole greenbelt area. I am sure he would feel there is no relationship between his architectural design for the area and the plan we are now following. If you doubt this, take a look at the plan and see the changes already in effect.

I am not sure what I can do, Mr. Speaker. I come from northern Ontario and this matter really does not concern me. However, I have an interest in seeing that the National Capital Commission as the national capital authority operates in a way of which the people of my area and every constituency in Canada can be proud. I expect there will be trains carrying passengers for some years and I do not like to see them having to arrive in Alta Vista. I should like to see them arrive downtown. When people come here from northern Ontario they are going downtown just as people are when they go to Montreal. If you go to New York city you do downtown. That should be kept in mind in developing new railway facilities. I agree that you do not have to take freight trains into the middle of town, but I think that passengers should be able to get off trains where normal transportation facilities are available at the door and where those who wish to walk will find themselves in the downtown part of the city.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I have a responsibility. I am going to accept this responsibility and raise these matters again when the bill is referred to the committee. I think there is an obligation on the part of the house to send this bill to the Standing Committee on Transport and Communications. I do not believe the sponsor of this bill said that he was going to do so. He shakes his head indicating he may not. Frankly, I think the law of the land says it has to go to a standing committee. That, of course, is not for me to decide. I suggest that even the discussion which took place last year indicated that the bill had no relationship to the plans which were developed for the area.

• (4:10 p.m.)

Those from Ottawa who fought the last federal election will be aware of the fact that the Beachburg line is an important part of the Ottawa terminal railway system. It was and is a major concern of many people who live and are normally resident in Ottawa, including some members of parliament who make this city their permanent home. These people are very interested in this committee and should be given the opportunity of appearing before it to discuss this bill. If they are not given the opportunity I hope they will rise in righteous indignation and take to task some of those members of the Ottawa board of control who seem to have ffiends in this house who are willing to support the ideas and changes apparent in this proposal.

I do not think there is anything more I can usefully add. I believe every member will agree that it would be nice if we could save the Union Station but to do that we would probably have to cover a certain area of the canal in order that buildings, parks and gardens could be established above the cement tunnel through which the trains would travel. I forget the estimated cost of this project which was given to the committee last year, but it was fairly small.

Surely all hon. members will agree that an open cut tunnel providing downtown facilities for the discharging and picking up of passengers would be a worth-while consideration. I

am sure the station could be rebuilt, modernized and used for other purposes such as a theatre, although for the life of me I cannot imagine why anyone would want a theatre in that area. That seems to be a pet project of some of the Ottawa board of control members.

If hon. members will think about this bill, surely they will realize that it is not a good one. We are providing the Canadian National with money through the back door to erect a building and adjoining facilities requiring a capitalization of some $30 million for which there has been no provision made yet. That is bad business in regard to any project. Any government that allows this to be done becomes the tail of a dog and it has no control over the wagging of that tail. It only provides the bones to feed the dog, the dog, of course, being the National Capital Commission which has been pushing parliament around for a long time.

The National Capital Commission is the child of parliament and it is the only body involved in the development of the national capital over which parliament has some control. For that reason we must have some say as to its actions. I think the bill now before us is in fact something we cannot change. To attempt to do so would be like trying to change during the consideration of the estimates amounts of money already spent by the government. The money has been paid, buildings have been erected and it is impossible to say afterwards that we are not going to erect those buildings or spend that money.

Perhaps it is my conservative attitude which encourages me to speak about this matter at all but I hope that hon. members, while realizing that the proposition before them is a *fait accompli*, will also realize that it does not meet the needs or wishes of the people living in the national capital who want a capital that is as beautiful as possible with facilities that will provide the services required for a national capital.

In my opinion, Mr. Speaker, the provisions of this bill do not meet the requirements of the people of this area nor the general scheme of municipal development. I think it will be evident that others know more about the needs than I, but I am sure that every member who represents a constituency in the general area of Ottawa has received letters demanding that the city of Ottawa be established as a national capital city under the control of the federal government. That may not be in keeping with the wishes of the people of Ottawa but it is in keeping with the wishes of my constituents who have written me on this subject. For that reason I would be remiss in my duty if I did not rise and comment on these problems which in my opinion we are facing in a negative way.

Hon. R. A. Bell (Carleton): Mr. Speaker, the strictures of the hon. member for Timiskaming (Mr. Peters) induce me to intervene very briefly in this debate. Most of the things he has said this afternoon he has said six, seven or eight years too late. He himself has conceded that the location of the railway station and lines in this community is a *fait accompli*. This afternoon he is simply threshing old straw because he knows he can get his name in the newspapers by this technique and create a considerable amount of publicity on the local Ottawa scene.

The fact is, Mr. Speaker, that this bill is very important to national capital planning. Without this bill it would be impossible to get rid of the many level crossings that exist in this community. It is a *sine qua non* to get rid of these level crossings.

Mr. Cowan: Mr. Speaker, may I ask the hon. member now addressing the house to address Your Honour rather than the hon. member for Timiskaming? He might as well be addressing me because I agree 100 per cent with the hon. member for Timiskaming.

Mr. Bell (Carleton): Mr. Speaker, I thought I was addressing you but I submit it is quite legitimate to look to any section of the house at any particular time when speaking. I say, sir, that this bill, covering as it does the location of the central Union Station, is one in respect of which a decision was taken a considerable number of years ago. Whether or not that decison was wise at the time, it is now too late to do anything about it.

What the hon. gentleman has said this afternoon does point up a plea I have made on at least two occasions earlier this session to the Prime Minister (Mr. Pearson) and the Minister of Public Works (Mr. McIlraith), that all the plans and studies of the National Capital Commission should be referred to a joint committee of the Senate and House of Commons for consideration. I do not suggest that the studies of such a committee would constitute an investigation of the commission at all. On the contrary, it would give the commission an opportunity to inform members of this house as to its basic plans and to indoctrinate them on the long range plans for the national capital.

Ottawa Terminal Railway Company

There is no use engaging now in harsh statements about what may have been done wrongly or otherwise in the past. It is all very well for the hon. gentleman to say that certain parts of this city are a disgrace and that we cannot be proud of them, but if there are problems in this city they are the result of long term neglect on the part of the parliament of Canada. The straightforward fact is that for many years the only contribution made by the parliament of Canada to the national capital was $100,000. That is why the neglect now shows and that is why it is taking so long to catch up. That is why there is an urgent need for a crash program for the centennial year.

• (4:20 p.m.)

The hon. gentleman mentioned one matter to which I think attention should be given and I hope the parliamentary secretary will make some reference to it when he speaks in closing the debate. I refer to the Beachburg line. My own view is that this particular bill has not gone far enough; it ought to go further, and the agreement ought to go further and provide for the abandonment of the Beachburg line. I am not going into that matter in any detail this afternoon but I shall be glad if the parliamentary secretary will indicate the stage and the nature of the studies which are now taking place in this connection. But I give him and the Minister of Public Works (Mr. McIlraith) notice that when the estimates of the Department of Public Works are before the house I intend to say considerably more on the subject of the Beachburg line and the fact that I believe that in the planning of the terminal and the attempts to abandon level crossings in this community we have not gone nearly far enough.

The hon. member for Timiskaming has put forward many strictures against the National Capital Commission. I believe that the staff and the members of the commission are dedicated people. Frequently I have criticized them and frequently I shall criticize them in the house, but I think the opportunity should be given to them to come before a committee of the house and there expose the long range plans so that we will not be confronted with the situation with which we are confronted this afternoon wherein the hon. gentleman six, seven or eight years too late, raises the subjects that he has raised. If we had before a committee of this house the opportunity to study the long range plans, we would be sure there would be parliamentary approval, parliamentary sanction and parliamentary backing for this national capital as the true symbol of a united nation.

[Mr. Bell (Carleton).]

Mr. Cowan: Mr. Speaker, could I ask the parliamentary secretary a question? I was on the transport committee in the last parliament. I am not on it this year. I do not need to ask why. I was one of those on the transport committee who voted for the amendment that the board of directors of the Ottawa Terminal Railway Company should include at least two French speaking members. That does not appear in Bill No. S-2. Another point to which I objected violently in the last parliament was paragraph 26 of the schedule. We were given the bill to consider in committee in November and December, 1964, and the clause then read, as it does now:

> Except as otherwise expressly agreed to by the parties hereto, all transfers of land and facilities referred to in this memorandum shall take place simultaneously on the second day of January, 1965.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order, please. If the hon. member's remarks are to be directed toward one particular clause, I would suggest to him that his remarks might be better made when the bill is before the committee.

Mr. Cowan: I understood it was not going to go to committee. That is why I was speaking.

An hon. Member: Committee of the whole.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Is the house ready for the question?

Some hon. Members: Question.

Mr. J. A. Byrne (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Transport): Mr. Speaker, in reply to the—

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order. I must advise the house that if the hon. parliamentary secretary speaks now he will close the debate.

Mr. Byrne: In reply to the hon. member for Timiskaming (Mr. Peters) I would say we can only hope, if there is such a paucity of planning in the National Capital Commission, that at least the net result will be as accommodating as the home which he himself built, which I understand is quite a commodious structure. The hon. member said that the Canadian Pacific Railway was getting out of the passenger business. I am a member of the Committee on Transport and Communications, and if I recall correctly there was no indication that they were getting out of the passenger business for at least some years.

I cannot answer for the city of Ottawa or the city of Hull, but I understand there is certainly an accommodation between all parties concerned that this bill satisfies their needs. I made a very brief statement at the opening of the debate on second reading because I felt, as did many other hon. members, that we were speaking now after the preparations had all been made. Therefore it is simply a matter of getting this bill through now as rapidly as we can in order to carry out the plans of those who have been discussing this matter for a number of years. I have heard the hon. member make a similar speech before and must say that when he discussed this question previously it was too late also. I believe this was during the session of 1965.

With regard to the question of whether the bill should go to a standing committee, I would point out that it has been before the Senate committee on two occasions and, as the hon. member for York-Humber (Mr. Cowan) pointed out, it was before a committee of the house. Therefore, all those people who wished to make representations have made representations and if this matter were to be again considered by a standing committee we would probably only be repeating what has already been said.

The committee of the other place heard representations in this connection. They heard representations put forward by representatives of the employees concerned and, I believe, the trucking industry. The chairman of the National Capital Commission was before that committee and pointed out that in so far as the Beachburg line was concerned they had appropriated funds for the purpose of making a study of the question of abandoning the Beachburg line in that area, but a determination would be made on that matter following the report of the firm which had undertaken the study. I regret that I have not the name of the firm that has been commissioned to undertake the study, but I understand it is a very responsible organization.

With regard to the question of representation of French speaking Canadians, I do not know whether the hon. member was referring to representation on the National Capital Commission or the Ottawa Terminal Railway Company.

Mr. Douglas: He was referring to representation on the board of directors of the railway.

Mr. Byrne: I suppose these directors are appointed by the railway concerned and this would be a matter for them to determine.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Is the house ready for the question?

Some hon. Members: Question.

Motion agreed to, bill read the second time and the house went into committee thereon, Mr. Batten in the chair.

• (4:30 p.m.)

Mr. Peters: On a point of order, Mr. Chairman, is it not mandatory that this bill go before the railway committee for it to decide what it wishes to do with it?

Mr. Bell (Carleton): On the point of order, Mr. Chairman, is it not true that a public bill goes to the committee of the whole unless otherwise decided by the house when Mr. Speaker is in the chair? A private bill, and this is certainly not such, under our Standing Orders is required to go to a standing committee.

The Chairman: Order. The comment made by the hon. member for Carleton is correct. This is a public bill and comes before the committee of the whole house, but we are slightly out of order at the moment. House in committee of the whole on Bill No S-2, an Act to incorporate the Ottawa Terminal Railway Company. Shall clause 2 carry?

On clause 2—*Incorporation.*

Mr. Peters: Obviously we cannot pass clause 2 without an amendment. The late Robert A. Emerson is listed as a director of the company and in fairness to the railway, since he died just recently, I would move that this matter be deferred until the C.P.R. has an opportunity to substitute the name of its new president.

Mr. Byrne: Mr. Chairman, perhaps I might have the Minister of Northern Affairs and National Resources move that the name of Mr. Ian Sinclair be substituted for that of Mr. Robert A. Emerson.

Mr. Laing: I so move:

That the name of Ian Sinclair be substituted for that of Robert A. Emerson.

Mr. Peters: Mr. Chairman, we are being asked to pass a Senate bill which was passed by the Senate on March 1, but if we amend it, it will no longer be the bill that was passed by the Senate. If this amendment is passed what steps are necessary so we will be in order?

Mr. Ryan: I might be of help on this point, Mr. Chairman. Apparently the bill would go back to the Senate for ratification. It would be a very simple matter.

Mr. Bell (Carleton): For concurrence in the amendment, not ratification.

Mr. Ryan: For ratification and concurrence in the amendment.

Amendment agreed to.

Clause 2 as amended agreed to.

On clause 3—*Provisional directors.*

Mr. Peters: Mr. Chairman, the same problem is involved here.

Mr. Byrne: I cannot see any real difficulty here. The name now in the amended bill is Mr. Ian Sinclair and this clause refers to those persons named in clause 2.

Clause agreed to.

Clauses 4 to 6 inclusive agreed to.

On clause 7—*Numbers of directors.*

Mr. Cowan: Mr. Chairman, with regard to this clause I do not have as strong feelings on the matter as another hon. member who is now on his way here but I understand his feelings from having sat on the transport committee with him in the last parliament. This is one of the points of contention that came up in the last parliament and before the transport committee. I consider it an ignoring of the expressed desires of the transport committee that this clause should appear in this way when the matter was discussed and gone into at length by the members of that committee a year or so ago and an amendment was adopted by a majority vote of the members. The vote was seven to six, as I very distinctly remember. I think we are entitled to an explanation why the considered opinion of the transport committee of the previous parliament should be so ignored in the presentation of this bill at this time.

Mr. Byrne: Since the hon. member has the advantage over me in having been on that committee, would he state what was the recommendation of the committee in this respect?

Mr. Cowan: The committee recommended that at least two members of the board of directors should be French speaking. That was the bone of contention at that time.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Caron: Mr. Chairman, I was the one who proposed last year that at least two French Canadians be members of that committee. I am told that this has been accepted and that they are proud there should be at least two. I am sorry, but I am sceptical and would rather have it specified in the bill. If it is so written, I am sure we shall get them, but if it is not, there will always be people who will come up with some excuse for not finding any.

Some people always claim that French Canadians are not qualified to fill such and such a post. So, if it is specified in the bill, French Canadians will have to be found. That is why I ask that the bill be amended to provide that two French Canadians at least be made members of that company.

[*English*]

Mr. Byrne: Mr. Chairman, I think that we can depend on the good judgment of the people concerned with the appointment of the directors to endeavour to make what might be a more equitable distribution than two, if the names of such people are available to them. Since this is a Senate bill I am sure the committee would not wish to accept an amendment in this regard.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Caron: Mr. Chairman, would you allow me to move the following amendment:

[*English*]

That clause 7 be amended by adding after the word "Company" the phrase "at least two of whom should be French speaking Canadians."

• (4:40 p.m.)

Mr. Stewart: Mr. Chairman, it seems to me there are two difficulties in the substance of the proposed amendment. One of them is that if we adopted the amendment we would have to proceed to a definition of what is meant by "French speaking Canadians". This would present, I suggest, very serious problems.

The second difficulty is that it might very well be that the particular number mentioned by the hon. member for Hull as a minimum would be treated as a maximum. I think that any such definition in this clause would be highly improper.

Mr. Scott (Danforth): Mr. Chairman, has the Chair ruled on the admissibility of the amendment so that we may speak to it? I should like to give my support to this very reasonable proposition which the committee last year took under advisement and after a great deal of study and consideration agreed to report to the house as a recommendation. Unfortunately, through some machination the committee never reported, so the question

was not drawn to the attention of hon. members. However, I think it is important for us all to realize that the members of our own committee considered this matter and felt it was a very reasonable and proper thing to suggest to the house. Really we are giving effect by passing the amendment to the considered judgment of our colleagues who served so long and hard on the committee last year.

Mr. Byrne: Mr. Chairman, I am inclined to agree with my hon. friend that if we set down a minimum requirement for French speaking members to be represented on the Ottawa Terminal Railway Company, in effect we are also setting down what may be considered a maximum. We are going to get into a difficulty of determination. I myself hope to have property in Ottawa before too long as well as acquiring facility in the French language and becoming French speaking. However, I think this is circumscribing the clause to a degree which would hardly be acceptable.

Mr. Herridge: Mr. Chairman—

The Chairman: Order. Before any further comments are made regarding the motion, in view of the comments of the hon. member for Danforth the Chair would like to say that it considers the amendment before the committee to be in order.

Mr. Herridge: Mr. Chairman, I want briefly to congratulate the Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Transport on his intellectual and material ambitions. I rise briefly to support my colleague from Danforth, who usually faces these problems from the common-sense point of view. In view of his explanation of the recommendations of the committee I feel he is on sound ground. I also express my support for the hon. member for Hull, who strangely enough is rather different from most people one meets, particularly in public life. I find that the older the hon. member for Hull grows the more progressive he becomes, and I congratulate him in that connection. In view of the fact that the committee studied this question and recommended that not less than two of the directors be French speaking, I believe that this is a very reasonable proposal. As one of those who always stand up for what I term British fair play, I support the amendment.

Mr. McCleave: Mr. Chairman, may I ask the parliamentary secretary a question before he goes out and makes a down payment on either property or a French language course? Since this matter was raised in the committee, presumably the incorporators of the proposed company would have taken it into consideration. Has there been any guarantee by them or a statement of some sort that in fact French speaking Canadians will be appointed to the board of directors? It seems to me as simple as that. The other question raised by the parliamentary secretary as to what is a French speaking Canadian can be easily defined and I will define it in French: "Un homme qui parle français".

Mr. Byrne: I thank the hon. member for his definition. I now know I will never aspire to be French speaking. Since it seems to be the consensus of the committee that there is no fear on the part of members that this number may become a maximum and thereby discriminate against the French speaking members, I hope we can let this clause stand—

Some hon. Members: Oh, no.

Mr. Ricard: What a farce.

Mr. Byrne: —for further consideration and go on to the next clause, clause 8. Then we can return to this clause later. Otherwise we may get into a matter of amending an important clause to which hon. members of the other place have given very thorough consideration.

Mr. Ricard: What about the previous amendment?

[*Translation*]

Mr. Lambert: Mr. Chairman, I must say I agree with the principle and the reasons set forth by the hon. member for Hull (Mr. Caron). Nevertheless, I wonder if he made himself clear, because we could find here members who, though not of French origin, are able to speak French. That is all the amendment proposes: that they speak or understand French. That is not what was asked.

• (4:50 p.m.)

On the other hand, I would have thought that the government had learned its lesson last year and would show us that it had. I am afraid, however, that the amendment will set up a dangerous precedent and that what the hon. member is asking for and which seems to him reasonable, will become a fixed maximum. In my opinion, that is the danger of an amendment like this one.

However, I must support the principle of the amendment and I feel that in a city like Ottawa the directors of the C.N.R. and the C.P.R. could easily appoint two representatives of French descent. That would make it

possible to settle this little fight. As far as I am concerned, it is a detail, but frankly I wish the government could accept the principle of the amendment.

I hope we will not let such a matter bother us.

Mr. Caron: Mr. Chairman, the parliamentary secretary suggested that we should let clause 7 stand and consider clause 8. I submit that this is useless, because we studied it in full last year and the Senate studied it also this year, even if it did not propose the amendment.

We are ready to take a decision. I agree with the hon. member for Edmonton West (Mr. Lambert) that there might be some danger in going about it that way, but if we find English speaking people who speak French well enough to be appointed, to that company, I feel it would be a recognition given to bilingualism and I would be happy about it. That is why I maintain that we should keep that clause, that is adopt it immediately and not let it stand.

Mr. Ricard: Mr. Chairman, I would like to add a few words to support the remarks just made by the hon. member for Hull. To clarify the situation, I would propose to replace the words "two French Canadians" by the following "two Canadians of French descent"—

An hon. Member: "French speaking".

Mr. Ricard: "Two French speaking Canadians", and then it seems to me that there could not be any misunderstanding and we would give the government the opportunity not only to act, but to take such action as it says it has been wanting to take for some time.

I think that our friends opposite should support their colleague from Hull and exert some pressure so that this matter will be decided immediately, because two parliamentary secretaries have said things that are far from reassuring and lead us to believe that there is some objection to bilingualism recognized in this particular case.

Therefore, I ask our friends opposite, particularly those who come from the province of Quebec, to use their influence to help us get what was promised last year.

Mr. Gauthier: Mr. Chairman, I should like to say a few words in support of the hon. member for Hull (Mr. Caron). I feel he should accept the suggestion made by the member who spoke before me, namely that it should be stated that two directors be of French descent, for, after all, I admit that I am slightly surprised to hear members speak in that fashion.

The matter was discussed in committee and it was agreed that there should be two representatives of French descent; but now, today, we find there is absolutely nothing about it in this bill.

What about bilingualism and the government's fine promises? I am willing to believe is might be an oversight but from what the parliamentary secretary said a while ago, I think there are some deliberate oversights.

If we are to continue to work together, English speaking people must show some willingness as we do, and it must be established, once and for all, that bilingualism is not merely something to be written about in books, but that is it meant to be applied here in Parliament.

Mr. Chairman, let the word spread and let there be an end to such repeated and absolutely useless bickering as we now have. If everyone respected, agreements, such things as this would not have to be discussed today. It seems to me it should be natural for a bilingual Parliament as we understand it nowadays. In my opinion, long discussions should not be necessary to obtain the adoption of something which is imperative.

I therefore ask the parliamentary secretary to accept immediately and with unselfishness the proposals now being made.

Mr. Langlois (Chicoutimi): Mr. Chairman, I am quite ready to believe that the Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Transport (Mr. Byrne), speaks in good faith when he says that the clause is not as it appears in the bill, and that by tacit agreement, there will be two French speaking directors on the board.

The hon. member for Hull (Mr. Caron) has protested against such a thing. I understand very well the reasons behind his protests.

As far as Canadian railways are concerned, I feel that ever since the latter were set up by Canadian legislation, Canadians of French origin have never been much favoured on boards of directors.

If we have to count on the discretion of C.N.R. and C.P.R. officials, who will have to choose the directors of this new company, namely the Ottawa Terminal Railway Company, I think we should entertain some doubts, and I should like to second the amendment of the hon. member for Hull, making a certain reservation concerning the words "of

French origin". Perhaps we could stipulate "of French origin and French speaking".

Now, in reference to the remarks of the hon. member for Edmonton West, it is obvious that there are today in Canada some English speaking Canadians who speak a very good French, but unfortunately there are also in Canada people who were formerly speaking French and who can no longer use that language. So, if a Mr. Lambert for instance or a Mr. Langlois are appointed on this board of directors and if these people after having moved from Quebec to another Canadian province, lose their language, I do not think that the purpose of the amendment of the hon. member for Hull will be served. That is why the words "and French speaking" should be added after the words "of French origin".

[*English*]

Mr. Byrne: Mr. Chairman, the hon. member for Saint-Hyacinthe-Bagot has put words into my mouth which surely were not intended. I have not in any way suggested that we are not giving and are not prepared to give full consideration to French speaking members. I am sure that if I had taken the opportunity to learn the language perhaps we would not have this misunderstanding. Since the Minister of Transport is not with us today, and knowing that he has some very strong feelings about this matter in that it would perhaps circumscribe the intentions of this section, I would ask that we rise, report progress and beg leave to sit again.

The Chairman: Order, please. Shall I rise, report progress and request leave to sit again later today or at the next sitting of the house as the case may be?

Mr. Starr: No, no.

Mr. Byrne: I move that the committee do rise, report progress and request leave to sit again later this day or at the next sitting of the house as the case may be.

Motion (Mr. Byrne) negatived. Yeas, 30; nays 38.

• (5:00 p.m.)

Mr. McIlraith: I should like to speak to the amendment. The situation is rather interesting. The leader of the house asked that this clause be permitted to stand because both the Minister of Transport and the Acting Minister of Transport are absent from the house. The committee has seen fit to reject that request, so I have nothing more to say about it.

Mr. Bell (Carleton): Does the hon. gentleman realize that his colleague, the Associate Minister of National Defence, voted against the government?

Mr. McIlraith: That request having been made and rejected, I wish to point out that this is the same amendment that was offered last year. What hon. members have been talking about in their speeches is the desirability of having a bilingual person, or a French speaking Canadian, on the board of directors. This is something with which I believe everyone in the committee will agree. But what this amendment does is to introduce racism as practised in another country in a not too different form within the memory of a great many Canadians. Such a course has never been followed in legislation in Canada, and I would ask the committee to consider carefully the principle that is involved.

As to the desirability of appointing two bilingual or French speaking people, whatever the language of the amendment prescribes, with that I am in complete accord. But I am very reluctant to see the committee carelessly interject this requirement without realizing the nature of the course upon which it has started in the absence of the minister. When we come to another clause and the minister can be here, I suggest we give my colleague the opportunity to consider the point at issue before resubmitting it to the committee.

That is the point I wish to make. There may be other procedures which will take care of the suggestion that has been made. From the speeches which have been made it is clear what hon. members want done, but I feel certain none of them would, on consideration, wish to do it by amending the legislation before us now—

Mr. Starr: Don't you think the government was defeated on a motion of non-confidence?

[*Translation*]

Mr. Caron: Mr. Chairman, three points have been raised by the Minister of Public Works (Mr. McIlraith). First, that the minister and the acting minister are absent. But that is not very important. It is the government that put the resolution before the house and it is up to the house to decide whether or not to accept it. If the minister thought he would not be here, it was up to him to ask that the resolution stand until the day he could be here. I am not at all interested in what the minister did or did not do.

According to the Minister of Public Works, that is racism. I wonder if he checked the meaning of the word "racism"?

When we ask that at least two French speaking Canadians be members of the committee, they say we are setting a limit. I do not think we are limiting anything when we ask for something reasonable. When I say I am sceptical, it is because past experience has shown that I was right. That is why today I am insisting that we be guaranteed two French Canadians at least. Then, I would be sure of getting them. Otherwise, if things go on like that, we would not get anything and I want to have something.

[*English*]

Mr. Knowles: Mr. Chairman, I realize that at least two of my colleagues have already spoken in favour of the amendment, and if the recent vote on the motion to rise and report progress indicates the view of the majority of the members of this committee it is obvious that the amendment is regarded with favour by a good many members. However, I should like to urge considerable caution before approval is given to this amendment. I admit what everyone knows, that I am an English speaking Canadian. However, I have taken the first lesson in French. I can now say "Vous êtes Monsieur Thibault?" But that does not take us very far. That is from the first lesson for members of parliament.

An hon. Member: You are in the retarded class.

Mr. Knowles: Yes, I am in the retarded class. That is right. But I think it would be very dangerous to write into one statute, thereby establishing a precedent for writing into other statutes, that appointments are to be made on the basis of which group in Canada one belongs to, or on the basis of what language one speaks.

If we decide to do this in the case of the particular bill now before us, why should we not do the same in the legislation setting up the Supreme Court of Canada, for example, or the Board of Transport Commissioners or any other of the boards and commissions we set up? Are we to decide that membership on these bodies shall be determined on the basis of differences between one language group and another? And if it is to be decided on this basis, what is to be the numerical division? I am surprised that my French speaking friends in the house who are supporting this amendment are prepared to settle for two out of ten.

Mr. Vincent: That is a minimum.

Mr. Knowles: I know that is the wording. But that is all that would be guaranteed—two out of ten. I submit that this is hardly equality. Moreover, it is putting our attempt to achieve co-operation between the two main groups in this country upon an arithmetical or legalistic basis and I say frankly I think this would be a disservice to the effort being made to achieve co-operation between French speaking and English speaking Canadians.

• (5:10 p.m.)

I might also say that it flies in the face of the whole idea that people should be appointed to such bodies because of their merit and because of their capacity to do the job. If this amendment were passed it would mean that even though there might be people of much greater capacity in the other language they could not be appointed because this proviso has to be given first consideration. I know my hon. friends may not believe this, but in their own interest I ask French speaking members who are objecting to what I am saying, not to settle for a mathematical solution to this problem, not to settle for a least two out of ten and not to be hoodwinked by the idea that they have status if they have it on this legalistic basis.

I think the board should be appointed on the basis of merit and capacity and that we should have enough faith in the capacity and ability of people in both language speaking groups in this country that they will get on these bodies in proportion to their strength, their capacity and the number they have in this country. I think also we should have the faith to believe that we can build a country in which we can work together. I plead strongly, Mr. Chairman, that the proposed amendment is not the way to do it. I know this is only one piece of legislation setting up a body for the running of a station which in a few years might not be here any more, but the principle is serious and I urge members to exercise caution before they rush headlong into voting for the amendment.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Marchand: Mr. Chairman, if I did vote in favour of the motion to stand the clause, it is because were are indeed dealing with an amendment which could have far reaching implications. I should have liked to have time to discuss the matter with all my

colleagues who share my convictions and speak the same language as I do.

The first thing that strikes me and to which I should like to draw the hon. members' attention is that whenever you insert in some legislation or constitution a clause such as this to protect a certain group, it is because you are assuming from the start that this group is incapable of looking after its own protection and of defending itself by other means. In other words, a form of discrimination is thus created to which I am completely opposed.

I have always been against granting a special status to women in the constitutions of private associations. As a matter of fact, if it is decided that two women must fill two executive positions when there are ten vacancies, I feel that if ten women are qualified to fill those ten positions, all ten should be appointed. You are actually entering into a constitutional and legal field to grant this type of protection. In my opinion, that is not really the problem. It is not that I disagree with the deep convictions of my colleagues who voted for the amendment, because they might realize that under certain circumstances I would go even further than they.

Then, we are working against French Canadians and I think we should be strong enough to demand, through political action and pressure, the representation we are entitled to. Otherwise, it means that to be represented in Canada as we should be, a provision will have to be included in every piece of legislation to ensure that such a representation will be granted to us. Well, I do not accept it on that basis. It is not to the idea that I object, on the contrary, it is merely to the principle.

I think that if there is a tendency to create government bodies, as was done in the past, where Canadians, and especially French Canadians are not adequately represented, we must fight by resorting to the political means at our disposal instead of seeking a legal protection which, in my opinion, shows a certain weakness.

That is why I would have preferred to discuss the matter among ourselves in order to determine the bearing of the section, because it has very far-reaching effects. Now, legal technicalities will arise in individual cases. In fact, what is a French Canadian?

I have just hired one in my department. His name is Duclos and he does not speak one word of French whereas another, bearing an English name, speaks almost exclusively French. This will pose extremely difficult problems.

I feel our aim is to have French Canadians represented on all quasi-judicial bodies according to their capacity, and not by virtue of privilege, under a small legal provision, but under a basic right in all democratic societies where members are entitled to certain representation.

For this reason, I would have wished that this matter could be threshed out among ourselves to be very sure that an acceptable status is being inserted in a piece of legislation.

Mr. Grégoire: Mr. Chairman, I should like to put a question to the minister.

Is the minister in a position to say whether the directors of the Ottawa Terminal Railway Company have already been asked and that there is no French Canadian among them?

Mr. Marchand: Mr. Chairman, I am not aware of this, but if such is the case, I feel that those who are interested in having a better French Canadian representation should then fight and let that be known, as the hon. member for Lapointe (Mr. Grégoire) has already done before in memorable circumstances.

Mr. Grégoire: Mr. Chairman, if it is true that the directors have been asked and that no French Canadian is among them, would this not weaken the argument the minister presented a minute ago?

Mr. Marchand: No, Mr. Chairman, this would not weaken my argument, because if we let ourselves be browbeaten in this way, it means we are not strong enough to assert ourselves. I think that means should be found to achieve our ends apart from a piece of legislation.

Mr. Caron: I listened with great pleasure to the arguments presented by the Minister of Citizenship and Immigration (Mr. Marchand) but I noticed one thing. Being new here, he is not familiar with the frame of mind of the house. Indeed, we have been making requests for years and we should not have to come back on that all the time.

A while ago I heard the hon. member for Quebec East, Quebec South or Quebec North-South state that we are going to reduce the scope of the legislation, in other words, that we are not going to reduce anything at this time. We are told that the directors of

the Terminal Railway Company have been chosen and approached and that not one of them is a French Canadian.

If there is not a single one, I want at least two. I am not asking for three or four but for two at least. As French Canadians who do not form a majority but a minority, we have the right to defend ourselves with the means at our disposal. I demand the protection of the law. If the minister had been here a little longer, perhaps he would share our belief that we need protection in that fight we are going to wage in the house. It is that fight I am launching today to get the appointment of at least two French Canadians. If, because of an oversight, French Canadians were not approached, there should be a change of heart and they should be approached and asked to sit on the committee.

When it is suggested that perhaps French Canadians do not have the qualifications for this position, I say this is not true. There are French Canadians who are comparable in everything with English speaking Canadians.

When the province of Quebec nationalized the Quebec Hydro, all the engineers were English Canadians. They were replaced by French Canadians who built one of the greatest dams in the world. This was achieved by French Canadian engineers. We had engineers, but no one dared look at them.

That is the reason why today I ask all those who are English, who think differently, to try and open their minds to new developments and to say to themselves that, although this never existed in the past, times have changed. Today, we ask that these new developments be incorporated in the act and that we have the protection of at least two French speaking Canadians.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

[*English*]

Mr. Byrne: Mr. Chairman, I suppose it is not giving information to the hon. member for Hull to tell him that this does not include the Hull station. It is entirely in respect of the Ottawa terminal. I have been asked whether people have been approached to determine those who may wish to accept appointment as directors. This information I do not have. We did not anticipate that this matter would be raised this afternoon.

• (5:20 p.m.)

An hon. Member: You should have.

Mr. Byrne: However, the minister will be back on Monday or Tuesday and I am sure the house would wish to allow the Minister of Transport to give that information together with his views on the question of appointments to this corporation.

Earlier I asked for the co-operation of the house to allow clause 7 to stand for the time being and carry on with the remaining clauses in the bill, or if it is the desire of hon. members we could go on with other government business. I would hope that the committee will not see anything irregular in such a step.

Mr. Starr: Complete disorganization.

Mr. Byrne: I would hope that in all probability we could resolve this matter with much less discussion if the information requested were made available.

Mr. Starr: Mr. Chairman, a few moments ago we voted on a motion introduced by the Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Transport that this committee rise and report progress. I voted against it because I felt that we wanted to see the nation's business progress in this chamber. In view of what has transpired since the motion was made, it is evident there is a great division in the ranks of the government in respect of this bill. I think the best thing that can be done to expedite the business of the house is for the government to go back to its caucus and try to rectify the situation. They can then return when ready and we can get on with other business in the meantime.

The Chairman: There has been a request to allow clause 7 to stand. Does the committee give unanimous consent in this regard?

Some hon. Members: No.

The Chairman: Apparently unanimous consent has not been given.

Mr. Leboe: Mr. Chairman, I have been listening very carefully to the discussion and while I am very much in sympathy with the objective proposed by the hon. member for Hull I am very much impressed by the statements made by the hon. member for Winnipeg South Centre and the Minister of Citizenship and Immigration. I think that if we replace the amendment with a guarantee that there will be so many English speaking Canadians on the board the whole situation will appear in a different light. I am amazed at the degree to which some of our colleagues in this house are trying in this way, it seems to me, to admit something that if I were in

their position I would never admit. They are saying that they do not have full rights as Canadians.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Ricard: Mr. Chairman, it cannot be said that I make an abuse of being in agreement with the hon. member for Hull (Mr. Caron), but it seems to me that the reason why he objects to a deferment of the decision in this connection is that he thinks—and I believe he is right in his thinking—that if we do not come to an immediate settlement of this matter there is a good chance that we will not have on the board the number of directors to which we are entitled.

A few moments ago we heard the Minister of Public Works (Mr. McIlraith) tell us that there was a threat of racism in the amendment while his colleague the Minister of Citizenship and Immigration (Mr. Marchand) told us that there was discrimination in the case of French Canadians.

French Canadians are now discriminated against, for there is not a single French Canadian director on the board at this time.

I agree with my hon. friend, the hon. member for Hull, that this question should be settled immediately and that the necessary action should be taken to guarantee French Canadians at least two directors on the board. Two is not much, but it is a lot better than nothing at all. That is what I want to bring to the attention of the Minister of Citizenship and Immigration. We do not want only two directors, we want at least two. We could have more, but let us start with two at least.

I think the hon. member for Hull would be well advised to demand that this question be settled at once.

Let us stop saying that French Canadians will be given this or that and let us get things done, let us give them two representatives, even if we have to increase this number later on according to the needs.

Mr. Marchand: You stated that at present there were no French Canadians?

Mr. Ricard: It is the hon. member for Hull who said that.

Mr. Marchand: On a point of order. I never said that there was no discrimination in the case of French Canadians.

Mr. Lachance: Would the hon. member permit a question? He says "We". Can he tell us whether he speaks for all the hon. members of the opposition as well as for the members of the province of Quebec?

Mr. Ricard: As a French Canadian; I hope you will at least join us.

Mr. Lachance: I should like to know whether you speak for all the opposition members when you say: "We ask".

Mr. Ricard: Mr. Chairman, I do not think we should engage in hair-splitting.

[*English*]

Mr. Cameron (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands): Mr. Chairman, it may be true, as the hon. member for Hull has said, that the Minister of Citizenship and Immigration is new in this house, but I remind hon. members that the minister had a very distinguished career in another public sphere in respect of which no one could for one moment suggest that he was not very conscious of the rights and privileges of the people of French Canada.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Cameron (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands): In fact, it occurred to me this afternoon that the minister was the spokesman and the only spokesman I have heard from the French speaking ranks who spoke on behalf of the dignity and self-respect of the French speaking section of our country.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Cameron (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands): I am surprised to find that there are so many of my French speaking compatriots who have so low an opinion of the dignity of their racial origin that they are prepared to be fobbed off with this sort of an arrangement. There are countries where this procedure is followed which do not stand very high in the estimation of other people throughout the world. I have only to call your attention, sir, to the Republic of South Africa where a minority is fobbed off with one or two seats in the house of parliament and they are supposed to be satisfied with that situation.

I suggest to my French speaking friends that they should not be satisfied with such a proposal. If there are ten French speaking Canadians who are best suited for this job there should be ten French speaking Canadians on the board of directors. It is a shocking thing to me that French Canadian

people, with a proud record and proud ancestry, are prepared to pay so little heed to the respect of their own people.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Cadieux (Terrebonne): Mr. Chairman, to my mind, the member who has just resumed his seat, spoke unfortunate words. There was confusion at the outset with regard to the very subject of the amendment. The amendment does not ask that there be two French Canadians on the board of directors.

This amendment is not, therefore, of a racial nature. It asks that at least two directors speak French. They may be of other origins than French, but at least we recognize the principle of bilingualism in legislative measures and this, to me, is important.

If we do not err at the start, I think we can eventually manage to reach an understanding. I expect, Mr. Chairman, that if you were to read the amendment again, the hon. members would see what this is all about.

[*English*]

May I ask that the amendment be read, please?

Mr. Cameron (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands): Would the minister permit a question? Did the minister not hear the French speaking member refer continually in his speech to French Canadians?

[*Translation*]

Mr. Cadieux (Terrebonne): I heard, indeed; only, I am limiting myself to the terms of the amendment for that is what will be incorporated into the act, and the amendment we are discussing is intended to confirm the question of bilingualism.

The amendment asks—let us stick to the amendment—that two members be appointed who speak French. I do not think that under those circumstances we are dealing with a racial matter. We are merely confirming bilingualism in Canada. If you confirm it through law, as experience has already proved, we will achieve that goal.

Mr. Marchand: With regard to the amendment, it differs from what the Associate Minister of National Defence (Mr. Cadieux) says; it is not what I have heard personally.

• (5:30 p.m.)

[*English*]

The Chairman: Order. The amendment moved by the hon. member for Hull reads as follows:

That clause 7 be amended by adding after the word "Company" the phrase "at least two of whom should be French speaking Canadians."

[Mr. Cameron (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands).]

[*Translation*]

Mr. Chrétien: Mr. Chairman, after hearing you read the amendment, I entirely agree with the Associate Minister of Defence (Mr. Cadieux). We do not want the matter to develop into a racial issue, at all, but it is time perhaps to give a concrete example in order that bilinguism be recognized in our statutes.

It is possible that the persons appointed to this board of directors will not be French Canadians, but French speaking, and on that basis, I am willing to vote for the amendment.

Mr. Goyer: Mr. Chairman, I am afraid that under the pretext of non-discrimination, discrimination will be sanctioned instead in a statute.

If I understand correctly, Canada is rapidly evolving at present toward the recognition of two majority groups, toward a bilingual, an entirely bilingual, country.

It is to place ourselves in an inferior position to suggest, by passing this amendment, that only two persons will have to be French speaking out of five, seven or ten—

Some hon. Members: At least two.

Mr. Caron: At least two.

Mr. Goyer: It is to admit that five, seven or eight persons out of ten could be unilingual.

I feel then that we should provide instead that all of them should be bilingual, and tend toward this policy.

I think this is exactly the opposite of the suggestion made by the hon. member for Carleton (Mr. Bell) the other day, when he said that the fact of being bilingual does not add anything to a person's competence, because it could simply happen by accident.

In my opinion, to insert this amendment in a statute is to go in the opposite direction and we suggest by the same token that it must imposed to a minority group in our country, when we know that it is the minority which is bilingual. And when it is wished to make the country completely bilingual, especially the higher officials.

Mr. Grégoire: Mr. Chairman, I listened to the Minister of Citizenship and Immigration (Mr. Marchand), and his statements on the specific and current question seem rather strange.

I think that the Minister, being a newcomer to the house, may not be aware of all the complexities surrounding the institution of this Ottawa Terminal Railway company.

This bill was before the transport committee last year, Mr. Chairman, and questions were put to the Minister of Transport (Mr. Pickersgill) and to the parliamentary secretary who represented him. At the time, I think it was the hon. member for Quebec South (Mr. Cantin) who was parliamentary secretary to the Minister of Transport.

He was asked whether the directors of the company had been approached. The present parliamentary secretary to the Minister of Transport (Mr. Byrne) does not know but last year it was confirmed in the parliamentary committee on transport that the directors of this company who were to be appointed had been approached by the Minister and that none of them spoke French. Such was the answer we had at the time.

That is why last year, when the bill came before the committee, an amendment was moved that at least two of the directors should be French speaking. Why? Because the parliamentary secretary admitted before the committee that no one speaking French was among those appointed.

In other words, we were in precisely the same situation as that described by the Minister of Citizenship and Immigration.

When it becomes obvious that there are no French Canadian directors, then we will resort to other means including the law. Well, that is what came out last year, that the future directors had been approached and that not one of them was French speaking.

When, last year, by a vote of 14 to 11—if my memory serves me right—the committee felt that it was appropriate to amend the bill so that at least two directors would be French speaking, that was for the specific case of the company which was to administer the railway station here, in Ottawa. It was precisely for that purpose because the facts had shown that there was not a single French speaking director.

In view of the facts, and since the directors have been approached and not one of them is French speaking, there is only one thing left for us to do as legislators and that is to use the law to force the minister's hand. If he acted too quickly in his search for directors for his company, he only has to retreat, to change his mind and to take steps to have at least two French speaking persons appointed.

As things stand now, there is only one recourse open to us and that is to impose them under the law. I do not contend that such an amendment must be introduced in all cases. I am saying no such thing but that is what should be done in this specific case. Last year, in the committee, we were told that all the directors had been approached and that not one of them was French speaking, but the committee decided to suggest an amendment. This year, the government comes back with the same bill but without the amendment.

What are they trying to hide? Have promises been made to certain individuals who have served the party well? What is it? Are friends involved? I know that is not the point. I should like to know why the Minister of Transport is proposing the same bill for the second year, but after having taken off an amendment which was inserted last year by transport committee.

I remember quite well that the one—I think it was Douglas Fisher, the former member for—

Mr. Vincent: For Port Arthur.

Mr. Grégoire: —for Port Arthur—who had moved or seconded the amendment. The hon. member for York-Humber (Mr. Cowan) had seconded the amendment along with Mr. Fisher, who was the member for Port Arthur at the time. English speaking members had voted for the amendment. Only one voted against, and he was a French Canadian, that is the former Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Transport, the hon. member for Quebec South.

Now, the minister is coming back with the same bill, but he has deleted the amendment. Under the present circumstances, Mr. Chairman, I think that the Minister of Citizenship and Immigration must review his position and understand that we are not dealing with a general case but with a specific case, where they want to force directors upon us, even before the company is formed and before the bill is passed. So I think that the Minister of Citizenship and Immigration must review his position and change his attitude now that he is acquainted with the facts.

• (5:40 p.m.)

Mr. Marchand: Mr. Chairman, there are only two points I wish to discuss. There is surely some confusion in the minds of those who took part in the debate and maybe even in the mind of the man who is now speaking. The amendment is not only about language but about French speaking Canadians. It means that an English Canadian who speaks French perfectly would not be covered, could not be considered as someone who answers the legal provision which we want to amend.

Therefore, in any case, I think that, since we want to protect bilingualism, if the amendment said that there must be on the committee or commission two people who can understand and speak French fluently, that is in accordance with the spirit of bilingualism.

But if we talk about French speaking Canadians, there is here a connotation which concerns the French Canadians as an ethnic group. It is a way of designating the French Canadians. That is where I disagree. I do not accept that the ethnic group to which I belong should need a legal text to protect itself. I am just saying to the hon. member for Lapointe (Mr. Grégoire) and to the house, and even to the public, that if tomorrow the commission concerned is created and if the biethnic character of Canada is not taken into account, I will join him to make representations. We will fight together about the same thing, irrespective of party discipline. That matter means a lot to me.

However, I do not think that we should fight in the name of the act. Besides, the hon. member for Lapointe should be the last one to want to hang on to means which, in my opinion, are used by groups which recognize their inferiority at the outset.

He knows himself that when he brought up the question of the C.N.R., his intervention was much stronger than if he had only called upon the act. He knows it very well and that is what we must do and not try to say: We need to be protected in a special way in legislation just as it is done in some associations to protect women.

That is what I wanted to say and my remarks must not be misunderstood. I know that, politically, I am on dangerous ground —but it is not the first time—and that what I said can be misinterpreted. As far as the goal is concerned, I am completely in agreement. I am just saying that I do not accept, in principle, a means like the one suggested and I will gladly do some picketing with the hon. member for Hull (Mr. Caron) and the hon. member for Lapointe if ever the representation is not made on a fair basis.

Mr. Prud'homme: Mr. Chairman, I think we are now getting into a debate which was obviously not anticipated and which might take a disasterous turn.

There are a lot of questions to which we must answer before we can write into the act the amendment moved by the hon. member for Hull (Mr. Caron).

[Mr. Marchand.]

I, for one, always wondered—this may seem somewhat original—but I always asked myself the question, and I was even waiting for the report of the Royal Commission on bilingualism and biculturalism for enlightenment on this matter, what is a French speaking Canadian? Does your name have to be Grégoire, Latrémouille or Tremblay to be a French speaking Canadian? Could a man, by the name of Haidasz, for example, not say: I belong, if I want to, to the French speaking ethnic group? That is what I wonder. I say that we are embarking in a very unfortunate way, upon a debate which could well turn into a parody of bilingualism and biculturalism in Canada.

I say that it is unprepared that we are launching into this unlooked for debate. These thoughts may seem odd, too many fundamentals are at stake and I, for one—I see the hon. member for York-Humber (Mr. Cowan), who seems to take great interest in this debate—

[*English*]

Mr. Cowan: No sir—reading every word.

Mr. Prud'homme: Just to make sure you understand, I mentioned that the hon. member for York-Humber, who seems to be following the discussion very closely, might help to define for me what is an English speaking Canadian and what is a French speaking Canadian.

[*Translation*]

And I say, and I repeat—and I hope I speak slowly enough for the hon. member for York-Humber to understand me—before we ask for something like that in a small section of a small act, in connection with a federal board, here in the national capital—I agree with the hon. member for Lapointe that it is essential, but an amendment could be brought forward to require that all members of the board be bilingual. I see the hon. member for Carleton (Mr. Bell) and the hon. member for Winnipeg South Centre (Mr. Churchill), who seem to find this debate very funny—I said very funny—

[*English*]

Mr. Churchill: Leave the personalities out of it.

Mr. Prud'homme: To make sure my hon. friend understands exactly what I am saying, to make sure I am translated accurately, what I just said was that I have never engaged in personalities.

Mr. Churchill: I rise on a point of order, Mr. Chairman. We were not laughing at the hon. member's remarks. We were laughing at the discomforture of the government which cannot straighten out problems among its own members.

The Chairman: Order. There is no point of order.

Mr. Churchill: Well then, my point of order deals with personalities which the hon. member is raising. My name need not be brought into this debate at all.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Prud'homme: I shall continue in French. I think it would be better if we were to show a little more serenity in this debate. I never implicated the former minister or the two previous ministers in this debate. All I said was that, in my opinion, in a discussion as serious as this one—

[*English*]

In English it means, seems to involve very much discussion. I do not know what the hon. member for Nicolet-Yamaska and the hon. member for Carleton said about this, but that is all. There were no personalities. Since I arrived here I have not engaged in personal remarks and I do not intend to, even with regard to the hon. member for Winnipeg South Centre.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Chairman, I wonder if the hon. member for Hull could not tell us if, with the political climate being what it is now and with the government that has been running the country since 1963, we are not feeling more and more at home here in this house, which was not the case for instance in 1955, 1957, 1958, 1960 or 1962? If we Canadians of French expression—as I prefer to put it—

[*English*]

Mr. Ricard: Order.

Mr. Prud'homme: For the information of the hon. member for Saint Hyacinthe-Bagot—

[*Translation*]

—the hon. member for Saint-Hyacinthe-Bagot (Mr. Ricard)—I was a student from 1953 to 1962, I watched him from the galleries of the house. I was here for the pipeline debate and I saw what happened. I was a student at the University of Ottawa and I probably spent more time here than most members opposite who are trying to interrupt me, including the hon. member for Saint-Hyacinthe-Bagot.

Mr. Ricard: Would it be possible, Mr. Chairman, to call the hon. member for Saint-Denis (Mr. Prud'homme) to order? That is all I am asking. He is telling us about the pipeline debate and all kinds of things which have nothing to do with the matter under consideration.

Mr. Prud'homme: I listened with pleasure to the remarks made by the hon. member for Saint-Hyacinthe-Bagot, but I must say that he and his comments are partly responsible for my taking part in this debate.

Mr. Ricard: I asked the Chair to call the hon. member to order.

An hon. Member: Agreed.

Mr. Prud'homme: I am asking the hon. member for Hull if it is essential and necessary to include articles in a small piece of legislation, perhaps not entirely without thinking about it because the hon. member for Hull did think about it for a long time, but without more preparation and without getting all the necessary explanations. In my opinion, it is important to hear all the explanations; otherwise, how far would we go?

Mr. Vincent: Is the hon. member for Saint-Denis saying that the hon. member for Hull, who knows his party as well as he does, is not entitled to ask for what he wants today?

Mr. Grégoire: That is not fair.

Mr. Caron: I have tried since the beginning to keep this matter out of politics. I talked about it as a matter of right for the French Canadians but not as a matter of general interest for the parties: Liberal, Conservative and others.

I heard the Minister of Citizenship and Immigration (Mr. Marchand) tell us a little earlier that if we are not given any, he will join the hon. member for Lapointe to fight.

Mr. Grégoire: They have been appointed.

Mr. Caron: That is why I want to see it in the legislation. If the minister has made a mistake in appointing them without consulting us, let him change the names of those he appointed. Tomorrow it will be too late.

So, in answer to the hon. member for Saint-Denis, who has just spoken, I say that a French speaking Canadian is a Canadian who speaks French correctly. He spoke about members with various levels. I accept this

because he speaks impeccable French and I am pleased to hear him. If you want to limit yourself to two, you will not have two. If the spirit in this house is broad enough to give us four or five, there is no need for it to be provided in the act. The only reason why we insist that it be written in the act is to be sure. Otherwise, we will never have any. I am not more confident at this time than I was a year ago. I have been hearing about this for two years. I moved an amendment last year. The committee voted on it.

The minister did not deem it advisable to agree with my amendment. He certainly has something on his mind. I insist that the matter be settled today, as to whether we should agree to one, two or more French speaking Canadians being appointed.

• (5:50 p.m.)

Mr. Gray: Mr. Chairman, I have a suggestion which could bring together the two ideas put before us today. I have much sympathy with the point of view of the hon. member for Hull. I sympathize with and support the Minister of Citizenship and Immigration. It is something which I suggest is not too difficult to solve. I did not have time to draft an exact amendment, but I suggest to this honourable house that we have here, and we already have examples before us, acts that can be used as examples to solve this problem.

For instance, I have here the Industrial Relations and Disputes Investigations Act. Section 58 deals with the establishment of the labour relations board:

[*English*]

It speaks of having members representative of employees and employers.

[*Translation*]

And also in the act on the Economic Council of Canada —I do not have it before me—it seems to me the act clearly indicates that the government must appoint as members of the Council one representative of labour and one of business. I have not yet had the time to write out an amendment. But it seems to me there is a pressing need for an amendment which would force shareholders to recognize the necessity of appointing as members of their company's board of directors people who speak the two official languages of our country.

That is why I ask the hon. member that this article be allowed to stand. That would allow me, and the members of the government, to speak to the hon. member for Hull with a view to writing out an appropriate amendment, which would take into account the idea I have just expressed and might possibly bring into harmony the two points of view.

[Mr. Caron.]

Mr. Grégoire: Mr. Chairman, I have a question. A little while ago the Minister of Citizenship and Immigration told me if there were not at least two French speaking members in the group, he would fight with me. Here is my question. Further to Question No. 910 the member for Villeneuve put on the order paper, which asks how many civil servants are bilingual in each of the departments, agencies and Crown corporations, is the Minister willing to visit with me the bound of directors of all Crown companies where there are no French Canadians?

Mr. Vincent: 12.6 per cent.

Mr. Grégoire: Let us say 15 per cent. Is the Minister willing to come with me before all those boards of directors?

An hon. Member: Let us start tomorrow morning.

[*English*]

Mr. McIlraith: Mr. Chairman, the motion put a few minutes ago was that the committee rise, report progress and ask leave to sit again. For some reason the committee seems determined to deal with this bill in the absence of the minister and the acting minister.

In view of the discussion since the motion was moved, I wonder whether the committee would be disposed to let this clause stand. If there is a disposition to do this, I would be prepared to make a motion that the committee let this clause stand and proceed to the next clause.

Mr. Starr: Mr. Chairman, in the interests of the progress of the house we would be agreeable to let this clause stand and proceed with the other business.

Mr. Churchill: This is called "bailing out the government".

Mr. Langlois (Mégantic): Mr. Chairman, if the minister intends to let the clause stand in order to discuss it further or amend it I am willing to wait for a change to be made, but I think we should have a debate first so that the minister can come back to the committee with an acceptable clause.

Mr. Starr: In answer to that, Mr. Chairman, the main thing is to let the Liberals hold a caucus and decide how to proceed.

Mr. Langlois (Mégantic): I am willing to let the Liberals hold their caucus but it would be a good thing to have a few opinions first.

Mr. Byrne: Mr. Chairman, on a point of order, it has been suggested that the committee allow clause 7 to stand and that we proceed with the other clauses in order to allow the Minister of Transport to consider whether an amendment is appropriate. At seven o'clock we could then proceed with clause 8, letting clause 7 stand.

The Chairman: Does the committee give unanimous consent to allow clause 7 to stand?

Mr. Langlois (Mégantic): No.

The Chairman: There is not unanimous consent.

Mr. McIlraith: Mr. Chairman, I did not request unanimous consent; I proposed a motion.

Mr. Langlois (Mégantic): May I call it six o'clock?

Mr. Knowles: Mr. Chairman, before you call it six o'clock, I would ask the house leader to seriously consider whether he would not think this might be a good day to have a two hour supper break. I think the house would agree to that.

Mr. McIlraith: Yes, Mr. Chairman. I think in view of the date on the calendar and the fact that it is apparent no business will be done now, and due to the rather unparallelled attitude taken by the committee to my request that an important matter like this be permitted to wait till the responsible minister is here to deal with it, it would appear to be a very good suggestion. May I add the personal hope that, in view of the date, each hon. member will enjoy his dinner very much.

The Chairman: Order. If there is any disposition on the part of the committee to suspend the next two hours of sitting, that will have to be decided with Mr. Speaker in the chair.

Mr. Knowles: Does it, Mr. Chairman? Since we come back at eight o'clock still in committee, could Your Honour not leave the chair at six o'clock by agreement of the committee? That is the way we used to do it.

• (6:00 p.m.)

The Chairman: Order, please. It being six o'clock, in order to permit the house to proceed with the consideration of private members' business it is my duty now to leave the chair.

Progress reported.

PROCEEDINGS ON ADJOURNMENT MOTION

SUBJECT MATTER OF QUESTIONS TO BE DEBATED UNDER ADJOURNMENT MOTION

Mr. Deputy Speaker: It is my duty, pursuant to provisional standing order 39A, to inform the house that the questions to be raised at the time of adjournment tonight are as follows: The hon. member for Greenwood (Mr. Brewin), Immigration—inquiry as to statement on Sedgwick report; the hon. member for Queens (Mr. Macquarrie), Labour Conditions—Atlantic region—steps to improve unemployment situation.

Hon. G. J. McIlraith (Minister of Public Works): Mr. Speaker, I move that the house suspend its sitting until eight o'clock this evening.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Is it the pleasure of the house to adopt the said motion?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Carried, with the understanding that at eight o'clock we continue with government business.

Motion agreed to and sitting suspended.

SITTING RESUMED

The house resumed at 8 p.m.

OTTAWA TERMINAL RAILWAY COMPANY

The house resumed consideration in committee of Bill No. S-2, to incorporate the Ottawa Terminal Railway Company—Mr. Hellyer (for Mr. Pickersgill)—Mr. Batten in the chair.

The Chairman: When the committee rose at six o'clock, clause 7 was being discussed.

Mr. McNulty: I move, seconded by the hon. member for Halton (Mr. Harley):

That the amendment be amended by inserting the word "and" before the words "at least" and by substituting the word "shall" for the word "should".

The word "shall" is more imperative than the word "should".

The Chairman: During the discussion of clause 7 the hon. member for Hull moved that the clause be amended by adding after the word "company" the phrase "at least two

of whom should be French speaking Canadians". The amendment as further amended by the hon. member for Lincoln proposes that the amendment be amended by inserting the word "and" before the words "at least" and by substituting the word "shall" for the word "should". The amendment as amended will now read—"and at least two of whom shall be French speaking Canadians".

Mr. McIlraith: I regret that earlier in the afternoon before I rose to speak I had not been able to obtain a copy of the amendment. It was only after the committee rose at six o'clock that I was able to see the amendment. The difficulty we now face is evident from a careful reading of the amendment, because the amendment as worded has no effect whatever other than to express a wish of the committee. The amendment provides no requirement that the railway company or the shareholders of the company should do anything. I am sure the discussion this afternoon proceeded on the basis that the amendment would achieve some definite result.

In any event, as I mentioned this afternoon, the minister and the acting minister are away. The government regards this matter as an important one and I believe it would be in the interest of the committee to give the government an opportunity to draft a satisfactory amendment which could be circulated and which would achieve the desired objective. It is the wish of the government that the composition of the board of directors should be such that it would reflect the bilingual character of the citizens of this country, bearing in mind the local aspect, since this is an Ottawa railway station, the bilingual character of the national capital. It is a question of doing this in a correct way—in a method which will not defeat its own purpose and which will not constitute a dangerous precedent. With this in mind I again appeal to members of the committee that they should permit the committee to rise and report progress.

I therefore move, seconded by my colleague the Minister of National Defence that the committee rise, report progress and ask leave to sit again at the next sitting of the house.

Mr. Starr: This motion is, of course, not debatable, but we are prepared to support it provided we are assured that the cabinet has solidarity in the fight that is to come.

Mr. McIlraith: You will be surprised.

[The Chairman.]

Mr. Grafftey: You are going to save national unity.

Progress reported.

NORTHWEST TERRITORIES ACT

AMENDMENTS RESPECTING ELECTED MEMBERS, INDEMNITY, ETC.

Hon. Arthur Laing (Minister of Northern Affairs and National Resources) moved that the house go into committee to consider the following resolution:

That it is expedient to introduce a measure to amend the Northwest Territories Act to increase the number of elected members of the council from four to seven; to increase to five thousand dollars per annum the maximum indemnity payable to elected members; to provide for the payment of a maximum indemnity of three thousand five hundred dollars per annum to appointed members; to provide also for the payment of reasonable travelling and living expenses incurred by members in going to and returning from sessions of the council; to provide that the first one thousand dollars of the indemnity paid to a member be not subject to income tax; to establish a separate consolidated revenue fund for the territories and for the administration thereof; to provide also for the keeping of territorial accounts, for the examination of these accounts by the Auditor General; and to provide further for certain changes in the administration of the act.

Motion agreed to and the house went into committee, Mr. Batten in the chair.

• (8:10 p.m.)

Mr. Laing: Mr. Chairman, I shall be very brief; but I shall be less brief if my hon. friend interferes with what I have to say.

Mr. Grafftey: I have never known you to be brief, but try to be tonight.

Mr. Laing: The proposal is to introduce legislation to allow the act—

The Chairman: Order. There is a little more noise than usual in the chamber. It is difficult to hear what the minister is saying.

Mr. Laing: There will be legislation introduced to amend the act respecting the Northwest Territories to provide for an increase in the number of elected representatives to the Territorial Council. For some years now this matter has been brought up, largely by hon. members on the other side of the house who have pointed out that in the high Arctic islands and on the eastern side of the Arctic area there has not been afforded to the people of those areas the opportunity to vote in elections in respect of the Territorial Council. Indeed that has been the case.

These people have had the opportunity of voting in a national election; in other words,

they have had a national franchise, but were not given the franchise in respect of elections to the Territorial Council. I think this was a reflection of the development of the territories themselves, in that most of the people resided, and most of the development took place, in the Mackenzie area of the Northwest Territories. We thought it imperative that at the earliest possible moment we should extend the franchise to those people living in the high Arctic islands and on the eastern side. Indeed, the Territorial Council already has passed legislation to provide for the additional constituencies implicit in this legislation. This will give them seven elected representatives, while we propose to retain five appointed representatives here. This will have the effect of giving the majority of Council membership to the people for election in the territories.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to assure the house it is obvious that, with the somewhat slow but nevertheless increasing population and the investment of moneys in the Northwest Territories, there is coming to the people who reside there permanently a degree of confidence in themselves, and we, I am quite certain, can reflect this confidence from here by transferring to them an increasing amount of responsibility over their own affairs.

We also propose to increase the payment given to the members of the Council. These men have constituencies to service which, judged by the standard of any members sitting in this House of Commons, are many times greater. We feel they are entitled to some reasonable compensation. Thus far they have been paid $2,000 maximum per year, and a small expense account for travelling for the ten days—and there is a limit of ten days—in respect of the sessions they hold. We think that, if they are to service their constituents, they should have a reasonable compensation.

There will be one or two amendments introduced which will have the effect of transferring a greater amount of responsibility to the Territorial Council from the government here. We propose, as we have said, in the future to give them an opportunity to have more what we have termed government on the ground. If that area is going to progress, its future will be largely in the hands of those people who permanently reside there.

This is a general summation of the legislation, and I would be very interested in having comments, although they might be short, from other members of the house.

The Chairman: The hon. member for Brandon-Souris.

Mr. Grégoire: Mr. Chairman, may I ask a question?

The Chairman: The hon. member for Lapointe on a question.

Mr. Grégoire: Is the new bill which the minister proposes to bring before the house about the same as the bill we had before us two years ago.

Mr. Laing: Mr. Chairman, it bears no relation whatsoever to the bills which were introduced. They contained a proposal to divide the Northwest Territories into two parts, which was a proposal initiated by the previous administration. It was to divide the Territories between the Mackenzie and the rest of the Territories. This has no relation to that whatsoever.

Mr. Dinsdale: Mr. Chairman, I shall follow the good example of the Minister of Northern Affairs and National Resources and be equally brief. Normally the hon. member for the Yukon would have been making the comments for the members on this side of the house, but he is unavoidably absent. As we proceed toward legislation which will arise from this resolution there will be plenty of opportunity for further comments by the hon. member for the Yukon as well as by other members on this side of the house.

As a former minister of northern affairs, it is needless for me to say that we wholeheartedly support the purpose of this resolution. It was in 1962 that the residents of the eastern Arctic, as the minister has already indicated, received the federal franchise. It had been anticipated at that time that the franchise would be extended in rapid succession to the territorial area of responsibility. Unfortunately it has required some four years to proceed to this logical and necessary development.

Therefore, as I have indicated, we will give this measure every conceivable support and the minister can be assured there will be no impediment whatsoever thrown in the way of proceeding with this resolution. I think all hon. members of the house, as well as the people of Canada generally, are aware that the progress north of the 60th parallel has

been such in recent years that the time has come when we must proceed to give more and more autonomy to the people in this important part of Canada.

I notice, and it is logical of course, that there will be an increase in the elected members of the Territorial Council to cover the rather extensive geographic area which will be brought under the terms of reference of this legislation. I believe the time has come when we might consider giving the Northwest Territories a completely elected council. The principle of part elected and part appointed was introduced to assist the residents of the Territories in their progress toward gradual provincial status during the development period.

It seems to me, from frequent contacts and continuing contacts with the residents of the Territories, and in view of the economic development—which has been noted in this house in the past months, such as the development of new communities, and the opening up of the Great Slave Lake area as a result of the construction of the Pine Point Railway—that this part of Canada is achieving not only economic maturity but also is rapidly reaching out to political maturity.

• (8:20 p.m.)

I would hope at some stage in the discussion in these matters, perhaps when the legislation is before the house, there will be an opportunity to consider some of these wider approaches to the problem, such as greater autonomy in the Northwest Territories. I am sure the people themselves feel that they are now able to assume complete responsibility for administering their own affairs and guiding their own destiny in terms of future development. If a committee has the opportunity of discussing this matter perhaps we will be able to meet with some representations from the Northwest Territories.

Mr. Chairman, that is all we wish to say at this stage but we will have more to say when the legislation is before us.

Mr. Herridge: Mr. Chairman, the members of this party support the spirit and purpose of this legislation, as I am sure all hon. members of this house do. This resolution simply provides for a further development of democracy in the government of the Northwest Territories.

Over a period of 20 years, since first coming to this house, I have on numerous occasions been on committees which dealt with questions relating to the Northwest Territories. It is very interesting to note, as the hon. member for Brandon-Souris pointed out, the changing circumstances and growing economic developments, particularly since the development of the Pine Point Railway and the mining interests connected with it, that have taken place in the Northwest Territories.

Accompanying those developments there is a natural increase in the demand for self-government, and this, as I said before, is a step in the right direction. As a result of the time I have had to listen to discussions during the consideration of the estimates of this department by various committees I think it is fair to say there have been some excellent persons appointed to the governing body of this area. However, on other occasions there have been appointments of individuals with dictatorial tendencies, such as the one brought to our attention in 1953. I am glad to say that we have made some progress since then.

I personally want to congratulate the minister for his administration of this department and for his understanding of the growing need for self-government in the Northwest Territories and other regions over which he has control. I do not intend to say anything further at this time, as we will have the opportunity to speak at further length when the bill is introduced.

I am very pleased to note this development, because while in the past 15 or 20 years circumstances were such that at times one might have questioned the attitude of some of the appointed individuals, others have been excellent and accepted their responsibilities in the spirit in which they were conferred upon them by this parliament.

Mr. Kindt: Mr. Chairman, may I ask the minister a question for the sake of brevity, because I do not wish to extend my participation in this debate. Will he indicate what will happen to the Eskimos in the Chimo Bay area? Will they be included in the Northwest Territories as far as representation is concerned, which is their desire?

Mr. Laing: Mr. Chairman, I do not think I understand the meaning of the question.

Mr. Kindt: Will the Eskimos in the Chimo Bay area in northern Quebec be included in the eastern Arctic region so far as representation is concerned? I refer particularly to the Fort Chimo area.

Mr. Laing: This legislation refers only to the Northwest Territories, and the Ungava area is part of the province of Quebec. Our interest in the Ungava or Nouveau Quebec area relates to the presence of Eskimos, and Eskimos are our constitutional responsibility. We have discharged that responsibility within a province; but this legislation refers only to the Northwest Territories.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Grégoire: Mr. Chairman, I have a few words to say about this resolution. I know that the Minister of Northern Affairs and National Resources (Mr. Laing) is aware of the problem I shall mention. I have referred to it many times in the house. It is an important problem to be solved.

Mr. Chairman, the government is about to increase the number of members of the Northwest Territories Council and to extend their responsibilities and jurisdiction. This is the first step towards the creation of another Canadian province, the Northwest Territories. The same will apply to Yukon and this is where I object. This raises a problem that should be solved without delay.

The Northwest Territories also comprise a whole series of islands around the province of Quebec, situated less than 12 miles from the shore line at low tide. A whole series of uninhabited islands. Being less than 12 miles from the Quebec coast, they are at the same time hundreds of miles away from the rest of the Northwest Territories. The day the Northwest Territories becomes a province, these islands will be 300 or 400 miles from the rest of the Northwest Territories while almost within the territory of the province of Quebec.

At the present time, they are considered as part of the Northwest Territories and seem practically linked to Quebec by land, in spite of which they are included in the Northwest Territories.

Well, I suggest that those islands will create a grave problem for Canada before long, especially when the Northwest Territories are divided into provinces, as this is bound to happen sooner or later.

So we have a problem there. It is geographically abnormal and illogical to include in the Territories islands that are practically tied together but located three or four hundred miles away and this is paving the way for a dispute between two provinces, the province of the Northwest Territories and the province of Quebec. The Canadian government will be the one to be hit on the rebound.

Now is the time—and I am saying this to the minister—while all those islands are uninhabited, when there is no trade, no industry, nothing there, to hand them over to Quebec, as all geographers and map makers in Canada have recommended.

Indeed, they have recommended that all islands which at low tide are located within those twelve miles be included in the territory of the province of Quebec. You will also note that those islands are uninhabited at present. Today, that could be done quite easily. If the minister remembers—I think that at the time his parliamentary secretary was the Minister without Portfolio, the hon. member for St. Lawrence-St. George (Mr. Turner), who answered questions on behalf of the minister at the committee meetings—to the representatives of the Northwest Territories who, for two or three years, came before that committee to look after the interests of the Northwest population before the committee—I think it was the committee on mines, forests and waters—I asked the following question:

Would you object to the federal government taking over all the islands within twelve miles at low tide around the province of Quebec and giving them to the province of Quebec? No one objected to it. On the contrary, they were unanimous to say: "We do not need them; they are situated at many hundreds of miles from the rest of the territory and if ever the administration were forced to look after those islands, that would be very complicated for the rest of the Northwest Territories."

The people of the Northwest Territories themselves would be quite willing to get rid of these islands by giving them to the province of Quebec.

Well, Mr. Chairman, when these islands are uninhabited, when the representatives of the Northwest Territories are willing to leave all those islands to the province of Quebec, when all this could be done without anyone objecting, I submit the minister should decide to hand over these islands to the province of Quebec.

He just has to consult geographers and map-makers and he will realize that at the present time, this is an abnormal and illogical situation from a geographical viewpoint. It is absolutely abnormal. All the shores at low tide supposedly belong to the Northwest Territories. However, if a citizen of the province of Quebec decided to build a cottage along the shores of the Hudson Bay, and to

add a wharf, well, just because the wharf would come in the water at low tide, this would be under federal jurisdiction. The shores come under the federal government, although such is not the case for other shores on inland waters.

Well, Mr. Chairman, I think the minister should decide that those islands belong to Quebec and the time has come to do so.

I urge the minister to take the opportunity of this legislation and include in the bill a clause stipulating that all the islands situated within twelve miles from the shore at low tide be given to Quebec.

I think all hon. members should support such a resolution. This would be a proof of wisdom and foresight. In fact, this would prevent conflicts which this situation might stir up later. I urge the minister to take this into consideration. The minister knows that I have been raising this problem in the House for two or three years. I think that since then, he must have looked into it and should be in a position to offer a solution.

• (8:30 p.m.)

[*English*]

Mr. Leboe: Mr. Chairman, we are very hopeful that the speeches on these resolutions will be short, and I intend to live up to that hope. One of the reasons for this hope, of course, is that as many of these resolutions as possible be passed so that the legislation may be brought before us. We are very pleased to have before us the resolution outlining the changes intended to be made to the Northwest Territories Act, because we believe that these changes will greatly assist the Territories in the administration of their affairs.

This motion is the second to be introduced by the Minister of Northern Affairs and National Resources which we are very, very pleased to support. The growth and development of that part of Canada is of ever-increasing interest, in a part of our country which so many people feel is a long way away. We will not presuppose the purpose behind increasing the number of elected members of the Council of the Northwest Territories, but with an increased number of members there will be a greater demand for the amenities of life for the people in this part of Canada. We support the measure and commend the minister on bringing it before the House of Commons.

[Mr. Grégoire.]

[*Translation*]

Mr. Mongrain: Mr. Chairman, I too support the proposed legislation of the minister, and I find it perfectly in order.

However, although my contribution may seem naive under the circumstances—I should like to put a few questions and offer some suggestions to the minister.

When we speak about the Northwest Territories, and the Yukon, I wonder whether the situation is not becoming a little out of date. The time has come to give some thought to the fact that within five or six years, it will be decided to transform these two areas into Canadian provinces, that is the 11th and the 12th provinces.

Everybody knows the Northwest Territories.

Even though the population is not yet very large in the Northwest Territories and the Yukon, thanks to means of communication existing today, they are visited by a large number of sportsmen. Furthermore, mineral deposits and all sorts of natural resources discovered there are now under development. This afternoon we heard the hon. minister tell us that the government intends to invest several million dollars to give to the people of these Territories the facilities we have here. I do not think they will become provinces within the next year or so, but I wonder whether the time has not come to start considering the possibility of the Northwest Territories, and the Yukon becoming the 11th and 12th provinces of Canada within five or six years.

Besides, the time has gone by where the Eskimos were considered here as second-rate citizens, because we did not have the facilities to enable them to enjoy our standard of living and to offer them an education to which they were entitled.

This is outdated and now the governments, both federal and provincial, give them many opportunities.

I submit to the minister that perhaps the time has come to establish a committee to plan a program with a view to giving a provincial status, let us say in five or six years, to those two territories. They would become bona fide provinces within confederation.

I should like to conclude my remarks by saying that I support the wish expressed, probably for the twelfth time, by the hon. member for Lapointe (Mr. Grégoire), to the effect that the Territories should be divided

on a reasonable geographical basis. Like him I say that any other kind of division is illogical and could certainly create misunderstandings and disagreements such as we have never seen.

Mr. Grégoire: Mr. Chairman, I should like the minister to answer certain questions we have asked; and amongst others, to speak of the islands problem. He must know about it, since for the last three years I have been speaking to him about it whenever the occasion arose. I should like to hear him on the matter.

[*English*]

Mr. Laing: Mr. Chairman, I am indeed grateful for the comments of hon. members who have participated in this debate at the resolution stage. I am particularly grateful to the hon. member for Brandon-Souris and would agree with him that we are making a rather startling improvement in the economics of the area. The hon. member will recall that when the railway was built there, his government contracted with the railway to use the rails to the extent of carrying 225,000 tons of concentrates per year. His government greatly underrated the future development of the north. Those two lines of rust, as the right hon. Leader of the Opposition referred to this railway the other day, will in this year, 1966, be carrying something like 630,000 tons out of that area.

• (8:40 p.m.)

I think it is important for us to know the extent to which the economic value of that area is being reflected in mineral production in Canada. In 1964 the total mineral output of the Northwest Territories was $17 million. In 1965 it was $72 million. This year I expect it to exceed $100 million.

I was grateful too for the words of the hon. member for Kootenay West. What we are endeavouring to do is to extend democracy—if you want to use a generalized term—to the area. I have made the statement that in the long run I think it would be better for the people who reside there to have a greater degree of control over their own affairs, even if they make errors. It would probably be better for us here to grant moneys to the area which they would control, so long as occasionally we sent an auditor to the territories to look after things. But beyond that, they could direct the money to their own intent and purposes.

I want to reply to the hon. member for Lapointe, who brought up a point which has been before the house on earlier occasions. He referred to the boundaries of the provinces. I would remind him that this bill does not confirm or amend the boundaries of the provinces. The hon. member is referring in substance to that myriad of granite fingers which point themselves out of the sea all around the northern coasts of Quebec. But not all are pure granite, as he knows; there are two or three extremely valuable islands there upon which there are considerable mineral resources, particularly iron.

I know the hon. member will not wish to hold up the progress of the extension of a greater degree of self-determination to the people who live in the Territories in order to press for an amendment to the boundaries of the provinces. I do not know by what measure the boundaries of the provinces could be adjusted, but certainly not by a measure such as we are discussing at this resolution stage tonight.

The fact of the matter is that all of those islands in the Hudson Bay, indeed those islands in James Bay too, are not part of the provinces of either Ontario or Quebec, but are part of the Northwest Territories. I have said before that the time may well come when they will be allotted to the provinces, but that is certainly not within the compass of the bill under discussion tonight.

Finally I want to thank the hon. member for Trois-Rivières for his very thoughtful suggestion. I would remind him in this connection—I had thought some other hon. members in the house would raise the matter—that at the present time a royal commission in the Northwest Territories under the chairmanship of Professor Carrothers is taking a survey of what might be the future of government in the Northwest Territories. It is a very excellent commission. They made the rounds of a number of communities in the summertime and they are now doing the same thing in the depths of winter. The evidence they are getting I have no knowledge of, but from what I read in the papers it is obvious that there is a very healthy ferment in the Northwest Territories which indicates that people are thinking in terms of their future and their ambitions.

Some provinces are proposing that their boundaries be extended to take over the section of the Northwest Territories to their north. However, at this stage I do not think we should prejudge anything. I hope we may

have very excellent guidance upon the present state of government in the territories and be given some indication of what it might be in the future when we receive the report, which is expected around August.

There could also be some guidance in the report for the hon. member for Lapointe in his desire to extend the provinces. This has been proposed for many years and is a matter I do not think we should cast lightly aside. However, I am quite certain that this royal commission headed by Dr. Carrothers will bring forward a great deal of information which will be of great value to us. May I thank hon. members for participating in the debate at this stage.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Grégoire: Mr. Chairman, I must say I am not at all pleased with the Minister's reply. He said: "I do not know how to go about setting the limits or boundaries of the provinces."

Well, Mr. Chairman, if he does not know how to do it, let him resign. He is supposed to solve problems. It is not enough to say: "I do not know how to go about it." Let him find out. Together with his officials and his deputy minister, he should find the answer. He asks us not to hold up the adoption of a bill, but he knows that two years ago a bill was held up in committee because it was felt that the "jurisdiction" of the Northwest Territories should not be increased until such time as problems like this were not settled.

This problem must be solved, while the federal government still has the authority to do so; for, when the Northwest Territories have greater "jurisdiction", powers and privileges to govern themselves, then, it will be too late.

It seems to me the minister should have a greater sense of responsibility. He knows that the situation is not normal, that it will be a source of useless bickering and struggles, because the federal government can at present settle the matter. Within ten or fifteen years, maybe sooner, it will have to be settled between the two provinces.

Privileges and powers are being given the Northwest Territories, but once they have them, the federal government will no longer be able to solve the problem of the islands.

It must be settled now. The minister says: Allow the legislation to be passed. We do not know what to do about that but let the legislation pass so that its benefits are not delayed.

But if disadvantages are to follow also, should we ignore them?

The minister is wondering if that can be included in such a legislation. Of course that can be the subject of an amendment to the bill that is put before us by the minister.

The minister introduces a bill to give responsibilities to the Northwest Territories. But by giving them such responsibilities he should solve the problems that exist, namely about borders.

It seems to me that it would be easy for the minister to prepare an amendment or a supplementary section to the effect that all the islands located 12 miles from the territory of the province of Quebec, at low tide, belong to that province. That is simple enough and, I repeat, particularly since the minister knows, because he was told when I questioned the representatives from the Northwest Territories, that none of them objected to that proposal. On the contrary, at the present time, they do not know what to do with those uninhabited islands which are located several hundred miles from the Northwest Territories and only a few miles from the province of Quebec.

When the Northwest Territories are made into a province, including the little islands which are located near the borders of Quebec, what will the minister be able to do when the time comes to settle the matter of borders between the two provinces?

If one stands on the shore of Hudson's bay, at high tide, one is said to be on the mainland, in the province of Quebec. On the other hand, at low tide, on the shore, one is in the Northwest Territories. Therefore, when the Northwest Territories become a province, one will have to go to another province for a swim. That does not make sense and the minister knows it.

What would it be for him to add a section which would give privileges or extend the jurisdiction of the citizens of the Northwest Territories and, at the same time, include an other section to settle that problem once and for all by saying: All these islands which lie within 12 miles of the Quebec shores, at low tide, belong to the province of Quebec.

• (8:50 p.m.)

It is as simple as that, particularly in view of the fact they are uninhabited and there is no one to object. It is time to settle this problem while there is no opposition. Does the minister prefer waiting until objections

are raised? Let us think of it now before objections are made. Would the minister rather wait?

I hope other ministers in the Cabinet who will show him where his responsibility lies, for at present he seems to forget it completely. I hope they will open his eyes to a problem that is bound to come up, but is non-existent at this time and that he could settle without difficulty.

Before long it will be a problem. He mentioned a while ago that these islands are rich, rich with ore.

While this does not give rise to discussions, why not settle the problem now. Because you will have to settle it later when it will not be possible or when objections are raised.

Mr. Lachance: Would the hon. member for Lapointe permit a question.

Mr. Grégoire: Certainly.

Mr. Lachance: I should not like to minimize the intervention of the hon. member which seems excellent, but does he not think that the provinces should have something to say and should this not possibly be the subject matter considered by a federal-provincial conference?

I cannot see very well how—I hope the hon. member for Lapointe will correct me if I am wrong—the federal government could pass any legislation now without consulting the provinces. Can the hon. member answer that question?

Mr. Grégoire: Certainly, Mr. Chairman, because at present these territories belong to the federal government and not to the provinces: They are within the Northwest Territories, which are under the exclusive jurisdiction of the federal government.

Mr. Lachance: Does the hon. member feel that if the federal government should pass a piece of legislation, it would impinge on provincial authority?

Mr. Grégoire: I will point out to my hon. friend that the Quebec government and the government of Manitoba have already submitted a request to the federal government concerning the islands situated within their respective territories.

The government of Ontario has made a similar request, for islands lying 12 miles offshore at low tide. But the only government that holds any jurisdiction or authority over the Northwest Territories is the federal government, who alone is entitled to put such a measure on the statutes. No province will object to that, none would, since it means increasing its territory, as these islands are rich in minerals, easily reached and easily developed. Who would object? Which province would refuse these islands? None, of course; they asked for them.

But the minister does not seem willing to solve this problem and that is rather discouraging, as we are about to constitute a province out of the Northwest Territories. Well, that new province will be about 400 miles from the province of Quebec, it will be Quebec's neighbour in that the Quebec shores, all around the province, will be in the new province of the Northwest Territories. That is the ridiculous side of the situation. Why not settle the problem? It would require only one more clause in the legislation, stipulating that the Northwest Territories, with their new jurisdiction powers and privileges, would be made up of the whole territory extending up to 12 miles of the province of Quebec, at low tide. It would be as simple as that to improve things, Mr. Chairman, and the minister would settle a problem and, mark my word, because this will be on the record. If the minister does not settle the problem at once, within, 10, 15, 20 or 30 years, no matter how far in the future, this will become a serious problem, a source of conflict and disputes within Canada. It will be said then that it would have been possible to settle such a conflict beforehand, if only the minister had assumed his responsibilities instead of being obstinate, as he has been for the past three years, to the point of not even wanting to settle this problem.

I would ask him to state in the house, to answer or at least to commit himself to take the necessary steps in order to settle the problem.

Mr. Chairman, what is even more revolting is that the minister merely smiles, as if that did not even concern him.

[*English*]

Mr. Dinsdale: Mr. Chairman, I do not want to pursue the subject upon which we have embarked in the last few moments because it is one that concerns most of the provinces in this country of ours. I can remember, for example, back in the early 1950's sitting in on a conference in northern Manitoba where it was suggested that most of the Northwest Territories be joined to the northern part of the provinces, and a new territory be carved out, to be called Precambria, which I think

was the name designated at that time. Sir, if we were to embark on a discussion of this kind at the present time, I am sure we should be spending many hours in debate. I agree with the minister that this is something that will have to be considered at some time, but in the proper context and under the proper circumstances.

My reason for rising again is to correct an historical reference made by the minister in regard to the construction of the Pine Point Railway. I know he did not intend to state it in these terms, but I believe he did quote the leader of Her Majesty's loyal opposition as having referred to two rusted lines into the territory. For the sake of the record I should like to point out to the Minister of Northern Affairs and National Resources that the Leader of the Opposition was merely quoting the immortal words of the hon. member for Bonavista-Twillingate, who led when he was in opposition a concerted attack in this house, against the whole idea of the construction of a railway into the Northwest Territories. To climax his argument, he wrote the whole thing off as a situation which would result in a railway line that would eventually disappear because of rust resulting from lack of use.

If our estimate with respect to 225,000 tons of ore per year from the Pine Point mine was what might be called a conservative estimate as a potential in the initial stages, I think the minister will agree that our attitude and our approach to the prospects of economic development in the Territories was much more liberal than that represented by the words of the gentleman who was rewarded for his particularly visionary contribution to the future of transportation in Canada by being made Canadian Minister of Transport under the Liberal administration.

For the sake of the historic accuracy I should also point out that the 225,000 ton figure was reached as a result of negotiations with the representatives of Cominco. We had to work closely in co-operation with them, and we wanted their support because it was a joint project. That company was going to be the chief user in the initial stages, and that was the figure that was regarded as reasonable by the representatives of Cominco.

I think the minister is also aware that we had had preliminary negotiations with the government of Japan, and although we had no concrete commitment from that government, we knew that in a very short time Japan would also be a market for this rich reservoir of resources.

I merely enter the discussion at this stage to make sure that the historical reference is accurate.

Mr. Mongrain: Mr. Chairman, I must apologize for speaking a second time about this matter. A few minutes ago I mentioned that I was in perfect accord with the hon. member for Lapointe in the principle he mentioned, that there is, so to speak, a geographic mortal sin committed with respect to the distribution of territory.

I do not follow the hon. member for Lapointe when he insists that the minister have an amendment right away to settle this question. I think the minister gave a very satisfactory answer, when he said a few minutes ago that there is now a royal commission studying the situation, and that the commission is supposed to report some time in August, if I understood the minister well. Perhaps we should just ask him that, when the report is received, it be tabled. Perhaps this would not be for five, six or seven months; there will be a reasonable delay. Probably the minister would have the right to come back at that time with an amendment along the lines suggested by the hon. member for Lapointe, and perhaps go a little further along the lines I mentioned myself some minutes ago.

• (9:00 p.m.)

Resolution reported and concurred in.

Mr. Laing thereupon moved for leave to introduce Bill No. C-146, to amend the Northwest Territories Act.

Motion agreed to and bill read the first time.

YUKON ACT

AMENDMENTS RESPECTING INDEMNITIES, TRAVELLING EXPENSES, ETC.

Hon. Arthur Laing (Minister of Northern Affairs and National Resources) moved that the house go into committee to consider the following resolution:

That it is expedient to introduce a measure to amend the Yukon Act to provide for the payment of an annual indemnity of three hundred dollars to each member of the advisory committee on finance and for the payment of reasonable travelling and living expenses incurred by them in attending the sittings of the committee; to increase to five thousand dollars per annum the maximum indemnity payable to members of the Council; to provide for the payment of reasonable travelling and living expenses incurred by members in going to and returning from sessions of the Council; to provide

that the first one thousand dollars of the indemnity paid to a member is not subject to income tax; to provide also for the keeping of territorial accounts, for the examination of these accounts by the Auditor General; and to provide further for certain changes in the administration of the act.

Motion agreed to and the house went into committee, Mr. Batten in the chair.

Mr. Laing: I will be even more brief in dealing with this resolution than I was in dealing with the last, because some of the things we have said with respect to the Northwest Territories apply with equal weight to the Yukon territory. However, the Yukon, I must remind members of this committee, is a far older area with greater experience in running its affairs. The Yukon in its heyday had a great number of people and it learned to operate, however roughly, its own affairs at that time. But with the decline in gold production the Yukon went back. It is a happy circumstance that I am able to advise members of the committee tonight that Yukon is on the way up—rapidly on the way up, I think. It depends no longer on gold but on silver, lead, zinc, asbestos and a variety of other minerals. The population there is rising. There are a large number of persons in the area who have acquired a great experience of public life, and we intend to extend to the members of the Council what I called, in the case of the other resolution, a reasonable payment for their services, namely $5,000 a year. There will also be provision for extending to the members of the advisory group on finance an additional $300 a year.

We are very enthusiastic about the Yukon territory. However, I am concerned by the repeated statements of those who live in this territory that they are governed by people who live 3,000 miles away. Again I want to emphasize that as rapidly as possible it is imperative for us to return as much of the government as we can to the hands of those who live in this region. This is the intention of the bill foreshadowed by the resolution before us; this measure contains a number of items transferring entirely to the Yukon jurisdiction over matters which are now administered from Ottawa.

Unlike the Territories, which are so vast, I think the Yukon no longer needs appointed members on its Council. But I would submit that in the case of the resolution we discussed some time ago there is merit in having well known people from southern Canada interested in the progress of the northern parts of this country. We shall not build this country soundly until we build it in depth.

I have no confidence in those who say the resources of the north should be kept in cold storage until such time as we may need them in the future. I think that if we cannot develop our country in depth and meet the challenges of these difficult areas at least reasonably well, then the chance of our doing anything worth while in any part of Canada is not very great.

Mr. Dinsdale: It always warms the cockles of the hearts of those of us on this side of the house when we hear the minister of northern affairs wax enthusiastic and eloquent on the prospects of the great northern territories of Canada.

We have heard it said in the past that the minister belongs more on this side of the house than on the other side in respect of such sentiments, and we have always sympathized with him because it seemed he was finding it difficult to persuade his colleagues on the treasury benches to embrace the prospects of the north with the same enthusiasm. However, the fact that we have these two resolutions before us tonight would indicate that at last he is getting the message through to his colleagues.

There used to be a slogan in the department of northern affairs when I was minister—I often chuckled at it when it came across the desk—"Woe unto those who sit on their frozen assets". This was the situation in the north for far too long, and I agree entirely with the minister that the breakthrough which has occurred in the last ten years is something which has been delayed for far too long. After all, Canada is a northern nation, as Professor William Morton of the University of Manitoba has put it. This is a northern nation with a northern heritage and destiny; the sooner we move toward development in depth the sooner we shall reach political and economic maturity.

Everything which has been said with reference to the resolution of the Northwest Territories applies in equal or even greater measure to the Yukon. Again, my hon. friend from the Yukon will have some specific proposals to put forward with reference to the legislation which will flow from this resolution. The Yukon territory is in a position where it could take over completely the administration of its own affairs. Indeed the time is not long distant when the Yukon will be another province with all the rights and privileges pertaining thereto.

• (9:10 p.m.)

Unfortunately the gentleman who has been the commissioner for the Yukon Territory during the past five years, Mr. Gordon Cameron, is retiring from that position. I would like to commend to the minister that his successor be a man of similar qualities and of a similar type. Mr. Cameron, while not born in the Yukon Territory, certainly had grown into the atmosphere and spirit of the Yukon. He commanded the respect and the imagination of the people, whether it was as an administrator or as a member of the bagpipe band, in which capacity he used to appear at the various official functions in the Yukon. I think it is a good thing for politicians to have a little bit of musical skill to contribute to their role in public affairs, because we all know music soothes the savage breast. This applies even to the bagpipes—and that is saying a lot on March 17.

I hope in appointing his successor the principle established in the appointment of someone from the Yukon Territory will be continued. There certainly are many men and women of a quality capable of providing the necessary political leadership for the Yukon. I hope too, when the legislation is before us, that we will have an opportunity to discuss some of the detail arising from these recommendations in the committee on Northern Affairs and National Resources. I trust we will again be able to meet representatives from the Council. Recently a committee was in Ottawa in connection with financial matters and, following from afar their deliberations and listening from afar to their comments, it certainly appeared to me that in the Yukon Territory and in the Northwest Territories they are wanting more and more self government, more and more autonomy. This might be the time, because the Yukon has provided the pattern which will be followed by the government of the Northwest Territories, when some executive responsibility could be given to the Yukon Territory Council. Again, as I said at the outset of these brief remarks, I welcome the minister into the family of boosters for northern Canada.

Mr. Herridge: Mr. Chairman, when this resolution is being considered by the house we miss the hon. member for the Yukon. I am sure he would have been very pleased to have taken this opportunity to discuss this resolution at possibly greater length than the member for Kootenay West.

[Mr. Dinsdale.]

Let me explain, Mr. Chairman, that I have just been chosen by a special caucus of our group to deal with this resolution because I have two particular qualifications. The first is that on one occasion during a political campaign I tramped 15 miles on snowshoes to address a meeting of 16 people, and 15 miles home the same way. So I am considered to be somewhat like Yukon Erik in that respect.

The other reason is when I was a very small boy I was nursed by a famous lady who came from Dawson City when the trail of 1898 folded up and when the mining and forestry development was commencing in the Kootenay country, namely Miss Yukon Iola. It was quite an innocent flirtation.

Mr. Chairman, we simply wish to express our support for the spirit and purpose of this resolution. As I said in respect of the previous resolution, there have been great developments in the Yukon during the last ten years. In the early days there was a great boom, and then the Yukon went into sort of economic and social obscurity for a great many years. We know that at the present time it is coming back and that developments are taking place.

We are very glad that this resolution provides for a reasonable indemnity and expenses for the financial advisory committee, because persons have to be properly compensated if they are going to do the job required of them. We also are glad there is a provision for an increase in the indemnity and expenses for the Council members.

Again, as I said, we are very pleased to see we can rely on the eagle eye of our Auditor General to make certain that the accounts in the Yukon are checked, as well as those accounts in the other parts of Canada which relate to the departments of the federal government. I am sure when we check those accounts, and after listening to the hon. member for the Yukon, we will find that no one commenced military service in the Yukon at nine years of age.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Laprise: Mr. Chairman, I support this resolution even if it should be only because the members of the council will be better paid and in a position to travel more easily.

Earlier, the minister, in another resolution mentioned the size of the North West Territories and of the Yukon. I realize the situation better than anyone, being the member for one of the largest ridings in Canada. I understand the attitude of the members for the Northwest Territories and for the Yukon.

I am pleased to hear from the minister that soon the Yukon Territory will get provincial status. This is an indication that our country is developing and making steady progress and I am happy to see that the minister is dealing with this aspect of the situation. He said that our natural resources should be inventorized and developed. I fully agree with his opinion. The natural resources being developed nowadays would not have been useful a eentury ago.

It may be that in a year's time we shall be developing natural resources which it is not necessary to develop today.

That is why I agree with the minister that we must know the extent of our natural resources to make them available to all Canadians as soon as possible.

For all these reasons, we support this resolution, and when the bill is brought forward we shall do that. The minister can count on our support concerning this resolution.

[*English*]

Mr. Leboe: Mr. Chairman, this resolution is another for the bringing forward of which we wish to thank the minister. We, too, are very happy that the minister is full of praise for the Yukon Territory.

• (9:20 p.m.)

We would like to point out that one of the great concerns of the people of the Yukon—and I am sure if the member for the Yukon were here he would be the first to mention it—is the reconstruction and the paving of the Alaska Highway. When we get a closer knit government in the Territories and the Yukon, better compensation and more adequate travelling expenses to take care of people moving from one place to another, this will be a way in which the federal government can give some very real assistance to the area.

I was interested in the remarks of the hon. member for Kootenay West, and it seemed to me that he did not want to be left out of recent headlines. I can say to him that I do not think he will be left out.

Mr. Gordon Cameron, I think, exemplifies the type of individual many people would say is the desirable type to be a part of the governing body of the Yukon. It is with regret that we understand Mr. Cameron has left. One of his close supporters has told me that Mr. Cameron was very much in agreement with these proposals now before us. I hope that when a new government is set up in the Yukon along the lines suggested by this resolution it will exercise its prerogative in seeking the co-operation of the province of British Columbia. I am certain it will find that British Columbia is anxious to assist and co-operate in any way possible in the development of the Yukon.

British Columbia cannot separate or isolate itself from development in the Yukon, no more than the Yukon can separate itself from the province of British Columbia. Very close knit co-operation is essential to the proper development of both British Columbia and the Yukon. These areas have many things in common and there are many areas for such development. From what the minister has said tonight I am sure he will spearhead the drive toward total co-operation between the Yukon and British Columbia, which together will co-operate with the rest of Canada. I hope he will keep his attention on the development and reconstruction of the Alaska Highway because it is one of the keys to the development of that area.

Mr. Laing: Mr. Chairman, I should not want the opportunity to pass without my making a contribution in respect of our regard for Gordon Cameron. Filling his position is not going to be easy because he is a relatively young man, extremely active and knows the Yukon like the back of his hand. That type of individual is not easy to find and I did want to pay a compliment to him. I agree with all that has been said about him. I do not know why he is resigning and I have not asked him, nor do I intend to ask him. He is a relatively young man and I believe he felt there was an opportunity to do better elsewhere. That is a good indication, because that condition has not been characteristic of this area of the country for many years.

I should like to thank the hon. member for Brandon-Souris for his suggestions. I thank the hon. member for Kootenay West and I am quite certain that his continuing durability is entirely due to Iola. I want to thank the hon. member for his reference to the Trans-Canada Highway. I do not think I will be divulging any secrets when I tell him we now have in hand the report on the Alaska Highway. We are reviewing that report now with the intention that it should be published as a document. There are certain private matters within it which we will have to extract, due to the nature of the inquiry made, but I do not think that will affect the value of what I believe will be one of the

most interesting documents published for some time.

Resolution reported and concurred in.

Mr. Laing thereupon moved for leave to introduce Bill No. C-147, to amend the Yukon Act.

Motion agreed to and bill read the first time.

Mr. Drury: Mr. Speaker, the next item on the order of business is item No. 4, a resolution preceding a bill affecting the National Research Council Act. Following that item of business it is proposed that we consider item No. 15, which is a resolution regarding the establishment of a Science Council of Canada. In view of the fact that the Science Council of Canada is dependent upon the amendments to the National Research Council Act to some extent I suggest that we might, with unanimous consent, proceed to item No. 15 and then deal with item No. 4, rather than doing it in the reverse order.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: It has been suggested that the house proceed with item No. 15 to be followed by item No. 4. Does the house give unanimous consent?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

SCIENCE COUNCIL OF CANADA

PROVISION FOR ESTABLISHMENT AND DEFINITION OF DUTIES

Hon. C. M. Drury (for the Prime Minister) moved that the house go into committee to consider the following resolution:

That it is expedient to introduce a measure for the establishment of a Science Council of Canada and to define the duties thereof, to provide for the appointment of the chairman and other members of the Council and for the payment of the remuneration of the chairman and of travelling expenses of the members and associate members of the Council, also for the payment of the remuneration of members of the Council for additional duties; to provide further that all expenditures for the purposes of this measure shall be paid out of money appropriated by parliament therefor.

Motion agreed to and the house went into committee, Mr. Batten in the chair.

Mr. Drury: Mr. Chairman, in every enlightened nation there has developed, within recent years, an awareness of the impact of science and technology upon every facet of life; an influence that is reflected in the economic growth, the health and well being of peoples, the physical comforts, the release from drudgery, the provision of time to practise and enjoy the arts, indeed in the entire social fabric not the least component of which is the political relations within and between nations. Equally well recognized is the implication that if science, in its many ramifications, is to serve the community and the nation to best advantage there must be some rationale, some orderly progress, some planning that takes into consideration the needs, the aspirations, the resources, the capabilities—yes, even the conscience of a people. For science must serve—not control—not only the greatest possible number of individuals, nor only one nation, but the great international community of man.

• (9:30 p.m.)

In many countries, Great Britain, Sweden, Germany, the United States, France, Japan, to name but a few, the serious need for long term planning in science and technology has been recognized for a number of years and appropriate action has been taken by the governments concerned to establish organizations charged with the duty of obtaining competent expert opinion on scientific and technological matters and providing governments with recommendations and advice upon which policy decisions can be based. As may be expected, the character of the organization is not the same in all countries but varies with the size, complexity and political philosophy of the individual nation. All, however, have developed formal organizations concerned with advising the government on the formulation of scientific policy.

It will be recalled that the Glassco Commission, in examining the situation in Canada, found that the mechanism by which objective and independent recommendations in respect of scientific policy could be brought before the government was not functioning. The commission proposed, therefore, that there should be established an advisory committee composed of people knowledgeable in science and its applications, which would have the responsibility of examining the several facets of science in Canada and of making recommendations to government upon which policy could be formulated. The commission emphasized that the advisory body should be independent and not directly associated with any operating agency.

As the house was informed by the Prime Minister on April 30, 1964, the recommendations of the Glassco Commission were studied by Dr. C. J. Mackenzie, a former President of the National Research Council, and following

his recommendation the government later that year established the science secretariat in the office of the Privy Council. Dr. Mackenzie noted at the time that before an advisory committee could be brought into being the role of the National Research Council should be re-examined and its position in relation to the proposed advisory committee defined.

Based on studies made in consultation with the National Research Council and other interested parties it has been decided to establish an advisory body to be known as the Science Council of Canada to advise the government on matters concerning broad national scientific policy. This decision takes account of the interests and functions of government departments and agencies whose activities are related to science and technology. Lest there be some misunderstanding of the term "science" in the name of the proposed council, it should be clearly stated that in this context it includes all the natural sciences over the broad spectrum from "pure" science to "applied" science, from the search for new scientific knowledge to its application in the service of man in such fields as engineering, medicine, agriculture and industry.

The purpose of the Science Council will primarily be to define and determine feasible long term objectives for science in Canada, to suggest appropriate paths for reaching them and to consider the responsibilities of the various segments of the industrial, academic and government communities in this field. The Council will be less concerned with day to day problems than with developing principles and evolving a philosophy upon which future courses can be charted. Other countries have experienced very rapid growth in science and science-based enterprises during the past five to ten years. In some cases the possible effects of growth were not anticipated or recognized, with the result that there developed an imbalance in the size of government agencies involved, in the disciplines supported and in the geographic distribution of scientific and industrial activity that, because of its magnitude, is now difficult if not impossible to correct. In Canada, although we have made notable advances in some areas, there is every indication that the next ten years will see a particularly rapid growth period in science and technology, especially perhaps in industry, and in the universities which must produce the manpower for the envisaged expansion of all science.

A particularly difficult and complex problem in the modern age is to determine the priority that should be accorded to the growth of a particular branch of science or technology at a given time for the optimum benefit of the country. It is obvious that Canada, with its limited means, cannot afford full support to all areas of science and consequently we must, during the period of rapid growth that lies immediately ahead, utilize our physical and human resources to the best advantage by exercising a degree of selection and making a resolute effort to determine the areas upon which support should be concentrated, while at the same time availing ourselves of the experience of other countries. It is our hope that the Science Council will undertake to develop basic concepts which will serve as guides for the allocation of these resources.

In this respect the Council will provide advice to the government upon which policy in respect of science and technology can be established. It will be the duty of the Council to assess in a comprehensive manner Canada's scientific and technological resources, requirements and potentialities and to make recommendations thereon to the minister. The Council will be advisory only and will have no direct authority over expenditures or budgets of any government department or agency.

Whatever policies may be adopted for the future of science in Canada, one thing is certain, that unless there is a sufficient number of well trained, intelligent and enterprising personnel skilled in the exploration and application of science the desired objectives will not be achieved. The effective development and utilization of scientific and technological manpower will be a primary concern of the Council.

As science is but one of the several components of modern society that together determine the course of human affairs, any studies that are made to determine the role and the objectives of science must inevitably take into account the possible effects on the society in which we live. Matters such as public health, employment patterns, the safety and survival of communities, the enjoyment of liesure and of old age, the philosophy of culture and of law, the entire fabric of the economy and many others can be profoundly affected by scientific and technological change

whether internal or international. The Science Council in delineating feasible objectives will be expected to consult and collaborate with other agencies and organizations in different fields to ensure that fullest consideration is given to the correlation of its objectives with the broad spectrum of social needs.

Science, in its many ramifications, has within it the potential to serve not only individuals but communities and the entire nation by providing better living, new employment opportunities, easier communication and countless other social and economic advantages. But the complex problem of determining the attainable objectives and of defining the role that science and technology can play will require for its solution the serious attention of enlightened, intelligent and public-spirited people who are aware of the implications of science in our economy and our society. We earnestly believe that the Science Council of Canada as it is now proposed will provide a particularly effective means of obtaining factual information and thoughtful opinions and of correlating them to form a most suitable background for the formulation and construction of government policy.

Mr. Grafftey: Mr. Chairman, in rising to support the resolution the minister has just put forward in the name of the government, let me just say that we on this side of the house really feel that the government and all parliamentarians have a real and active role to play in encouraging what we recognize as individual and national excellence. I think that if we support the resolution the minister has put forward in a real and tangible way, we will have moved at least one step forward in encouraging in this nation individual and national excellence. To my mind individual and national excellence means one thing, that as legislators we should expect nothing but the best from our nation and each and every citizen in our country which we call Canada.

• (9:40 p.m.)

Tonight I think I speak for all members on this side of the house when I say that while we recognize there is much yet to be done we should be very proud of the role which the National Research Council in this country has played in the past. I think the minister will agree that this is a Council of which Canadians should be very proud. We should also be proud of the role that our scientists have played in general, apart from the role the National Research Council has played in particular.

In my brief remarks this evening I should like to touch on an idea mentioned by the Minister of Trade and Commerce in the House of Commons a few nights ago. We in Canada living north of the United States of America, a country which has the highest standard of economic living in the world, are in a particular vulnerable position. It seems to me that in attempting in an economic sense to keep up with the Jones, we invariably enter into areas of activity into which we in fact have no business to go. The facts of everyday life dictate that living north of the United States we in Canada are obliged both at home and abroad to enter into various fields of activity, economically, politically and, if you will, socially.

However, too often we pay attention to the bigness of our ventures rather than the quality of our enterprises, and it is for this reason I am most interested in the fact that in his very good speech this evening the minister used the word "selection". This will be one of the jobs of this council.

I believe that rather than paying attention to the bigness of our ventures we should base our national activities on the idea of individual and national excellence, and we should moreover underline specialization and selectivity. Specialization and selectivity should keynote our national approach to economic ventures. I am very glad the minister mentioned the word "selection" tonight because it does fit in with the general remarks I have to make.

As I say, Mr. Chairman, we should support the idea of individual and national excellence, and we should go on to support the resolution, the work of the National Research Council and the endeavours of this new body which the minister is setting up, as well as the endeavours of Canadian scientists.

The minister has very ably said this evening that in a country like Canada, which has vast resources but a small population spread out from Atlantic to Pacific, we must select the areas of scientific activity which we are going to support. But this is a very difficult thing to do. Because of this fact it is impossible for us to give the kind of support to all the scientific endeavours which we should like to give at the present time.

However, with this in view, I would put before the house the suggestion that as a country up until now we have not allowed—I

do not blame any government entirely for this—sufficient importance to be placed on the support of scientific research in Canada. It is my belief that the government and the country that does not support adequately enough scientific research is merely killing the goose that lays the golden egg. For every dollar spent to assist a scientist in Canada, the United Kingdom spends $5 and the United States government $10 to $15.

In my short remarks this evening on this resolution, while I am not going to enter into a debate on this question, I realize it is of very great concern to the minister that this country is faced with a scientific brain drain. We have listened to both sides of the question, and I will be the first to admit to the government that it is a very difficult problem to discuss and resolve especially this evening. But I think that on balance this country is faced with a brain drain of scientists who are seeking employment outside of Canada. It is not an easy problem to solve, but I suggest that support of this resolution would help the minister to find a solution to this problem which is presently facing the nation.

I hope I will not be out of order if I refer to another reserach council which falls under the jurisdiction of the Minister of Industry. I am referring to medical research, a matter which I hope will receive priority. The other night I mentioned in the house that in my view, Canada is facing a very serious shortage of doctors. Approximately the same number of medical graduates graduated from our medical schools last year as were leaving ten years ago. Yet, some 400 of the 1,000 medical graduates who graduated from our universities last year left the country. At the same time hundreds of qualified students are being turned away from our medical schools. Why? The reason is we lack teachers.

Why do we lack teachers in our medical schools? And I am told that if we are going to have enough teachers by 1970, excluding all considerations relating to medicare, we will need 2,000 medical teachers for our medical schools. At the moment we have only 1,000. In the United States last year, 90 per cent of the assistance given to scientific research in medical schools originated from the federal government and amounted to approximately $1,300 million.

Contrast this with the state of affairs in Canada, where governmental assistance amounted to about $15 million. I am not blaming the government for this. There has been a long tradition of inadequate assistance in this field. Therefore I hope one of the priorities in this new study will be medical research. Otherwise our teachers as well as our medical students will flee to the United States, and Canada sooner than later—and I say much sooner than later—will be faced with a crisis owing to our shortage of doctors. This is just another reason we should underline the urgency of this timely resolution which has been placed before the house by the minister this evening.

I cannot help but introduce this comment at this time. A few weeks ago when I was in New York state testifying before the legislative committee on automobile safety, many of the legislators and officials in New York state felt that the National Research Council had a real role to play in assisting them in the United States in the final completion of their prototype safety car. I think this matter should be of great interest to the Minister of Industry, who already knows about it. If the Council does play this kind of role I am sure that many benefits both direct and indirect will redound to our nation in general.

I have touched upon just a few specific topics, Mr. Chairman, relating to this important resolution the minister has put before us tonight. I hope my brief remarks will only go to underline the fact that this resolution merits the support of every member in every corner of the house.

Mr. Schreyer: Mr. Chairman, some ministers welcome comments on resolutions which they sponsor; other ministers presumably do not. I hope this minister is not in that latter category because I should like to make some comments on the resolution before us relating to the establishment of a Science Council for Canada.

• (9:50 p.m.)

It is pretty difficult to visualize just what will be the eventual role and function of this Science Council, beyond noting what was said by the minister in his opening remarks on the resolution. Certainly, in so far as this measure goes it receives the support, I am sure of almost all members because there is a crying need in this country for expanded science research facilities and capabilities, if we are to be able to say that we are doing our best to improve our industrial productivity, economic efficiency and so on.

The second annual report of the Economic Council of Canada makes it pretty clear, Mr. Chairman, that the industrial development of our country depends directly on the quality and quantity of our institutions of education and scientific research.

Science Council of Canada

Through the provincial governments of this country we have been accelerating our efforts in education. However, I am not so sure about the scientific research aspect, and our responsibilities toward that aspect in the 1960's, because I have gained the impression from the few journals I have read that Canada is somehow lagging behind other countries in the expansion of science research institutions and facilities.

If we are really concerned, as I believe we are, about our industrial productivity—and this is the term we hear so often in this house and across the country—and if we are really concerned about our competitiveness in the export markets of the world; if we are really concerned about the adequacy of our scientific and industrial research capability, and if we are really concerned about the so-called brain drain, which is another term we hear so much about, the federal government must lead the way in expanding the size and scope of our post graduate institutions in their role as centres of scientific research.

Mr. Chairman, what I am trying to say is that scientific research should not be regarded, as it seems to have been regarded up to now, as something almost exclusively under the jurisdiction of the provinces. This whole matter is related to education. I suggest that the time is ripe for the federal government to assert a greater degree of leadership in helping to expand scientific research facilities in Canada.

I believe there are several compelling reasons why the federal government should be taking the lead, and I do not think that the establishment of an advisory council type of project is adequate to the task that lies ahead.

What are some of these obvious reasons to which I have alluded? What are some of these obvious reasons why the federal government should undertake greater responsibility in this field? One reason, Mr. Chairman, is obvious. It is that scientific research is a costly proposition. Therefore attempts should be made to avoid duplication and overlapping as between the different universities under different provincial jurisdictions. Another reason is that if there were greater federal leadership, if there were federal coordination, specialization in scientific research could be effected. There must be specialization as between the different institutions that go in for science research. It seems to me that we have to attempt to obtain the economy of

[Mr. Schreyer.]

scale and the economy that comes with specialization in research. This can be achieved to a much greater degree if there is federal leadership.

I would put forward yet a third reason, Mr. Chairman. That is, that our industrial productivity and export positions are matters relating to our entire Canadian economy. It follows therefore that industrial or applied science research, as it is sometimes called, must be national-economy oriented. However, industrial research or applied science research in turn is dependant upon the research that is carried on in our postgraduate science faculties, because it depends for its personnel on the academic centres, especially on the universities. Those academic centres must turn out, and must graduate scientists. Some of those will stay in the academic community. Some of them obviously would then be available for our industrial research centres.

Canada has not been doing very well at all so far, Mr. Chairman. The previous speaker made some references to scientific research performance in Canada, as compared with that in the United States and Great Britain. One reason why we have not been doing too well in this country is that many of our people upon graduation leave for the United States. There is greater opportunity in the United States for them. It is contended by some people that this so-called brain drain is somehow counterbalanced by the immigration into Canada of scientists from Europe, and particularly from Great Britain.

I would submit that the scientists and personnel that we do get from the old country are, for the most part, at a lower level of achievement in their careers than those leaving Canada for the United States. Men holding degrees at the doctorate level leave Canada for the United States. People at the bachelor level in science emigrate to Canada from the old country. Canada is losing all the while. This has to do with lack of opportunity here.

In the minute or two left before ten o'clock I should like to take an opportunity to quote some sentences from a letter written by a science graduate of Canada to the editor of the journal *Physics in Canada.* I quote:

Dear Sir:

In the near future I will be faced with the prospect of being forced to desert Canada (which will have "invested" over ten thousand dollars in my education) for the brighter research opportunities in the United States.

Unfortunately Canada's political elements seem to be unaware of the seriousness of the situation. I therefore suggest that it would do far more good to send this and similar articles directly to individual Members of Parliament—

—pointing out the problem.

For obvious reasons, Mr. Chairman, I need not name the writer.

Mr. Chairman, may I call it ten o'clock.

Progress reported.

• (10:00 p.m.)

PROCEEDINGS ON ADJOURNMENT MOTION

A motion to adjourn the house under provisional standing order 39A deemed to have been moved.

IMMIGRATION—INQUIRY AS TO STATEMENT ON SEDGWICK REPORT

Mr. Andrew Brewin (Greenwood): This afternoon I asked the Minister of Citizenship and Immigration a question about the Sedgwick report on immigration he tabled a few days ago. I am glad to take this opportunity to expand my question.

Mr. Sedgwick is an eminent lawyer. Whether he has any experience in immigration matters I do not know. His report contained some good suggestions, but there are other recommendations which cause great anxiety and I would urge the minister to repudiate them promptly. I refer to the recommendations in the report that sponsorship of immigrants be limited to spouses and minor children.

Members of this house will know that in recent years there have been two main streams of immigration. The first group has been selected on the basis of special skills and qualifications and has been based directly on economic motives. The second group has been admitted on social, family and humanitarian grounds. The basis of selection here has been on the ground of relationship to Canadian citizens and residents.

In his report Mr. Sedgwick makes a derogatory reference to large numbers of what he calls unskilled and functionally illiterate adults who have come to Canada through the sponsorship movement. If he were more aware of the facts he would know that a very large number of these sponsored immigrants have become established in a whole series of useful occupations and have made a useful contribution to this country.

The admission of unskilled immigrants to Canada in the past was due to deliberate government policy of selection, when it was thought advisable to seek unskilled labour to do some of the jobs Canadians did not care to do. I protest that Mr. Sedgwick's suggestion would practically eliminate considerations of family obligation and humanity, from our immigration policy.

In my view an attempt to base our immigration policy solely on economic considerations and to eliminate family and humanitarian considerations would be unworthy of Canada. It would, for example, prevent sons or daughters bringing their aged parents to this country, though they might well be in a position to do so. It would prevent the possibility of a successful immigrant bringing over his children, if they were over 21, or his grandparents, or orphaned children from Hong Kong—a case I have in mind.

The whole trouble is that Mr. Sedgwick maintains a restrictionist mentality. He keeps on saying that no alien has a right to come to Canada. He ignores the clear intention of parliament, as expressed in the present act, to give a limited statutory right to persons who are qualified and who do not fall within the prohibitions in the act or in the regulations. He apparently does not know that this has been pronounced by the Chief Justice of Canada who specifically referred, in one particular case, to the statutory right to bring qualified persons to Canada.

I hope the minister will give us an assurance that the government has no intention of preventing Canadian citizens who have the means to do so from bringing close relatives to Canada other than husbands, wives and minor children. If he gives this undertaking he will relieve a great deal of anxiety, for there are many people in Canada who look forward to bringing members of their family here when the time comes to do so. I hope the minister will use his good judgment in accepting the good parts of the report and rejecting the bad parts, which include the basic philosophy that parliament has given no rights in the field of immigration.

In my view, Mr. Speaker, a generous humanitarian immigration policy is not only in accordance with humanity but is also in Canada's own best interests. I hope the minister will be able to give us assurances on this matter.

[*Translation*]

Hon. Jean Marchand (Minister of Citizenship and Immigration): Mr. Speaker, as I mentioned this afternoon, following the

Sedgwick report, the Department of Citizenship and Immigration prepared a brief which has now been submitted to the cabinet.

The point he raised is extremely important. I know to what extent it can affect a great number of Canadians. It is a point we shall consider very earnestly and closely. Unfortunately, I cannot give him the assurance he is asking for tonight without prejudice to the cabinet's decision. I do not think I should give any further reasons. The hon. member for Greenwood (Mr. Brewin) understands very well that in the house, outside the cabinet, I cannot commit myself on behalf of the government.

We have based ourselves on two criteria: professional skills and qualifications, and the second one, sponsorship, that is, by the immigrant in Canada who, according to our statutes, was entitled to send for his relatives. I believe that the second point, namely, sponsorship, should remain one of the basic criteria of our immigration to Canada.

We are not accepting machines, they are men with problems, men with relatives. In short, this might seem a bit ridiculous, but if Canada needs an engineer and finds one in Germany, if the latter finds out after getting here that he is unable to send for his mother whom he was supporting back in Germany—some provisions may seem very harsh, but at any rate this is a very sensitive matter and I regret to be unable to give him the assurance he is asking for.

On the other hand, I can assure him that I shall consider with a great deal of attention the remarks he made tonight.

[*English*]

LABOUR CONDITIONS—ATLANTIC REGION—STEPS TO IMPROVE UNEMPLOYMENT SITUATION

Mr. Deputy Speaker: The hon. member for Queens.

Mr. Heath Macquarrie (Queens): Mr. Speaker, I note that neither the Minister of Labour nor his parliamentary secretary is present. I assume this is inadvertent rather than studied discourtesy. I will address myself to one of the minister's colleagues, in this case.

Time after time we have read with anxiety and concern the unemployment figures which reveal that in the Atlantic area the unemployment index stands at twice the national average. Figures released today show 10.9 as against 3.2 and 3.4 for Ontario and for the Prairies. These regional disparities are not and should not be the concern of only those who come from the Atlantic region; they should be of concern to the whole national economy.

• (10:10 p.m.)

As the Economic Council so rightly points out in page after page, it is one of their great priorities, as they see it, to do something to rectify the imbalance. So, if the Prime Minister were here and recalled his admonition to the hon. member for Cumberland (Mr. Coates) to be grateful for what the government had done, we would say in reply that this is not one area which makes us burst with gratitude. There has been insufficient attention to this problem, and on occasion definite acts and actions have aggravated and exacerbated the difficulty, such as the closing down of the enamel heating plant at Charlottetown, the closing down of the naval training centres, and the failure to move with rapidity on the much heralded $25 million grant to the ailing mining industry of Cape Breton, something with which my colleagues from the other island have acquainted the house many, many times. I should not like to bewail the past, but to urge whichever minister is going to reply and is going to take an interest in this matter that he, or the Minister of Labour (Mr. Nicholson), set out in terms of high priority an effort to remove the Atlantic region from this painful and persistent economic inequity which we have undergone for so long. I should like him to move forward on many fronts in co-operation with his colleagues in an effort to do something about this chronic state of high unemployment.

I could suggest to him that he seek to motivate his colleague, the Minister of Forestry (Mr. Sauvé), to get ARDA finally off the ground. I could suggest that the Minister of Industry (Mr. Drury) finally move and make the whole region a designated area under his legislation.

I might suggest, too, let us use a little imagination and realize that certain anti-inflationary measures in other parts of the country are just as possible of being helpful to the Atlantic region. We need further acceleration of certain building projects. This is something that can be done without alteration to legislation, but with a little more common sense in administration. We want building projects further accelerated, not retarded; and the Minister of Public Works (Mr.

McIlraith) could be very helpful in this regard. We would like national establishments to be centred more in the Atlantic region, and the federal government can assist in the decentralization of industry. I should like more attention paid to our natural trading advantages.

Finally I invite the government to look upon this very painful situation, this blot upon the economic façade of a great and prosperous country, and to call in others. This is a great government for conference and inquiry. I ask that it get together with the Atlantic premiers, who are setting a fine pattern of co-operation. I should like the government to call a meeting with the premiers, with the Atlantic Provinces Economic Council and the Atlantic Development Board, which should have a great increase in its capital fund. I should like them to call a meeting with the appropriate ministers of the Atlantic region, and there are only three of them now. I should like to see the minister look upon this one area as something in connection with which he, in his term of office, can show imaginative leadership and vigorous action. In this way he may do something about it, so that month after month we will not find the Atlantic provinces, where confederation began and whose presence in this was absolutely necessary, with these economic inequities under which we have laboured for 98 years.

I hope the minister will show some appreciative and appreciable area of amelioration and call upon the government to do these things. I am not interested in the Atlantic region aspect. I do not make comparisons with the circumstances of 1957, although they could be made; but I do say, in the name of the Atlantic region and, more particularly, in the name of a strong united Canada: Let us have some action.

[*Translation*]

Hon. Jean Marchand (Minister of Citizenship and Immigration): Mr. Speaker, this question can only be answered by the cabinet, because economic development involves not only the Department of Citizenship and Immigration or Manpower, but also the Department of Labour, and the Department of Finance, the Departments of Industry, Agriculture and Forestry. Indeed, I think the whole cabinet is concerned.

Therefore, I shall set aside the remarks that were made and simply try to give a few ideas I have on the subject.

Among them, one I feel is of such significance, that among problems facing Canada some could, at a given time, bring about the dislocation of the country. Among these are not only the language problems and the problems of relations between ethnic groups, there are also the economic problems.

Canada, to my mind, cannot survive with areas not progressing at the same rate, or nearly at the same rate if you will, as the overall prosperity manifest in the rest of the country. In other words, for a country to hold together, the spread between the lowest and highest incomes must not be too large, as otherwise dislocation eventually occurs.

When the Maritimes are mentioned, I think it is justified, but a large part of Quebec should also be included, I mean everything south and east of Quebec City which economically, is more closely related to the economy of New Brunswick, Nova Scotia and Prince Edward Island than to the general economy of Montreal and Ontario.

In any case, we really have a major problem here and I do not know what the budget holds in store for us, since even when you are a member of the cabinet, you are not told about all the secrets contained in the budget.

I do hope that the budget will take into account the points that were made and which, in my opinion, were very sound.

[*English*]

Motion agreed to and the house adjourned at 10.20 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS

Friday, March 18, 1966

The house met at 11 a.m.

PRIVILEGE

MRS. MACINNIS—LISTING OF FEMALE MEMBERS OF COMMITTEES

Mrs. Grace MacInnis (Vancouver-Kingsway): Mr. Speaker, I rise on a question of privilege. As a member of a minority group in this house my question concerns the privileges of this minority. It has to do with the way in which the names of the members of committees are listed every Wednesday in *Hansard* and elsewhere. It also concerns the way in which the voting records are kept.

You will notice, Mr. Speaker, that first of all the committee chairman is listed, and then the vice chairman. Then within the all-embracing framework of the word "Messrs." are listed the committee members. The names of the women members—I use that term as a result of some of the atmosphere that still lingers, I imagine, after our experiences in the past two weeks—are picked out in the committee listings as though they were something accidental and perhaps not likely to recur.

I know, Mr. Speaker, that the presence of women in this house this past while may have been accidental and we hope their presence will not recur in that particular form. But I do suggest that women have been members of this house for long enough now to be considered as lady members of committees instead of having their names put in the list haphazardly like raisins in a pudding, as though to signify that they are something less than full members.

• (11:10 a.m.)

I do not know just how this is going to be done, but I do feel that in the wisdom and the great impartiality that you have shown—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

Mrs. MacInnis (Vancouver-Kingsway): —ways may be found to list the women—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. That matter will be considered by the Chair.

EXTERNAL AFFAIRS

NATO—TABLING OF AIDE MEMOIRE FROM FRANCE TO CANADA

Hon. Paul Martin (Secretary of State for External Affairs): Mr. Speaker, I wish to table copies in English and in French of an aide memoire sent to the government of Canada by the government of France, dated March 10, with regard to matters having to do with the North Atlantic Treaty Organization.

Mr. Diefenbaker: Is this the one I have been requesting?

Mr. Speaker: Does the minister have leave to table the document to which he has just referred?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

[*Translation*]

IMMIGRATION

RESTRICTIONS ON CANADIAN WORKERS ENTERING U.S.

Hon. Jean Marchand (Minister of Citizenship and Immigration): Mr. Speaker, on February 24, in reply to a question asked by the hon. member for Mégantic (Mr. Langlois), I said that I would table the correspondence with the American consulate about Canadians who are going to the United States to work.

I am not tabling that correspondence but the regulations which were sent to me the day before yesterday. The hon. member for Carleton (Mr. Bell) mentioned that I had not tabled the correspondence as I had said I would, but after checking the file I noticed that I received those documents from our embassy in the United States through the Department of External Affairs, and unfortunately the document cannot be tabled.

So, I made a mistake, that is the correspondence was not exchanged with the American consulate but with our embassy in Washington.

INDUSTRIAL RELATIONS AND DISPUTES INVESTIGATION ACT

AMENDMENT TO DEFINE "BARGAINING UNIT"

Mr. Maurice Allard (Sherbrooke) moved for leave to introduce Bill No. C-148, entitled an

Act to amend the Industrial Relations and Disputes Investigation Act.

Some hon. Members: Explain.

Mr. Allard: This bill results from the present conflict between the C.N.T.U. and the C.B.C. about a decision of the Canada Labour Relations Board.

The purpose of this bill is to amend the Industrial Relations and Disputes Investigation Act so that a negotiation unit may be recognized both at the regional and the national level.

Motion agreed to and bill read the first time.

[*English*]

ADMINISTRATION OF JUSTICE

STEVEN TRUSCOTT—REQUEST FOR INVESTIGATION

On the orders of the day:

Right Hon. J. G. Diefenbaker (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, in the absence of the Minister of Justice and the Solicitor General I should like to direct a question to the Prime Minister. While ordinarily the administration of justice falls under provincial jurisdiction, where the death sentence is imposed there is of course the right and the duty of the Governor in Council to review and determine on commutation or not, as the case may be, because of the revelations made in a book by Mrs. LeBourdais, which is about Steven Truscott's trial and the circumstances surrounding it, in the interests of justice and so that justice not only may be done but may seem to have been done, would the Prime Minister give consideration to an investigation into this matter, by way of royal commission or otherwise, to ascertain the true facts, in keeping with what has been done recently in the United Kingdom in the Evans murder case?

Right Hon. L. B. Pearson (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, I have already discussed this case with the Solicitor General, who has told me there is a report to be made in regard to it. I would prefer to reserve any comment on what the government may suggest is desirable or otherwise with respect to further action until I have seen this report. I am informed that it will not be many days before the report will be ready.

[Mr. Allard.]

FINANCE

GUIDE LINES—INSTRUCTIONS TO U.S. SUBSIDIARIES

On the orders of the day:

Mr. T. C. Douglas (Burnaby-Coquitlam): I wish to direct a question to the Minister of Finance. In view of the widespread interest in the announcement the minister made the day before yesterday about certain Canadian economic guide lines, I should like to ask the hon. gentleman whether these guide lines will cover the securities of Canadian subsidiaries of United States corporations and, if not, why no attempt is being made to block this loophole by means of which capital could be raised in Canada for investment in third countries.

Hon. Mitchell Sharp (Minister of Finance): I am not certain that I completely understood the question put by the hon. gentleman. In the announcement I made the other day I was concerned with the possible flow of capital from Canada and, therefore, from North America, because of our access to the American market, to be used in foreign countries for the financing of foreign projects. It seemed to us that my request was in the national interest as a means of defending not only the Canadian capital market but the North American capital market. As I said at the time, this was done after discussion with the United States; indeed, the United States itself welcomed those measures.

We did not feel it was necessary to go any further than that at the present time. As far as Canadian subsidiaries of United States companies are concerned, companies which might be raising money in this market, it was believed—and this belief has now been strengthened as a result of discussions we had with the United States when Canadian cabinet ministers met with United States secretaries—that Canadian subsidiaries would act in a normal way and as good Canadian citizens.

Therefore, as I said, we did not feel there was any loophole to be plugged. I would add, however, that the government is giving consideration to reinforcing the advice which has been given to these companies as a result of the discussions we had in Washington, by trying to define what constitutes good Canadian citizenship on the part of subsidiaries.

Mr. Douglas: A supplementary question. Is there anything in the economic guide lines which would prevent the Canadian subsidiary

of a United States corporation raising capital in the Canadian market for use outside Canada?

Mr. Sharp: No, there is nothing specific in the request I made the other day, nor do we anticipate that special provision will be necessary. If it were we would certainly act.

Mr. Colin Cameron (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands): The other day the minister made mention of discouraging the issuance of bonds in Canada by foreign borrowers. I wonder whether he could tell us what type of thing he has in mind as to this element of discouragement. Will it be decisive? Will it stop the practice?

Mr. Sharp: I think the statement I made the other day was quite clear on this point. It defined exactly the type of security I asked Canadian investors not to buy. I know already from the reaction I have had from the investment community that they are taking this advice very seriously, but I intend to follow up in the future by finding out how much compliance there has been.

[*Later:*]

Mr. W. H. A. Thomas (Middlesex West): Mr. Speaker, I should like to pose my question to the Minister of Finance. Have copies of the letters dispatched to Canadian companies outlining Canadian guide lines, as described by the minister, been tabled or in some way put on the records of the house? If not, will the minister table copies of those letters?

Mr. Sharp: Mr. Speaker, I would be very happy to table the letter. I can inform the house that it contains mainly the statement I read in the house the day before yesterday.

TRADE

ENTRY OF U.K. INTO COMMON MARKET—EFFECT ON COMMONWEALTH AGREEMENTS

On the orders of the day:

Mr. H. A. Olson (Medicine Hat): My question is addressed either to the Secretary of State for External Affairs or to the Minister of Trade and Commerce. It arises out of the greatly increased interest in Britain's entry into the European common market on the part of the governments of both France and Britain. I should like to ask whether Canada has communicated her views to the government of Great Britain respecting this matter, particularly with respect to commonwealth trade agreements.

Hon. Paul Martin (Secretary of State for External Affairs): Mr. Speaker, the decision as to whether Britain joins the common market is, of course, one to be made by the government of Great Britain itself. My hon. friend, however, may be assured that in all matters affecting our economic relations with Britain there have been and will continue to be the closest consultations.

Mr. Olson: As a supplementary question, has the British government been in contact with the Canadian government respecting this matter, particularly as it involves the commonwealth trade agreements we have with Britain at the present time?

Mr. Martin (Essex East): There have been no such consultations within the last few days but, as I said before, there are continuous consultations between our two governments on economic matters.

INDUSTRY

HAMILTON—POSSIBLE USE OF STUDEBAKER PLANT

On the orders of the day:

Mr. Heward Grafftey (Brome-Missisquoi): Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the Minister of Industry. I would like to ask whether yesterday he received official representations in his office from officials of the city of Hamilton relating to the possibility that the Studebaker plant in Hamilton could be used beneficially in the completion of the New York safety car project.

Hon. C. M. Drury (Minister of Industry): Mr. Speaker, I did see Mayor Copps and some of his civic officials yesterday morning. The purpose of his visit was not to make representations but to explain that he and his officials would be actively exploring possibilities for the use of the plant for that purpose.

Mr. Grafftey: As a supplementary question, this week the automobile industry announced to the public that the 1967 cars will have the sporty tiger look. Has the industry informed the minister that the sporty tiger look will include safety features?

Mr. Drury: They have not so informed me, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. David Lewis (York South): Mr. Speaker, may I follow up the question just asked of the Minister of Industry, and ask whether he is merely leaving it to Mayor Copps to make the investigation or whether

the government is taking an active part in developing steps for the use of the Studebaker works in Hamilton for the production of a safety car or some other vehicle, under public ownership if necessary.

Mr. Drury: Mr. Speaker, I think the hon. gentleman asked a similar type of question a few days ago, and I do not think I really have anything further to add in respect to the matter of public ownership. I do reassure him, however, that the government is taking active steps to secure some form of utilization not only of the Studebaker plant but of its personnel.

Mr. Lewis: As a further supplementary question, when there are people out of work and the plant is shut down, how long does it take for these steps to be taken?

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

EXTERNAL AFFAIRS

NATO—REPLY TO AIDE MEMOIRE FROM FRANCE

On the orders of the day:

Right Hon. J. G. Diefenbaker (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, in connection with the tabling of the aide memoire of General de Gaulle's message to Canada and to the other nations joined together in NATO, I would ask the Secretary of State for External Affairs whether there has been any reply on behalf of Canada to this aide memoire, containing as it does those things that were revealed in the Sunday edition of the New York *Times* on March 13. At the same time, because of the great importance of this message and its implications for future relations among NATO countries, would the minister consider that this should not only be tabled but made a part of *Votes and Proceedings*, so that it may be readily seen by anyone wanting to study it?

Hon. Paul Martin (Secretary of State for External Affairs): Mr. Speaker, I hope the house may concur in the suggestion that the aide memoire I have tabled might be made an appendix to today's *Hansard*. There has been a reply to the letter addressed to the United States. Other countries, however, have not yet replied. Canada has not made its reply to this note. NATO members are meeting today, and pursuant to an agreement, which I hope will be reached between all the other members of NATO, there will be a statement made, perhaps over the week end, by heads of governments.

[Mr. Lewis.]

There can be no doubt about the position of Canada. We affirm our belief in collective security, our belief in the principle of military integration, and we express our satisfaction that the French government, as the note reveals, does not intend to denounce the treaty.

Mr. Diefenbaker: Mr. Speaker, I have a supplementary question. Does the minister not go a little far in saying that the French government does not intend to denounce the treaty but simply gives notice that the treaty will continue to the end of its period, but that France's attitude from now on will be that any integration in the manner of today on the part of the various nations sending troops to France would be an invasion of France's sovereignty?

Mr. Martin (Essex East): No, Mr. Speaker. The note I have tabled indicates that the French government do not intend to take advantage of the provision in the treaty for denounciation in 1969. They propose to continue in the alliance, but they do ask for the removal of bases and for action regarding other provisions which they believe to be contrary to the sovereignty of France.

Mr. Andrew Brewin (Greenwood): Mr. Speaker, may I ask a supplementary question. I wonder whether I might ask the Secretary of State for External Affairs whether, when the Canadian reply is available, he will table it in the house. Second, in view of the fact that the French aide memoire makes it clear that Canada will be asked to remove her units, installations and bases in France, have any negotiations been entered into with any other European country to transfer these bases and installations to any other country in Europe?

Mr. Martin (Essex East): There are discussions taking place, as I said, among the permanent representatives of the countries which compose NATO. The modalities have yet to be decided on, but these questions now are being examined, in respect of where the forces shall be relocated. This is a very large operation which can not be planned within the ten days since the announced decision of the government of France.

Mr. Speaker: Do I understand correctly that the aide memoire is to be made an appendix to today's *Hansard*?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

[*Editor's note: For text of document above referred to, see appendix.*]

NATIONAL PARKS

BANFF—REPORTED POLLUTION OF BOW RIVER

On the orders of the day:

Mr. Eldon M. Woolliams (Bow River): Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct a question to the Minister of Northern Affairs and National Resources. Would the minister immediately check into the matter of the pouring of raw sewage by the C.P.R. and other operators at Banff, into the Bow river? This is causing pollution of the Bow river which is affecting the health of about half a million people in the city of Calgary and the district surrounding that city.

Hon. Arthur Laing (Minister of Northern Affairs and National Resources): I am a little unhappy that Calgary and Banff appear to point to one another as culprits. We have made a decision to construct a modern sewage treatment plant at Banff, and thereafter the effluent put into the Bow river will not be harmful to anyone. The engineering work will be undertaken in the year immediately ahead of us.

DEFENCE PRODUCTION

R.C.A.F. OVERHAUL AND REPAIR CONTRACTS

On the orders of the day:

Hon. D. S. Harkness (Calgary North): Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the Minister of Defence Production whether he now is in a position to answer the questions I asked him last week in respect of the R.C.A.F. overhaul and repair contracts.

Hon. C. M. Drury (Minister of Industry): Mr. Speaker, I regret that I do not have the information here. I will bring it forward on Monday.

INDIAN AFFAIRS

COURT DECISION RESPECTING PROVISION OF MEDICAL CARE

On the orders of the day:

Mr. Frank Howard (Skeena): Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct a question to either the Minister of Northern Affairs and National Resources or the Minister of National Health and Welfare, whichever minister may have this matter under his jurisdiction. My question relates to a decision which I understand is known as the medicine chest case concerning the native Indians in Saskatchewan, which decision in effect reversed the decision of the lower courts. May I ask the government or the Minister of National Health and Welfare whether the government intends to take any steps to promote or assist in an appeal of this decision?

Mr. Speaker: Order. It is very difficult for the Chair to decide how urgent this question is. Apparently there is a question of an appeal, which might indicate that the matter is urgent in some way, and if there has been a decision made perhaps we should allow the minister to answer the question.

Hon. A. J. MacEachen (Minister of National Health and Welfare): Mr. Speaker, the government has not given any consideration to any action following the decision, but I will be glad to keep the hon. gentleman informed.

Mr. Howard: I have a supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Will the minister, when he is considering this question, give consideration also to the prospect of action, either administrative or governmental, to provide these people with the necessary medical services in the spirit of the treaty without the necessity of an appeal process?

Mr. MacEachen: I will be glad to consider that suggestion.

INDUSTRY

COPPER—STEPS TO PREVENT PRICE INCREASES

On the orders of the day:

Mr. A. D. Hales (Wellington South): Mr. Speaker, I should like to direct a question to the Minister of Trade and Commerce. In view of the action taken by President Johnson to keep the price of copper low in the United States, what steps does the minister propose to take to keep the Canadian price from spiralling? Canadian manufacturers using copper are finding it very difficult to compete with their United States counterparts.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. I suggest that this question is not so urgent that it could not be placed on the order paper.

NATIONAL DEFENCE

CYPRUS—ROTATION OF CANADIAN FORCES

On the orders of the day:

Mr. George Muir (Lisgar): Mr. Speaker, I should like to address my question to the Minister of National Defence. In view of the statement made yesterday by the Secretary of State for External Affairs regarding the Cyprus situation, is it the intention of the government to further rotate units serving in Cyprus and, if so, what units will be affected?

Hon. Paul Hellyer (Minister of National Defence): Mr. Speaker, that is our intention.

The units involved were mentioned and recorded in *Hansard* a few days ago in reply to a hypothetical question which was posed that day. The hypothesis has now been removed.

INQUIRIES OF THE MINISTRY

On the orders of the day:

Mr. David Orlikow (Winnipeg North): Mr. Speaker, I should like to direct a question to the Prime Minister. Is he aware of the statement made by the Minister of Agriculture to the effect that before a member of parliament is called to the cabinet the Prime Minister requests a complete report on him from the secret police, and that this report contains information on all aspects of the life of the candidate, even regarding his romantic affairs?

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

Hon. Michael Starr (Ontario): Mr. Speaker, I wish to direct a question to the right hon. Prime Minister, asking him whether his attention has been drawn to the disorganization of the cabinet benches yesterday as a result of which this house had to recess for two hours. Will he assure us that we will not meet this situation again?

Some hon. Members: Order.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

Right Hon. L. B. Pearson (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, the recess yesterday was, of course, in honour of St. Patrick's day.

Mr. MacInnis (Cape Breton South): I have a supplementary question.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. The question was not allowed by the Chair, so a supplementary question cannot be asked.

Mr. Donald MacInnis (Cape Breton South): Mr. Speaker, the hon. member for Ontario asked a question which the Prime Minister answered. I should like now to ask him to consider the breakdown yesterday of cabinet solidarity, and whether he will explain the absence of 12 members of the cabinet today?

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

HOUSING

REPORTED SHORTAGE OF MORTGAGE MONEY

On the orders of the day:

Mr. Reid Scott (Danforth): Mr. Speaker, if you will allow me I should like to direct a question to the Minister of Labour, who is

[Mr. Hellyer.]

responsible to the house for housing matters. In view of a statement made by the president of the National House Builders Association that the industry faces the danger of a critical stoppage in production due to the shortage of mortgage money, can the minister say whether the government is prepared to resume its role of direct lending in order to assure that there will be an adequate flow of mortgage money for this industry?

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. I suggest to the hon. member that this is a general question of policy which should not be asked at this time.

EXTERNAL AFFAIRS

REQUEST FOR STATEMENT ON PROPOSED CULTURAL EXCHANGES

On the orders of the day:

Mr. Barry Mather (New Westminster): Mr. Speaker, I should like to direct my question to the Secretary of State for External Affairs. Bearing in mind the agreement announced yesterday between the U.S.A. and the U.S.S.R. which provides for an extended program of cultural exchanges between both countries, I wonder whether the minister will undertake to make a statement some time soon in regard to what Canada and the U.S.S.R. are doing in this field.

Hon. Paul Martin (Secretary of State for External Affairs): Yes, sir.

Mr. Howard Johnston (Okanagan-Revelstoke): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Secretary of State for External Affairs. Many Canadians will have read with interest the announcement of the cultural and technical accord signed with Algeria. Is this the first of a series of accords, anticipating future similar agreements with Morocco and Tunisia?

Mr. Martin (Essex East): Mr. Speaker, as my hon. friend knows the government has been expanding its cultural arrangements with the French speaking countries in Africa and with the French speaking countries in Europe.

FISHERIES

REPORT OF INQUIRY INTO FRESH WATER FISH MARKETING

On the orders of the day:

Hon. H. J. Robichaud (Minister of Fisheries): Mr. Speaker, yesterday the hon. member for Selkirk asked me whether the chairman of the commission of inquiry into fresh water fish marketing had submitted a report. In my

reply I stated that I understood a preliminary report had been received. What I should have said is that a transcript of the minutes of public hearings has been received.

CANADIAN CENTENNIAL

INQUIRY AS TO ORGANIZATION OF YOUTH PARLIAMENT

On the orders of the day:

Mr. L. M. Brand (Saskatoon): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Secretary of State, but in her absence perhaps I can direct it to her parliamentary secretary. Would he advise the house whether any proposals for Canada's centennial youth parliament, other than that from Mr. William Fair, have been received by the minister's department? In view of the urgency of commencing organizational work on this project, has consideration been given to setting up a parliamentary committee to assist the centennial commission in organizing this youth parliament?

Mr. Albert Béchard (Parliamentary Secretary to Secretary of State): Mr. Speaker, I will take this question as notice.

CANADA ASSISTANCE PLAN

INQUIRY AS TO INTRODUCTION OF LEGISLATION

On the orders of the day:

Mr. Stanley Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Mr. Speaker, I should like to direct a question to the Prime Minister. In view of the fact that the government has stated on several occasions that the Canada assistance plan would come into effect on April 1, which is only two weeks from now, can the Prime Minister say what are the government's intentions regarding this legislation?

Right Hon. L. B. Pearson (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, our intention is to bring this forward to the house just as quickly as possible. My hon. friend will realize that in view of the developments of the last two months the April 1 date does not seem now to be very practical.

Mr. Knowles: I have a supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. In view of the general belief that parliament is now back to work, will the government consider putting a number of items of legislation on the order paper so we may have them before us, such as medicare.

Mr. G. L. Chatterton (Esquimalt-Saanich): Mr. Speaker, is it the government's intention to refer the Canada assistance plan to a standing committee of the house or a joint committee of the Senate and the house?

Mr. Pearson: Mr. Speaker, the government's intention in that regard will be made known when the bill is before the house.

CANADIAN BROADCASTING CORPORATION

APPEARANCE ON PROGRAM OF REPORTED VIET CONG SYMPATHIZER

On the orders of the day:

Hon. Marcel Lambert (Edmonton West): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Prime Minister. Is the government aware of the presence in Canada of a self styled Viet Cong sympathizer by the name of Ramsey, of American origin, who has been brought to Canada by the C.B.C. at C.B.C. expense to air his views on a week end television program? If so, what consideration is being given to these activities?

Right Hon. L. B. Pearson (Prime Minister): No, Mr. Speaker; but I will be glad to look into the matter, as I am not familiar with it.

Mr. Lambert: I have a supplementary question. Do we as Canadians have to aid and abet a modern day Lord Haw Haw or, as someone has put it, an unwashed Tokyo Rose?

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

HOUSE OF COMMONS

REQUEST FOR REPORT OF COMMITTEE ON ELECTION EXPENSES

On the orders of the day:

Mr. H. A. Olson (Medicine Hat): Mr. Speaker, I should like to ask the right hon. Prime Minister whether he has received a report from the special committee set up to look into the matter of federal election expenses. If so, can he give some indication when this report will be made available to members of the house?

Right Hon. L. B. Pearson (Prime Minister): No, I have not received it yet. However, I understand that the commission has completed its work and I am informed that the report should be available, I hope in both languages, very very shortly.

Inquiries of the Ministry

[*Translation*]

GRAIN

MONTREAL—ALLEGED DISCRIMINATION BY WHEAT BOARD

On the orders of the day:

Hon. Théogène Ricard (Saint-Hyacinthe-Bagot): Mr. Speaker, I should like to put a question to the Minister of Finance.

In view of the fact that the arbitrary restrictions imposed by the Canadian Wheat Board as issued on February 7 last in the memorandum of the board secretary are causing serious economic prejudice to the interests of Montreal harbour, does the minister intend to allow the Montreal Harbour Board or its representatives to appeal from these discriminatory measures against Montreal harbour?

[*English*]

Hon. Mitchell Sharp (Minister of Finance): Mr. Speaker, this matter has been under discussion in government circles from the time we received these protests. We are still in the process of examining them, but the tentative decision we have now reached—and I say this so there will not be any expectation which might be disappointed—is that we will not change the present regulations.

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE

REQUEST FOR COMMITTEE CONSIDERATION OF BILL C-145

On the orders of the day:

Mr. Frank Howard (Skeena): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Fisheries. Inasmuch as his departmental estimates will be going before the standing committee on fisheries, would the minister now consider referring to that committee for study the bill which was introduced the other day, namely Bill C-145, dealing with commercial fisheries?

Mr. Speaker: Order. This matter does not seem to be urgent, and I do not think the question should be accepted at this time.

FINANCE

REQUEST FOR TABLING OF AIDE MEMOIRE ON U.S. GUIDE LINES

On the orders of the day:

Mr. T. C. Douglas (Burnaby-Coquitlam): Mr. Speaker, may I ask the Secretary of State for External Affairs whether he will now consider tabling the aide memoire which was sent to the United States government regarding the S.E.C. regulations with respect to the American economic guide lines?

[Mr. Pearson.]

Hon. Paul Martin (Secretary of State for External Affairs): Yes, Mr. Speaker.

SCIENCE COUNCIL OF CANADA

PROVISION FOR ESTABLISHMENT AND DEFINITION OF DUTIES

The house resumed, from Thursday, March 17, consideration in committee of the following resolution—Mr. Drury—Mr. Batten in the chair:

That it is expedient to introduce a measure for the establishment of a Science Council of Canada and to define the duties thereof, to provide for the appointment of the chairman and other members of the council and for the payment of the remuneration of the chairman and of travelling expenses of the members and associate members of the council, also for the payment of the remuneration of members of the council for additional duties; to provide further that all expenditures for the purposes of this measure shall be paid out of money appropriated by parliament therefor.

Mr. Schreyer: Mr. Chairman, I would just like a few more minutes to conclude the remarks I was making last evening on this resolution.

I was saying, Mr. Chairman, just before the ten o'clock adjournment that the effort being put by the Canadian government into science research, and indeed the support of our academic centres vis-à-vis science research, did not compare very well with the effort put into this same field by the governments of other industrial nations. I concluded my remarks by reading into the record a letter which I believe could be typical of the attitude of many of our graduate students when they find themselves having to move to the United States; not so much because the salaries are better, although that is one reason, but usually because there is greater opportunity for them in their chosen scientific careers across the border.

It is often said, Mr. Chairman, that when making a comparison between Canada and the United States the ratio which should be used is ten to one; that whatever is being done in the United States should be achieved by Canada in the order of one tenth of the accomplishment. Now, it is true that sometimes comparisons are odious and invidious, but from time to time it is necessary for us to make comparisons in order to see how we measure up to progress and efforts made by other nations. When one compares the efforts in our Canadian graduate schools with the United States graduate schools, we find we are lagging behind.

I have some data, Mr. Chairman, which I believe will be of interest. This is taken from the first report of the Economic Council of Canada, and the report makes the observation that Canadian universities produce one doctoral degree for every 33 degrees granted in the United States. This is entirely out of proportion to our population ratio and is out of proportion to our national income levels, Mr. Chairman. Therefore on both counts it is fairly obvious that we are lagging behind in so far as science research effort is concerned.

Some sources put the ratio in the order of $100 expended on science research in the United States, both at the universities and in industry, while only $1 is expended in Canadian research, which is a fantastic discrepancy, Mr. Chairman. This ratio, if allowed to continue for long, will simply mean that with each passing year our rate of economic growth and industrial productivity will continue to lag behind even more the advanced and developed nations.

It seems to me, Mr. Chairman, that in addition to a science advisory council, which is now before us, the government should seriously consider greater financial support to our major universities which will enable them to expand their graduate school science research programs. This is not all that should be done with regard to our university graduate research centres. This government should also be assisting industry in expanding its science research capability, which may have to be done on a co-operative basis.

Last year, for example, the Ontario Research Foundation recommended the establishment in this country of a system of research associations integrated at the national level for the purpose of undertaking research for companies within industrial fields. These industrial research associations could presumably be integrated and co-ordinated by the federal government, and if necessary the federal government could establish a crown corporation with somewhat the same purpose as the Rand Corporation in the United States, a publicly owned think factory, if you like, which in addition to carrying out its own science research could also act as a co-ordinating agency for a system of research associations in different parts of the country.

• (11:50 a.m.)

Whatever approach is adopted, one thing that is clear is that the government of Canada must certainly do a good deal more than it has done up to now in providing leadership and a means of co-ordinating our research efforts, as well as in providing a greater degree of financial support.

We find when making comparisons between our effort here and that in other countries, so far as industrial science is concerned, that Canada compares very poorly indeed. I have before me a chart published by the Ontario Research Foundation and which was later published in a Canadian electronics periodical in September last year. This chart shows that a small industrial nation like Belgium, for example, is able to sustain 55 industrial research associations, to support which the industrial firms pay up to 60 per cent of the cost with the government paying 30 per cent. In West Germany there are 61 industrial research co-ordinating associations or agencies, if you like, again with industry supporting over 60 per cent of the cost and the government over 30 per cent. In Sweden there are 27 such research associations with industry paying 75 per cent of the cost and the government over 20 per cent.

How does Canada compare, Mr. Chairman? Canada has two such industrial research associations which, according to this chart, are entirely supported by industry; there is no government support. Of course in relatively recent times the government has given some assistance to industrial research by way of tax write-offs and concessions, so we are making some progress.

It is pretty difficult to make a precise forecast, Mr. Chairman, without going into a great deal of detail, but one thing which does become eminently clear as we delve into this subject more and more is this. Science research in our academic graduate schools is not being supported by the government of this country to a sufficient degree, and our effort compares poorly with the effort put forth by other countries. In addition, the research carried on in our academic institutions and in Canadian industry leaves a great deal to be desired, not in terms of quality, Mr. Chairman, but in terms of personnel and actual quantity of programs being undertaken.

With those remarks, Mr. Chairman, I will conclude at this time, although I think it must be pointed out once again to the minister and to this administration that we can talk all we like about industrial productivity, but when our industrial research is lagging behind other exporting countries not only are we not going to make up any lag or deficiency; we will slip further behind.

Science Council of Canada

Mr. Johnston: Mr. Chairman, my remarks will be brief. We welcome the proposal to set up a science council and its proposed function as an advisory body. We also appreciate the outline of its duties presented to us by the minister last evening, when he spoke of it having the task of defining long range objectives in science for Canada, when he spoke of developing principles in research, and when he spoke of philosophy. Possibly he should have introduced an additional word at that time, because some of the most important decisions which will have to be taken in science research in the very immediate future will be moral ones.

There are a variety of aspects of scientific research which will increasingly concern the people of Canada. We trust that one of the functions of this advisory body will be to give immediate consideration to some of these issues. As an example of what I am talking about I might mention the proposals to synthesize various viruses, which could have far reaching implications for the future of human life on earth. That is only one of a great many problems.

I think we can trust the science council—and I believe that here we are talking primarily about the science council—to give good advice to the government as far as increasing our scientific research and providing opportunities in Canada for Canadian scientists. I think the council will give that kind of advice. These are the things which must be done, the things which are obvious, and we can expect them to give proper advice there.

The really difficult problems will arise when they come to questions of philosophy and morality in scientific research. The right answers will not always be obvious and their work will be difficult indeed. The members who compose the council will have to be chosen with the utmost care so we will have a group which will be able to give the best advice possible to the government on some of the extremely pressing problems which will come up in the future.

I prepared my remarks originally, Mr. Chairman, expecting the resolutions to be introduced the other way around, so I will have more to say on government order No. 4 when it comes up for debate.

Mr. Aiken: Mr. Chairman, I think we all accept the premise that science is necessary to our progress. This has been the tenor of the speeches which have been made to this point. I have a few questions I should like to ask the minister before the committee passes this resolution, because there are a lot of things which are not clear in connection with the necessity for the setting up of a science council.

Rather than speak of the need for further research, I should like to look at the technical aspect. In his introductory remarks the minister indicated that the role of the National Research Council is going to be altered in some way, and I assume that immediately hereafter the minister is going to introduce another resolution to change the name of the National Research Council and to make some other changes. However, before we pass the first resolution I think we ought to know what is the set-up proposed for the National Research Council.

• (12:00 noon)

I appreciate that the minister can bring in only one resolution at a time, but perhaps we should be better acquainted with the facts if we knew a little more about the proposed change in role of the N.R.C., and whether that will bring about the necessity for a science council.

Mr. Chairman, I should like to ask this question. What role can the science council that is now proposed carry out that could not be carried out by a branch of the National Research Council, which has been set up and which is a very large organized establishment? Why could not an advisory council on science, say, be incorporated as part of the National Research Council without setting up a completely new branch? I mention that because the minister said in his introductory remarks at page 2849 of *Hansard* of March 17:

> The council will be advisory only and will have no direct authority over expenditures or budgets of any government department or agency.

Therefore the first question I should like answered is why it is necessary to set up another agency of government when the procedure and means of carrying out what is suggested is with the National Research Council. I should like to know that.

Second, I should like to know to whom this new council is going to report. From what the minister said I expect that it will report to the science secretary of the Privy Council, who undoubtedly will want to refer certain matters to the National Research Council and certain matters to the different departments.

Then presumably the report will go to cabinet.

I should like to know where this proposed council is to report, and for what purpose it is to report. Is it for the purpose of over-all government policy respecting science, or is it for the narrower purpose of advising the means of achieving our scientific objectives in Canada? That is a question that we should all like to have answered. Where is this body to report, and what will be the result of that?

I wish to mention a third point. The minister has said that Dr. MacKenzie has recommended that some changes be made in the proposed set up. We have great regard for the ability of Dr. MacKenzie. I should like the minister to let us know whether what is now proposed is what Dr. MacKenzie recommended. Did he recommend the setting up of a science council in addition to the N.R.C.? Dr. MacKenzie's experience in the National Research Council is valuable to us. The minister in his introductory remarks referred to Dr. MacKenzie and said that the doctor had looked into this matter. We should like to know whether this is a proposal that Dr. MacKenzie actually recommended be carried out, and if this proposal essentially is carrying out what he has recommended.

I should also like to ask the minister what deficiencies exist in the present set up which require the addition of a science council. We have always been led to believe that the National Research Council was a leader in its field, not only in Canada but throughout the world. Great numbers of students come to Canada to take part in and observe the work of the council and the work of Atomic Energy of Canada Limited, which is closely allied with that of the council. We have been led to believe that in this country we have one of the best research councils in the world. I believe that is true. I should like to know what are the deficiencies in the present set up that bring about the need for an additional body, which is nothing more than an advisory committee. I do not want to lead the minister into making his speech on the National Research Council, but I think we should have the facts I ask for before us.

I am not against anything which will improve our scientific knowledge and our research facilities. However, I for one would like to be satisfied that we are creating something which is not presently provided for and which cannot be done under the aegis of the National Research Council, under the aegis of the Privy Council secretariat, or under the various other research groups existing in the different departments. I was always under the impression that the National Research Council largely co-ordinated the efforts of other research institutions, such as defence research and so on, although defence research to some extent is separate from other reasearch. Almost every department has its own need for research, and almost every department has its work done, in large measure, by the National Research Council, which does the requested work at the same time that work within the department itself is carried on. However, I was always under the impression that the National Research Council carried out much of that work.

The remarks I have just made cover the points I wish to draw to the minister's attention. The minister did not really answer those questions which have been put to him. I read through his introductory remarks again, and if there were answers to the questions in those remarks I was unable to find them. I should like very much, before we even consider bringing in a bill to set up a science research council, to obtain some answers as to the over-all plan for the division of duties as between this new science council and the National Research Council. Once those answers are available we shall be better able to decide on the need for the proposed council.

• (12:10 p.m.)

[*Translation*]

Mr. Allard: Mr. Chairman, the resolution before the committee is seeking to attain very worthwhile objectives.

The minister said last night in his statement that the science council would try to define long term objectives for science in Canada, including all natural sciences as well as pure and applied sciences. He also assured the house that this would be an advisory body which would only advise the government by encouraging the development of science in Canada.

I have listened to the remarks made by hon. members in the house since the minister spoke.

It is very easy to see, in the light of the opinions expressed, that this new science council of Canada is expected to take an interest in a variety of fields, namely security, public health, natural resources, productivity, education and university programs.

Those, Mr. Chairman, are fields which, in my humble opinion—and I am not afraid to be considered narrow-minded—do not come, in

the last analysis, under the jurisdiction of the federal government.

For many years, within the federal administration, I am not questioning their integrity but they have been trying to look after everything, and when they cannot come in through the front door, they do it by the back door. All indirect means are used to succeed, after a number of years and indirect precedents created here and there, in getting into fields which the Canadian constitution gave exclusively to the provinces.

Today the government wants to set up a national advisory science council. We are told: It is not going against the authority of the constitution, it is not invading the provincial field with regard to culture and education. It is only an advisory body.

But that is just it, Mr. Chairman, what advice will that body give? It will say to the federal government: It would be advisable to increase the expenditures of the federal government for grants to the universities, increased laboratory facilities, special studies, either in natural sciences or pure sciences.

The federal government will be advised to deal with matters which do not come under its jurisdiction under the Canadian constitution.

I know very well, Mr. Chairman, that when some hon. members talk of respecting the constitution, others look at them, curious, amused, saying that we are singing a tune which is utterly out of date.

But I feel that this way of doing things increases and multiplies tensions across Canada. If that is what is called co-operative federalism, I fail to see where the co-operation comes in.

For instance, have the ministers of the present government discussed with the provincial governments, at recent federal-provincial conferences on poverty or other topics, the creation of a national science council? No. A move is made, a field is entered into, and when one is strongly entrenched in it, when public funds have been spent in fields which are not allotted by the constitution to the central government, then the provinces are told: "Now, if you wish, we will co-operate".

So that is co-operative federalism? Well, Mr. Chairman, I must say that I respect that way of doing things, which has become desirable for nine provinces in Canada—I am the first to respect 1966 concepts of thought and action—but it does not reflect in any way the wishes and aspirations of Quebec and French Canada.

[Mr. Allard.]

That is why, Mr. Chairman, I say that by invading this field, through that body, we are directly, or indirectly if you wish, dealing with the fields of education and culture which, according to the Canadian constitution, come strictly under provincial jurisdiction.

I have neither the time nor the intention of developing today all the arguments that prove that the federal government has, in the last few years, intruded into sectors which do not fall within its jurisdiction. I shall merely refer the house to Vol. II, Part III, page 237 of the French version of the Tremblay Commission report, where fair and profuse answers are given to the arguments developed here in the house, and elsewhere by other people, to justify the federal government's intrusion, not only in the field of science but in all spheres.

Specific answers are given to those arguments and I urge members of the house to study the arguments put forward in answer to the following contentions with regard to the theory of ancillary powers.

The argument concerning the financial incapacity of the provinces is often heard: Ottawa will look after this, Ottawa will be in a position to help the country for the common good, because the provinces do not have the financial means to do so. It is very easy to understand, since the argument is fully explained. The provinces are unable to deal adequately, in their universities and high schools, with the development of science because the central government keeps too great a share of tax revenue in the country. It is as simple as that. That is why the central government, while not handing over to the provinces an adequate share of tax revenue, intrudes in all types of fields in which constitutional responsibility is not too well defined.

At page 237 of the same report, extensive answers are also given to four other arguments: the distinction between culture and education, the right of the government to concern itself with education, the requirements of the common good, the national role and the needs of universities.

Mr. Chairman, I do not intend to summarize all this, but hon. members who want to know why Quebec has always been very sensitive about this matter will find here substantial arguments in this connection.

Therefore, I say that the creation of a Science Council of Canada is a unilateral and indirect intrusion in the field of education. It reflects the centralizing principle which has

been applied here in Ottawa for many years, whatever governments came into power, to the effect, for instance, that Ottawa enjoys an unlimited taxation power and an absolute power to spend in its own way. But that is not true. I say that this way of proceeding infringes the federalist nature of the Canadian constitution.

That is why, Mr. Chairman, even though I understand that the situation and mentalities have undergone great changes since 1867, I submit that we are today confronted with two mentalities: the English Canadian mentality, which does not object to the fact that the central government becomes interested in all sorts of fields, such as sciences, culture, scholarships, federal loans to students and, on the other hand, the French Canadian mentality, which does not want Ottawa to be the centre of all these activities and claims jealously provincial autonomy in these important and fundamental matters.

Mr. Chairman, decisions will have to be made one of these days because of those two attitudes.

The provinces cannot be suffered to invade a jurisdiction which possibly comes under the federal nor can the latter encroach without previous consultation, agreement or constitutional reform upon a provincial jurisdiction.

We are all hugger-muggering along, creating constitutional chaos and permanent tensions in the country.

I see that the government has again been sinking into lethargy during the past month and a half.

We have asked several members on both sides of the house to set up a parliamentary committee on constitutional reform to open a dialogue, to consider the responsibilities of the federal and provincial governments in the economic and social context of 1966.

Other members have asked that this parliamentary committee appoint federal legislators who would define their views together, as a prelude to a national constitutional conference bringing together representatives of the provinces and federal legislators.

That is urgent. It is much more urgent I feel than to constantly try to create enmities on both sides of the house. Those are basic requirements in 1966.

What, then, is happening in Quebec? All kinds of organizations. Again, recently, a committee called the Canada committee was formed. That is quite an organization. There are also many people from Montreal and its vicinity who are concerned about the national interest, of this Canadian crisis which is a fact, which is serious and which originates in Quebec.

While this is going on, Mr. Chairman, here what do we do? For three or four days at a time, from both sides of the house, we pick on each other, engage in sword play, make charges on the floor of the house, indulge in all kinds of foolishness. But what about essential business? Nothing is done there.

I feel that those are urgent matters, Mr. Chairman, and therefore the government ought to set up a parliamentary committee on constitutional reforms, so that we can clearly define and exchange our views with the provinces and then adapt ourselves to the social and economic prospects of 1966.

Did the minister discuss those things with Hon. Pierre Laporte, the Quebec minister of cultural affairs? True, they relate to education. But no, such things are not mentioned. We invade every field, and when Quebec starts crying and complaining again, we say: Quebec is never satisfied.

• (12:20 p.m.)

[*English*]

Mr. Drury: Mr. Chairman, I have just been asked a question, and I might prevent the hon. gentleman from falling into error if I tell him that I have not spoken to Mr. Laporte. I have, however, spoken about this project to the minister responsible for the new Quebec research council, the minister of trade and industry, Mr. Levesque.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Allard: Mr. Chairman, whether it concerned this or that minister, the fact remains that the Minister of Industry did not tell us about the talks and negotiations on the joint effort that could be achieved between his department and the provincial department. But there is no doubt, Mr. Chairman, that this is a very delicate matter in view of the constitutional responsibilities and considering especially the consequences of the advice that the advisory council will give the federal government. That will probably lead the federal government to establish—it is probably a very clever prelude—in a few years a department of science in Canada and to justify the payment of scholarships to universities, colleges and secondary schools in practically all fields related to science.

That is why I have some reservations as to this resolution. I wish to raise these questions

precisely in order to bring them to the attention of the hon. minister, and I shall wait for the bill and its various provisions to be presented before expressing a definite opinion on the general aims of the project.

Mr. Chairman, I believe that there is always a solution to a problem. I think—as the minister seemed to indicate earlier, although we do not know of these conversations—that there should be long consultations and a close co-operation between the central and provincial governments in all these fields which were not as important in 1867, when many sciences and especially technological developments, industrial and otherwise, which are so useful today, did not exist.

Therefore, the government should take steps in this direction, not unilaterally but after consultations according to the present economic and social context; in other words, there should be constitutional reforms in this field. This is very easy and not at all complicated.

I would not wish the house to think that the government takes steps without consulting provincial representatives, including those of the province of Quebec, so as to know the opinion of that province.

[*English*]

Mr. Orlikow: Mr. Chairman, not a single hon. member could disagree with the sentiments expressed by the minister when he introduced this resolution yesterday. In view of the complaints which have been made, not only from year to year but literally from week to week, by members of the scientific community, by physicists, by the medical profession, by chemists, by agricultural scientists, and by industrial researchers about the lack of direction in scientific policies, about the amount of money provided, about the woeful lack of support for all these disciplines from Canadian governments during the last ten years, it is obvious that this kind of organization is needed.

But, Mr. Chairman, as I read the minister's remarks in *Hansard* this morning I could not help thinking I have heard this before. It is practically word for word the same speech the Prime Minister made when he announced the formation of a scientific secretariat to be headed by Dr. Forward. I think that was two years ago. Since then we have allocated a little more money for scientific research than we provided previously, but basically nothing has changed. Our scientists are still complaining, and legitimately so, about the lack of support from government. Basically they still do not know in what fields we are to concentrate our efforts, if we are to concentrate them at all. They do not know how much support they can get or expect from the government.

One thing this new organization can do, although on the basis of experience I am sceptical that it will, is define the relationships between existing organizations which do research, the relationships between the National Research Council, the Defence Research Board, the scientific secretariat, if it continues to exist, and the research which is being done and which should be done in the universities.

If this science council can do that, Mr. Chairman, then it will make a contribution; but I am sceptical about the ability of a new organization to overcome the established practices and desires of the existing agencies such as the National Research Council and the Defence Research Board. I doubt whether it will be able to make them give up any of their power, their prestige and their ability to control what is done not only by themselves but by others, and I shall go into that in some detail in a few minutes.

But even if it could do that—and this is not the time to discuss it in detail although I can tell the minister some of us will be discussing it in great detail, possibly extending over days and weeks when the estimates come before the appropriate committee—unless there is a major and revolutionary change in the thinking, in the concept of Canadian governments, federal and provincial, about the need for a tremendously expanded effort which will mean tripling and quadrupling the amount of money spent for scientific research, this country will be left far behind most of the other countries of the world.

It is easy to make the kind of speech which the minister made in vague generalities, but when we come to examine actual cases we can see how far we depart from what the minister spoke of yesterday. Some weeks ago in his capacity as a member of parliament from Montreal the minister, together with the Minister without Portfolio, sent a telegram to the government of Quebec urging it to reconsider the grants it was giving to McGill University, the university from which the minister himself graduated.

In view of that I am surprised to find that one of the most exciting, one of the most imaginative scientific research programs ever developed in Canada, conducted by the

university of which the minister is a graduate, is now in a state of utter confusion, not knowing whether it will have to close up shop or move its whole operation to the United States simply because the minister and his department have not lived up to their promise that they would let the project know about further financing by January of this year. I am referring to the project called the high altitude research program.

In this connection I wish to quote one paragraph from a series of articles evaluating this program, written by Anthony J. Patterson, which appeared in the Ottawa *Journal* in 1964:

> The significance of HARP, however, extends far beyond the gathering of weather information for scientists. Originally designed as an alternate technique to rocket firings in order to send probes to heights of 100 miles and above, the gun is now being talked about for everything from orbital shots to defence against ICBM attack.

• (12:30 p.m.)

So far, Mr. Chairman, that project has had allocated to it in the way of funds just under $6.5 million. I am told that 60 per cent of this money came from the United States and 40 per cent from Canada. So one can see that the Canadian government has not been overly generous in financing a project in a major field which is being carried on by Canadians in a Canadian university. This HARP project has had a continuing battle on a day to day basis to know exactly what its future is. They have said—and this is information I received less than one hour ago—that they practically have run out of funds from the Canadian government. McGill University and the United States partner were promised that by January 1966 they would be told what funds would be forthcoming for the next year at least to help finance this important project. It now is March 18, and the promise to let McGill University know by January still has not been kept. They still do not know what financial assistance they can expect from the Canadian government.

So far no money has been allocated by the Canadian government, with the result that McGill University and the directors of the HARP project now have been forced, by the failure of the Canadian government not only to give them the money but also to tell them what they can expect, to try to get more money from United States government sources. The money they received from the Canadian government has come by way of grants through the Department of Defence Production. I have been told, Mr. Chairman, that a large part of the difficulty in getting any commitment from the Canadian government has been because senior officers in the Defence Research Board are hostile to this project, so much so that they have exerted pressure on McGill University to have the director dismissed. I am told that letters have gone from officials in the Defence Research Board to McGill University along this line. I am told also, Mr. Chairman, that at the lower levels in the Defence Research Board the personnel have been favourable to the HARP project, but that at the top the officials of the Defence Research Board have been carrying on a vendetta against this project and that this is the reason the money they expected to receive has not yet been committed.

What is the reason? I think the reason is what I tried to get at in the very beginning; the top officials in the Defence Research Board are antagonistic to any scientific project which has any relationship to defence unless they themselves can control it lock, stock and barrel. I am told that this has been the reason for the opposition to this project on the part of certain officials in the National Research Council. That is, they think it is a matter of civilian research and they think they should control it. This is a project which is under the control, as I think it should be, of the actual people in the universities.

Mr. Chairman, if this is what has gone on, at a time when we have had a scientific secretariat, it seems to me we have a right to ask how much things will be different when we get this science council. In connection with this federal project I am told that while we are worrying, and rightly, about the fact that we are not getting enough postgraduate people in the sciences in Canada, here is a project which up to now has had five persons working on it who are working on their Ph.D. degrees, and they are expecting 20 more to come to work for them in the next year or so; and if they cannot get the money from Canada and are not told what they can expect, the alternative will be that they will have to turn increasingly to the United States.

Who among us can say, if the United States continues to increase its contribution to this important scientific project, that at some future date they will not say that since they are paying for the whole project it might as well be removed to a United States university or some other similar facility in which they could have complete control?

Science Council of Canada

Mr. Chairman, this is just one example. I could bring many examples and show them to the minister, but I am sure he has more information than I have. I have a file which is at least a foot thick containing correspondence from persons in the scientific disciplines dealing with the same story. In 1964 I received a letter from a former Canadian who now is an associate professor of physics at the Massachusetts Institute of Technology, undoubtedly one of the top if not the top scientific institution in the United States. This person, Mr. Chairman, is in the United States because Canada could not find a place for him. It was not just a case of there not being a salary for him at some Canadian university, but that there were not the facilities available for him to carry on the research which he, like hundreds of other Canadians, would like to do.

He sent me a letter in which he mentions that in a period of less than two months he collected the names of 50 physicists from Canada who now are working in the United States. I would like to read the names of some of these former Canadians who now are in the United States. Among them are Dr. P. E. Pashler, manager of applied physics research at G.E. Research Laboratory; Dr. J. Hillier, vice president, R.C.A. Laboratories; Dr. A. H. Snell, assistant director, Oak Ridge National Laboratory; Prof. P. T. Demos, director of the Laboratory of Nuclear Science, M.I.T., and Professor L. V. Holroyd, chairman of the Physics department, University of Missouri. In his letter, Mr. Chairman, he quotes from the letters he has received from these people, all of them saying the same thing; they would have been happy to stay in Canada had this country given them the facilities and the ability to do the work they would have liked to do.

Mr. Chairman, Professor Lomon sent me a report issued by the National Acadamy of Sciences of the National Research Council in the United States which shows the number of people of foreign origin who studied for their doctorate in the United States for the years 1957-61. From North America, which means essentially from Canada, over 1,100 people studied in the United States. The minister knows, I am sure, as we all do, that people who go to the United States to study for their Ph.D. degree very often do not come back to Canada. Mr. Chairman, with the kind of thing I spoke of specifically in respect of the HARP project, and if this is typical of the Canadian attitude, it is not surprising that they do not come back to Canada.

[Mr. Orlikow.]

• (12:40 p.m.)

I want to speak for just a few minutes on a problem which is of tremendous concern to Canadians and which should be of concern to a government which has pledged to implement a plan of universal medical insurance coverage for Canadians by 1967. The Canadian Medical Association has indicated on a number of occasions that this plan really will not work. I disagree with this view, but one of the reasons advanced for that belief is simply that we do not have enough doctors in Canada. How can we have enough doctors in Canada when the medical colleges, which depend so fundamentally on professors who are interested and involved in medical research, simply have not got the people required to perform the tasks which we ask them to perform?

I could go back and refer to the Farquharson report and document it; I could go back to the MacKenzie report and document it, but let me refer to a report presented to the Prime Minister in January of this year signed by Charles Gundy and endorsed by a long list of the best known individuals in the field of medical education and medical research in Canada. This list of endorsements includes several hundred of the most distinguished medical researchers in Canada, and I should like to read a few excerpts from the report. The first is:

> Although financial support has been increasing, medical research in Canada today is being conducted on an inadequate scale.

And a little further on:

> A substantial increase in capital and operating support for medical research in Canada is needed at once. The key consideration is the creation of conditions which will encourage teacher-scientists to remain in Canada and in teaching and research; which will encourage Canadian teacher-scientists and graduates now in the United States to return to work in Canadian universities and hospitals; and which will encourage undergraduates to take up research in the medical sciences as a career. Unless a more favourable environment for medical research is provided as a matter of urgency, the skilled manpower on which all else depends will be inadequate both in quantity and quality.

I could go on and on reading from this very detailed report, but I am sure the minister has it in his possession. I should like to read from letters I have received expressing specific opinions of the better known medical research people in this country, to indicate just how disheartened they are about

medical research and the support they receive from the Canadian government. I should like to read from this letter I received from Dr. J. C. Laidlaw of the Department of Medicine of the University of Toronto. The paragraph to which I refer reads as follows:

> Dr. Mustard and I have canvassed some 80 Canadian medical research workers who are considered to be among the top men in their fields. These are the men who receive grants from the National Institutes of Health (N.I.H.) in the U.S.A. **Sixty five of the 80 men canvassed replied to the** questionnaire. Their replies indicated that on the average 50 per cent of their operating funds came from American sources.

The Chairman: Order, please. I must advise the hon. member that his allotted time has expired.

Mr. Orlikow: I wonder if I could be allowed a minute or two more to complete this quotation.

The Chairman: Does the committee give unanimous consent to the hon. member to continue?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Mr. Orlikow: Dr. Laidlaw then states:

> This is very disturbing in view of the announcement that N.I.H. support of Canadian medical research is to continue to diminish, and diminish considerably over the next five years.

I have received similar letters from Dr. Nickerson of the Department of Pharmacology of the University of Manitoba, Dr. Hoffer, director of psychiatric research of the Department of Public Health in the province of Saskatchewan and from Dr. Selye of the University of Montreal. All of these men make the same point; that what governments of Canada—not just this government, because this goes back a long time—have done to support medical research has been completely inadequate.

It has been stated, of course, that we cannot compete with the United States. Certainly we cannot compete dollar for dollar; but if you compare Canada with the United States in terms of per capita assistance to medical research you will find that the United States is spending ten times what Canada is spending. In other words the Canadian population is only one tenth of the United States population, but the United States is spending 100 times as much as Canada is spending for medical research. It is no wonder that some of the most respected, progressive and intelligent medical researchers have gone to the United States in recent years, or that more are planning to go there.

This is perhaps not the time to go into details on this subject, but I should like to close my remarks with an appeal to the minister. I hope the statement he made yesterday regarding the establishment of this science council is more than just a general statement such as many which have been made year after year by this and former governments. The government should take the lead in this country in facing up to the fact that unless we meet the needs of scientific research the whole educational system at the university level in this country, the whole science program and, indeed, the industrial base of this country will fall behind not only the United States but all other major industrial countries in the world, with the most disturbing and profound consequences to this country.

Mr. Herridge: Mr. Chairman, I am not going to speak at any length. I think I can make what general remarks I wish to make on this resolution in a very few minutes.

In view of the minister's academic, military and parliamentary record, and in view of the fact that this house is composed of a good number of members who have been bestowed with orders, decorations and degrees, I rise in a sort of humble mood to present a few ideas in support of what I consider a worth-while resolution which I trust will result in some early government action. As I said, Mr. Chairman, I trust the house will consider my remarks somewhat in the nature of fireside musings on scientific policy on the part of a comparative simpleton in this field. I do not pretend to be an expert in this regard. I am speaking as a rancher and as a member of parliament without very much knowledge of this aspect of life. However, I have given some thought to it.

Let me say first of all that I have always aimed at viewing my life as a whole in an attempt to adopt a sort of philosophy of life. My philosophy is based on four firm beliefs. The minister may look at me and think this is a bit out of order in the consideration of a resolution such as the one before us, but I think before I am finished I will have gained some measure of support.

• (12:50 p.m.)

First of all, I believe in the first clause of the old Westminster catechism, that the chief end of man is to glorify God and enjoy him forever with all the implications and manifestations surrounding that first doctrine. Second, I believe we should aim to teach all human beings a reverence for all living

things in creation. Third, I believe when men are dealing with public or private policy we cannot go very far wrong when we are considering a resolution like this which has as its basic purpose that we practice that old adage, waste not, want not. My fourth belief is that the Lord helps them who help themselves, and I trust that this resolution is directed to that end.

Now what in reality is the purpose of this science council? In my opinion it is to remedy the startling unevenness in our national life. I think we all agree with this opinion. We cannot measure our success as a society with the poor and underdeveloped nations. The only fair comparison must be that we must measure our achievements against our potentialities and capabilities.

To illustrate the very sharp contrasts which exist side by side in Canadian life, and which I trust this resolution is directed at, we must take note of homes which are comfortable and even lavish, while the facilities for public recreation in our cities are often still primitive. We spend immense sums to air condition offices and public buildings while we continue to allocate insignificant funds to eliminate the dangerous pollution of our atmosphere. Millions of dollars are spent for advertising all conceivable and sometimes unnecessary products, while at the same time we say we cannot afford to develop the necessary parks and recreational centres in the downtown sections of our cities.

More and more of our country's unparalleled natural beauty is being destroyed by thoughtless and unplanned exploitation. As an example of this let me refer to these terrible places where they dump all the used automobiles, which you find outside our cities and many of our towns. Millions of dollars are spent on pleasure craft in this country. This has come to be a status symbol. I have not been worried about status because within thirty days of your death most people have forgotten you, except your relatives and close friends. We cannot in many instances find unpolluted water where we can enjoy swimming and the other water sports. Canadians have developed a great capacity for solving mechanical problems and creating technical wonders, while at the same time we tolerate great areas of shabbiness and ugliness in our cities and our countryside which debase our lives and our culture.

I trust this resolution will provide an opportunity for the logical and moral development of our physical resources. Under the present circumstances I may say, in terms of ill health and unemployment, there is continued misuse of our human resources. This misuse is inexcusable, and I trust that under this resolution an attempt will be made to solve this waste of human resources. Let us face it. In the midst of progress and plenty for the majority we find that many live their lives in despair because they are shackled by generations of disadvantages imposed by society and by the lack of opportunity surrounding them.

Now tremendous possibilities for the application of science can be found if this resolution is acted upon in national planning for the prevention of disease, training of doctors and the provision of the physical plants in which work can be undertaken or the healing of human beings.

Now just briefly, according to figures I have received we are spending about 75 cents per capita for medical research, whereas by comparison in the United States a single agency, the National Institute of Health, spent about $5.35 per capita last year. I think this explains what can be done in this country to improve the situation with respect to the development of hospitals, medicare plans and national health. The application of science in the development of national and provincial policies, for the conservation of land, water, forests and wildlife, offers tremendous possibilities and great opportunities to this council.

However, for policies to be effective they must be understood. This requires a sound campaign of education on the part of the federal, provincial and municipal governments and organizational interest in giving effect to the policy expressed in this resolution. This legislation is a vehicle through which a national policy for the utilization of scientific methods can be provided for the development of the individual and the nation. The government has to take action to make certain of this fact.

Research into all aspects of human endeavour relating to the conservation and development of our human and natural resources is urgently required, as well as the co-ordination of that research and activity. All types of organizations in Canada are urging research in such various fields as agricultural organizations, labour organizations, organizations representing industry, various conservation groups and communities

and so on. What is required is some leadership from the federal government under the provisions of this resolution.

The Chairman: I apologize for interrupting the hon. member, but the Secretary of State for External Affairs has a statement to make and in order that he may do so the Chair will have to rise and report progress. Does the committee give unanimous consent?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Progress reported.

EXTERNAL AFFAIRS

NATO—STATEMENT RESPECTING FRENCH AIDE MEMOIRE

Mr. Speaker: Does the house give its unanimous consent to revert to motions?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Hon. Paul Martin (Acting Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, in reverting to motions I want to say to the hon. gentleman who was speaking in committee that I regret to have had to interrupt him at this stage. However, I am sure he will fully understand, and I will just be taking up a few moments.

I rise to make a declaration that is being made by fourteen countries of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization at this hour. Normally the Prime Minister would be making this statement. However, he has gone to welcome the Queen Mother, who is arriving in Ottawa at this moment.

Mr. Speaker, the government of France on March 10 delivered a note to the Canadian ambassador in Paris setting out the position of that government regarding France's future participation in NATO.

The French note which I tabled this morning states that France intends to withdraw all its remaining land and air forces still remaining under NATO command. French naval forces have already been withdrawn. France also requires the removal from French territory of all NATO military headquarters, including SHAPE itself. Finally, France requires the withdrawal of foreign forces and installations from France, unless the forces are placed under French rather than NATO operational command.

• (1:00 p.m.)

It is the view of the Canadian government that Canadian forces at the disposition of the alliance in Europe should be under the operational command of the Supreme Allied Commander. The direct implication for Canada of the French decision, therefore, is that we shall have to relinquish our air base at Marville and the air division headquarters at Metz and relocate these forces and facilities elsewhere. Other Canadian forces in Europe outside of France are not directly affected.

The French government also addressed notes to all other members of NATO. These notes are all substantially similar. The notes addressed to the United States, the Federal Republic of Germany and Canada deal additionally with matters which are the subject of bilateral agreements with France.

The French intention to withdraw from the integrated military arrangements established under NATO has been the subject of consultation among the other 14 members of the organization who have determined to maintain the integrated defence structure of the alliance. The experience of the last two world wars and modern developments in warfare permit no effective alternative to unified command and planning arrangements for allied forces. Recognizing the need for continuing these proven arrangements, Canada has today joined the other members of NATO in making the following declaration:

> The following declaration has been agreed between the heads of governments of Belgium, Canada, Denmark, the Federal Republic of Germany, Greece, Iceland, Italy, Luxembourg, The Netherlands, Norway, Portugal, Turkey, the United Kingdom and the United States of America.
>
> The North Atlantic Treaty and the organization established under it are both alike essential to the security of our countries.
>
> The Atlantic alliance has ensured its efficacy as an instrument of defence and deterrence by the maintenance in peacetime of an integrated and interdependent military organization, in which, as in no previous alliance in history, the efforts and resources of each are combined for the common security of all. We are convinced that this organization is essential and will continue. No system of bilateral arrangements can be a substitute.
>
> The North Atlantic Treaty and the organization are not merely instruments of the common defence. They meet a common political need and reflect the readiness and determination of the member countries of the North Atlantic community to consult and act together wherever possible in the safeguard of their freedom and security in the furtherance of international peace, progress and prosperity.

I would remind the house before I take my seat that the government of France in the note it has sent to Canada does not, as I said during the question period today, propose to denounce the treaty.

Statement re French Aide Memoire

Right Hon. J. G. Diefenbaker (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, the conclusion arrived at by the minister on behalf of the government of Canada will, I believe, command the support of all Canadians. There is nothing more serious than the possibility of the disintegration of an organization that has meant so much to the peace of Europe and of the world. Apparently General de Gaulle believes that the dangers of 1945, 1946, 1947 and 1948 are no longer in existence. I only wish that events which have taken place could give support to that view. We still face a terrible threat from Communist aggression, and this organization, built on unity and common safety, has done much to preserve the peace.

Let me recall the situation in the dark days of 1916 and 1917 during the first world war. When there was disunity in command there was defeat on the field of battle. It was difficult to bring the nations together at that time and it was difficult in the last war. However, it was not until unity was established that the forces of freedom were able to move forward. That unity must be preserved today.

What the declaration by the French government will mean is that we shall have to withdraw our forces from France. Supreme headquarters will be removed from Paris and our headquarters at Metz will also have to be moved.

This is an announcement that cannot but cause deep concern to all of us who believe in the necessity for an integrated command as a basis for the survival of each and all of us. There is apparently nothing that can be done to bring about any change of opinion on the part of General de Gaulle and the Republic of France. That being so, we must accept the declaration that he has made, at the same time making it clear on behalf of Canada that we believe in the continuance of NATO and that the nations of NATO shall continue to remain united.

In saying that I realize that the note states that NATO will continue, but NATO without an integrated command will be as non-existent as it is possible for that organization to be. So the remaining nations in NATO must show, with the kind of spirit that is necessary today, that they will stand together.

It is regrettable that France has taken this stand. I called it a truculent one the other day and the minister took objection to the use of the expression. It is a stand difficult to understand but it is one that we must meet by bringing into still closer relationship the remaining nations of NATO in an integrated command, at the same time doing our part to implement those portions of the NATO agreement having to do with the strengthening of economies as between nations. Indeed, what has taken place is a challenge to open up new vistas in international relationships. One of those things which I think should be carefully considered is an Atlantic community built upon the principles of equity, and common purpose, thereby assuring that the nations which stand for freedom will stand together in the years ahead.

Mr. Andrew Brewin (Greenwood): Mr. Speaker, we too regret the determination of the French to withdraw from the integrated planning and activities within NATO, though we are glad they are not withdrawing from NATO itself. It seems to us that this determination is based upon the idea of the sovereignty of individual nations, an idea which is not appropriate in these times. It is an anachronism, and we regret this step.

• (1:10 p.m.)

There is, of course, as the French aide memoire indicates, a very great diminution in the threat which existed and therefore in the need for an integrated defence within NATO. But we do not believe that the threat, although greatly diminished, has been entirely removed. We think that the French aide memoire is perfectly right in saying that the centre of international crisis has shifted from Europe to Asia and to other parts of the world. We therefore welcome the announced intention of the 14 remaining nations to continue to discuss integrated plans for dealing with that threat, diminished though it may be.

It seems to us that any alliance in the modern day is not meaningful unless it provides for close integration of action and military plans. However, Mr. Speaker, there is one aspect of this matter that has not been touched on. That is the belief we have that the French proposal to invite Canada to withdraw her air bases and other installations from French territory gives us an opportunity to do something that ought to have been done long ago, and that is to reconsider very carefully and very radically our whole strategy and our present strategic plans within NATO.

We have long expressed our disquiet about the reliance upon a tactical nuclear response within NATO. We have long expressed the view that the Canadian NATO role would

be far more appropriate if it consisted of a contribution to a mobile reserve. We hope that the new plans that will be made necessary by the initiative of France will include for the alliance as a whole serious reconsideration of whether the massive line-up of tactical nuclear weapons within NATO is appropriate at the present time with the diminished threat and, indeed, with the risk that this sort of strategy involves.

We therefore hope that the opportunity will be taken in all these discussions for Canada to do what we think should have been done some time ago, namely, to renegotiate her role in NATO and assume a more appropriate role in the future.

SCIENCE COUNCIL OF CANADA

PROVISION FOR ESTABLISHMENT AND DEFINITION OF DUTIES

The house resumed consideration in committee of the following resolution—Mr. Drury —Mr. Batten in the chair:

That it is expedient to introduce a measure for the establishment of a Science Council of Canada and to define the duties thereof, to provide for the appointment of the chairman and other members of the Council and for the payment of the remuneration of the chairman and of travelling expenses of the members and associate members of the Council, also for the payment of the remuneration of members of the Council for additional duties; to provide further that all expenditures for the purposes of this measure shall be paid out of money appropriated by parliament therefor.

Mr. Herridge: Mr. Chairman, I have a suggestion and a few brief remarks I wish to make. It is my belief that there is a place for the establishment in Canada of a Canadian college of conservation. I believe the time is ripe for the establishment of a Canadian college devoted to teaching the philosophy and principles of the conservation of renewable natural resources.

The idea first struck me when I was informed of overseas students coming to Canada. In many cases those students go on a six month tour across Canada to see Canadian industry, Canadian agriculture and Canadian development in other respects. After they have completed their tour, left this country and returned to their own countries, it seems to me they have not received any, as it were, unified instruction as to the purpose of their visit. I am suggesting to the minister that this proposed council could consider the development of a Canadian college of conservation in a very modest way in some appropriate southern part of the country, which in my view ought to be something like the Kootenays where there is water, land and forest.

The buildings would be built of logs. I think there is an opportunity here for the development of artistic values. The buildings could be staffed with a small administrative skeleton staff. The college would be able to make provision say for 50 students, in the first instance, whether they be from overseas or from Canada. Provision could be made for professors who are competent in their own fields to be asked to come from the various universities across Canada to give lectures there for one or two weeks on the particular subjects in which they are competent.

I am making this suggestion because I have discussed the matter with a number of people who know about these things. I believe there is a place for this type of college in Canada. You might call it almost a technical training school. It would be a college where students would learn the principles and ideas behind the whole philosophy of conservation, not necessarily with respect to dealing with pure or applied science but so that at the end of one or two years, or whatever period was decided upon, the persons who had attended this college, whether they were from Canada or abroad, would receive a diploma, as it were, from the Canadian college of conservation which would indicate that they had been trained in these principles.

If this is done, when overseas students return to their own countries they will have obtained some knowledge of what we are aiming for in the direction conservation, and if they are Canadians, especially persons who are not particularly interested in academic life at its higher levels, they will have opportunities for employment with various organizations or various levels of government in this country where they can practice the principles they have learned at the college. I should like to see this matter explored because I think it could be undertaken at very small cost compared with the results which could be obtained. I believe that our university students and high school students must continue to be informed of the value of these proposals if we are going to maintain and improve in this country our present standard of living.

In conclusion, Mr. Chairman, may I say this. I have enough confidence in the minister to believe that he is determined on this question. He had a good administrative record in the army, and I believe that if he

applies the same discipline to this organization, shall I say, as he has to other things we will get results. With a competent, dedicated science council, with the necessary funds from the federal government to carry out work that has to be undertaken, with a sound program of education to inform the public, university students and even high school students and with co-operation between all levels of government and various organizations as well as the participation of the public, I think that through the application of this resolution we can stimulate the imagination of many young Canadians. If this is done I am confident that we can utilize our human and natural resources in this country to the much greater advantage of this generation and generations to come.

The Chairman: Shall the resolution carry?

Mr. Aiken: Mr. Chairman, I have a number of questions I should like answered. I do not wish to make a speech now.

Mr. Drury: Mr. Chairman, I am very glad to have noted that, while there may have been some questions or doubts, the approval of the house was unanimous with respect to this resolution, but also for the purpose it is designed to serve with which I do not think anyone can make exception. Attention has been drawn to the lack of resources provided in this country in support of research generally and perhaps more particularly, based on the volume of words spoken, in relation to the medical sciences. This is a condition of which I certainly am fully aware. I am fully cognizant of it and I am sure the government is also. I am sure that the government is not only aware of it but is concerned about it.

• (1:20 p.m.)

Within the past year the government has taken a number of steps to increase the resources available for research purposes in this country, the most recent being a supplementary estimate of $3 million for the Medical Research Council to make up in some degree the deficiency which has been mentioned. But the purpose of this new council will not be to provide more money directly or to seek more money directly. Rather, it will be to provide the guidance and leadership in respect of scientific research which I believe most hon. members have agreed is necessary to analyse our potentialities, to analyse our capacities and to set objectives in the research and scientific field which it seems likely we should be able to meet. I am

[Mr. Herridge.]

persuaded that once these objectives have been delineated the intelligence, the imagination and the energy of Canadians are sufficient to ensure that there will be a general move in the direction of achieving them.

Questions were asked by the hon. member for Parry Sound-Muskoka. Some of these were detailed and might better await the production of the bill before they are discussed. However, there was one general question very directly relating to the resolution itself. It was: Why should we set up a science council when we already have the National Research Council? I tried to make clear that the Glassco Commission in its report on government administration—and this view was subsequently supported by Dr. Mackenzie in his examination of the problem—had reached the conclusion that the National Research Council, which has been doing excellent work in its field and about which I shall have more to say later, has tended over the years to concern itself with two main tasks, the allocation of resources to individuals in the academic stream by way of university scholarships and bursaries and, second, the operation of large, substantial and successful laboratories under its own direct control. As a consequence of these two main preoccupations there has perhaps not been sufficient attention paid by the council to the larger question of the delineation of scientific objectives for Canada as a whole, not merely the government, not merely the academic community or the industrial community, but for all Canadians.

The making of such an analysis will, of course, be one of the principal and first tasks of the science council. A number of people have felt, and I am in agreement with this view, that this new focusing of attention on analysis and objectives could be better done by a new body set up for that particular purpose than by redirecting the National Research Council in this sense. Dr. Mackenzie, as I mentioned, supports such a view. In short, we would do better to appoint a new advisory body and this advisory body should not be made in any way subordinate to the National Research Council, given the nature of the people we hope to appoint to it and their stature in the community. The new council will have an existence altogether independent of the National Research Council.

Mr. Aiken: I asked four questions and the minister has answered three of them. As to the remaining question, I would be quite happy to wait until we see the bill.

Mr. Orlikow: It is obvious the minister does not intend to answer any of the detailed questions some of us have put to him. However, I should like him to outline the relationship between the new science council, the National Research Council and the Defence Research Board, for example, because I think this is important. I hope he will tell the committee whether the scientific secretariat will continue to exist after this new body has been established or whether it will disappear and its functions be taken over by the new body.

I hope the minister will tell us also something about the research which is being done and the increased research which should be done in the universities in relation to this new organization. I understand this council will be advisory, but will it co-ordinate our scientific efforts? Will it, for example, be advising Treasury Board on the allocation of funds as between the National Research Council, the Defence Research Board and the universities or other specialized agencies?

Mr. Drury: No, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Orlikow: Or is it to be just one more of the many bodies we have at the present time, each of them equal?

Mr. Drury: Briefly, this will not be a regulatory body in the sense in which I believe the hon. gentleman is trying to suggest. Nor will it be an operating agency as the National Research Council is or as the Defence Research Board is. The purpose of this council will be to look at science in Canada as a whole and its relationship to the other facets of Canadian life and to set broad scientific objectives. Perhaps we might adopt an analogy. The science council, one can expect, will be doing in respect of the scientific world, the research and technological world, what the Economic Council of Canada is doing in the economic field. I do not think the hon. member is under any illusion that the Economic Council of Canada is controlling Treasury Board or the Bank of Canada. Nor, indeed, should it. But this does not mean that the Economic Council serves no useful purpose and is just another body. If the hon. member would look at this analogy I suggest the purpose of the new council would become clearer.

The Chairman: I might point out to hon. members the terms of the Standing Order which apply when a resolution of this kind is before the committee. The time limit on speeches is 20 minutes and the hon. member for Winnipeg North has now reached that limit. In all fairness I should point out that this does not preclude the asking of questions.

Mr. Orlikow: If this science council is not to allocate funds, I should like to ask the minister which agency of the government will advise Treasury Board as to the division of the total amount of money which the government of Canada will be spending on scientific research? Let us say the government of Canada decides to spend $100 million, $200 million, or whatever the amount may be. I hope it will be more from year to year. In that case, what agency will take the requests of the National Research Council, the Defence Research Board, the universities and so on and say to the government: We think Canada should concentrate on certain fields; these are the bodies which should do this work and this is what they should get? The minister has not said that the scientific secretariat is going to continue in existence, and one of the complaints from scientific sources is that there is no central planning, no central co-ordination, no system of priorities. If this new agency does not do this job, who will do it?

• (1:30 p.m.)

Mr. Drury: Mr. Chairman, I should like to correct what I think is an unwise notion concerning research, the notion that the federal government should have a budget for research and that somebody should spread the budget among the various agencies and that there should be a body to do this spreading.

Research and the resulting technology have come to be an integral part of every kind of operation in the kind of society in which we live; I repeat, "an integral part of every kind of operation". This means that operating agencies themselves must have their own research resources as a necessary part of conducting their operations. The operating agencies must understand this and must be encouraged to regard research as an essential and continuing part of their total operations. If this is so, it would, therefore, be a mistake to remove research, to regard it as some special form of activity which could be separated in itself and make it the responsibility not of the people who were responsible for the operation but the responsibility of some other separated, isolated, esoteric community. For this reason I would oppose any notion that the federal government set aside a sum

of money for research and that it be spread around by some appropriate body among the various agencies.

To answer the specific question asked, the scientific secretariat will continue. It will continue to have the function it now has as an information gathering and disseminating body for the government and it will also perform the secretarial function for the Science Council of Canada.

Mr. Cameron (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands): Can the minister tell us whether the government has given any consideration to fostering the development in Canada of what are known in the United States as research parks, of which there are about four or five in that country, these parks being aggregations of scientific research to which governments, industry and the academic world contribute? One is told that these aggregations of competent scientists have an extremely valuable use in what one might call intellectual cross-fertilization. In other words, it is necessary to have an organization of a certain size before you can have original research thinking coming out of it. Has the government done any investigation of these research parks? One is at Palo Alto and others are at different places throughout the United States, but they are joint enterprises of government, industry and the academic world.

Mr. Drury: Mr. Chairman, I think the hon. gentleman will be glad to learn that we already have one of these just outside Toronto. There is not very much contribution made to it by the academic community but it does involve both government and industry. This is an interesting concept. I think it has prospects for making a better utilization of limited resources than some of the independent operations that have been conducted in the past, and we are studying it carefully.

Resolution reported and concurred in.

Mr. Drury (for Mr. Pearson) thereupon moved for leave to introduce Bill No. C-149, to provide for the establishment of a Science Council of Canada.

Motion agreed to and the bill read the first time.

RESEARCH COUNCIL ACT

AMENDMENTS RESPECTING NAME, ADDITIONAL REMUNERATION OF OFFICERS, ETC.

Hon. C. M. Drury (Minister of Industry) moved that the house go into committee to consider the following resolution:

That it is expedient to introduce a measure to amend the Research Council Act to change the formal title of the National Research Council; to provide that members of the council, other than the president or vice president may, during any period in which they perform duties on behalf of the council in addition to their ordinary duties, be paid such remuneration therefor as the council may authorize; to authorize the appointment of persons to perform duties of a temporary nature for a period of not more than six months; to authorize the council to operate and maintain a national science library; and to provide further for certain changes in consequence thereof and also in connection with the administration of the Act.

Motion agreed to and the house went into committee, Mr. Batten in the chair.

Mr. Drury: Mr. Chairman, this is a bill which will be desirable in the light of the enactment of the bill which has just been read a first time, namely, the bill to establish the Science Council of Canada. I should like to take this occasion to point out to hon. members that this year the National Research Council, which everyone will agree has had quite an outstanding record in its dedication to the support of excellence will be celebrating its 50th anniversary.

The council started in 1916 as a body to establish scholarships for graduate students and to provide grants in aid of research for professors. It was only some nine years later that the National Research Council organized laboratories and began the kind of work for which it has since become so well known. In world war II the council was successful in mobilizing all the scientific and technological agencies in Canada and out of this arose such wartime developments as radar, atomic energy, and scientific backing for our military and economic leaders in the military and civilian fields during the war.

• (1:40 p.m.)

The National Research Council during the war set up Research Enterprises Limited, a manufacturing concern for the rapid production of gun sights and about $300 million worth of radar equipment designed by the National Research Council. Following the war the National Research Council continued to expand not only its ideas but its activities and from this fabric was created two agencies which in themselves, in an independent way, have achieved very considerable success in the scientific world and considerable renown. The first of these, of course, was the Defence Research Board which was created in 1947, and subsequently Atomic Energy of Canada Limited in 1952.

The aim of seeking new frontiers of knowledge on the part of the National Research Council has been reinforced by a very important service to the Canadian scientific community under the name of the N.R.C. technical information service. This technical information service does provide scientific information across Canada and abroad but principally to Canadians and is, I might point out, very extensively used. Inquiries answered by the technical information service amount to some 17,000 a year.

The resolution has for its purpose support for a bill to amend the National Research Council Act. The National Research Council has in its present form two official titles. One is The Honorary Advisory Council for Scientific and Industrial Research and the other is the more commonly used title, National Research Council. Since the second title receives more general use throughout the world and the words "of Canada" usually are added thereto to distinguish it from the national research councils of other countries, it is proposed to abandon the formal and little used title and to add the words "of Canada" to the second title, making it read in English, National Research Council of Canada, and in French, Conseil National de Recherches du Canada.

Since the proposed Science Council of Canada is to have the duty of advising the government on scientific policy, the Research Council Act should be amended to relieve the Research Council of this duty.

It is proposed to take advantage of this opportunity to make some minor amendments to eliminate anomalies which have become apparent in the operation of the council, and to introduce certain desirable improvements. I think, Mr. Chairman, with those remarks we might be able to concur in the resolution.

Mr. Aiken: Mr. Chairman, it was with a good deal of relief that I heard the minister finally come around to the change in the name which is proposed in the bill to come before us. I do not think anyone can have objection to that. I had some fear that perhaps we were going to make some change in name that might have been more radical than this. So far as the name is concerned, I think that the adding of the words "of Canada" is perfectly unobjectionable in that the name "National Research Council" is the name by which the council generally is known. I can certainly give my approval to this.

So far as the other items are concerned, we are quite happy to wait until we see the bill because, as indicated by the minister the changes are mostly a matter of internal administration. I should like to say that I believe the house and its committees ought to have a further opportunity to look into questions relating to some parts of the minister's department, particularly the National Research Council.

In 1960 and 1961 a special committee on research was set up. At that time the work of the National Research Council and Atomic Energy of Canada Limited was gone into very carefully. I was a member of that committee and gained a good deal of background knowledge from it. All the members felt there was a tremendous advantage in going into the work which the National Research Council and our research agencies are doing on behalf of this country. We obtained a lot of good information and were able to support many of the projects that were then undertaken.

I should like to suggest to the minister that if it can be done during this parliament another similar committee ought to be set up so that members of the house once again may indicate their interest in the work the council is doing. Much work is being done of which we have no knowledge. I think it would give the council an impetus to know that members of parliament are interested in the work they are doing and it would give us a good deal of information which we can use in our normal work. With those few remarks I advise the minister that we are not going to delay this motion further.

Resolution reported and concurred in.

Mr. Drury thereupon moved for leave to introduce Bill No. C-150, to amend the Research Council Act.

Motion agreed to and bill read the first time.

RURAL DEVELOPMENT

PROVISION FOR ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL DEVELOPMENT OF SPECIAL AREAS

Hon. H. J. Robichaud (for the Minister of Forestry) moved that the house go into committee to consider the following resolution:

That it is expedient to introduce a measure to establish a fund in the Consolidated Revenue Fund for the economic and social development of special rural development areas, to provide for payments out of the said fund not to exceed fifty million dollars; to provide also in connection therewith for entering into agreements with the provinces

for comprehensive rural development programs; and to provide further for the establishment and duties of an advisory board and for the administration of the fund.

Motion agreed to and the house went into committee, Mr. Batten in the chair.

Mr. Robichaud: Mr. Chairman, because of the unavoidable absence of the Minister of Forestry, who is detained at home on account of illness, I have been asked to introduce this resolution.

• (1:50 p.m.)

The purpose of the resolution now before us is to establish a special fund for rural economic development. As hon. members know, the ARDA rural development program in co-ordination with other programs is tackling the problems of rural low income throughout the rural areas of Canada. However, as hon. members will also know from their own studies, rural low income, poverty and underdevelopment are particularly deep-seated in certain rural problem areas in Canada.

As the ARDA program has evolved, it has become evident that special comprehensive and co-ordinated development programs for these areas are required if living standards for the people in these areas are to be greatly improved in a reasonable length of time.

This approach, which might be described as a specific regional development approach for these areas, involves the following process:

First, the selection of these areas which are subject to widespread low income, have major adjustment and development problems and have recognized development potential.

Second, the undertaking of physical, economic and social studies and investigations to determine the development problems and potentials of the areas.

Third, the involvement of local people through the preparation of comprehensive rural development plans.

Fourth, the undertaking of a broad range of projects for the implementation of the plan, with the objective of increasing income and raising standards of living in the area.

Planning in several of these areas has now reached the point where rural development comprehensive plans, including proposals for specific projects, are being prepared and it is obvious that special provisions will be required to finance the development plans. The areas where the process is at this stage include the Interlake area in Manitoba, the lower St. Lawrence in the Gaspé area of Quebec, and northeastern New Brunswick. A number of areas in other provinces also are proceeding with the development of plans.

A bill to provide for the economic and social development of these areas is being proposed in order to provide special financial assistance beyond that normally available under the cost-sharing provisions of the ARDA program to implement these plans. I believe this bill provides an important forward step in the most comprehensive program which is now being developed to meet the particular problems of certain rural areas in Canada.

Mr. Rapp: Mr. Chairman, we welcome this announcement of the Minister of Fisheries on behalf of the Minister of Forestry. I should like to say at the outset that $50 million for the development of economically and socially underdeveloped areas in Canada is not sufficient. One of the problems we have faced in this regard in the past has been the lack of money.

Second, I should like to know whether the government intends to enter negotiations with the provinces in respect of the establishment of the advisory board and whether provincial representatives will be included on the board. Will the provinces also make contributions to this plan and will they have some say in the administration of the fund?

All in all, we welcome this step on the part of the government, but as time passes problems will develop in provincial areas which cannot be solved by the provinces alone because of the lack of funds. I hope that the $50 million will be increased in order that the economically underdeveloped areas in all ten provinces of Canada can be assisted. I hope also that provincial representation will be allowed on the advisory board.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Vincent: Mr. Chairman, I may have a few words to say on this resolution before consideration of the bill itself.

In my opinion, the Minister of Forestry (Mr. Sauvé) will have to be very conscientious when he chooses members of the advisory board because if the latter is composed of practical men who are thoroughly familiar with the problems of the areas covered by the program, it will be extremely valuable not only to the minister but to the government in general and to the farmers concerned.

• (2:00 p.m.)

Since the first purpose of the legislation is to determine areas, the latter will have to be chosen very objectively. In several parts of

Canada, farmers do not have sufficient income at this time.

We should not think that we are going to solve the problem of agriculture merely by setting up industries in the areas concerned. Members of the advisory board will be in a position to enlighten the minister on studies concerning the potential of those areas.

There again, the board will necessarily have to be composed of people who will have not only theoretical and academic training gained through advanced studies, but also practical knowledge and experience of the agricultural problems of the areas involved.

The third objective of the legislation is the training of the people already established in those areas. In that connection also, we will need serious advice from responsible people who are truly familiar with the problem, not only advice from theoreticians who seek to solve the problems without knowing the practical implications of the solutions they advocate.

Therefore, those are the only remarks I intend to make. I believe that the Minister of Forestry will take them into consideration because, as I said, this advisory board is of vital importance and will have to include serious minded men with experience in addition to academic training.

It would be proper to appoint to that advisory board representatives of existing farm orgnizations. As a matter of fact, the Canadian Federation of Agriculture made some searching studies on the low income groups problems in certain areas of this country, and it would be necessary to have someone from the Canadian Federation of Agriculture advising the Minister of Forestry on such matters.

We also have in Canada the western farmers who are organized, who have studied these most important matters and who also may supply the Minister of Forestry with one or more qualified men to sit on this advisory committee.

Finally, we also have in Quebec an organization, the Catholic Farmers Union which, for several years, has been submitting proposals, recommendations and solutions; in short, it has studied the question of poverty in some areas of the province, particularly in the lower St. Lawrence.

Well, the Catholic Farmers Union is surely in a position to suggest experienced and knowledgeable people who could bring their contribution and assist the federal government and the minister in this mission. This started with ARDA, which was passed by the preceding government. So, I repeat that the federal government should count on the experience of those who will sit on the advisory committee.

Mr. Gauthier: Mr. Chairman, just a few words in order not to delay the house.

First, let me congratulate the Minister of Forestry (Mr. Sauvé), who is not in his seat at the moment but who is represented by the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Robichaud), for the resolution he has moved to create a $50 million fund to be available for the purposes of ARDA. I note, on reading the resolution, that we are voting $50 million simply to extend ARDA.

As the previous speaker said, although the amount is insignificant compared to the needs of every Canadian province, these $50 million are not what we might have hoped for, but it is better than nothing.

But here is the point I want to make. A little earlier, the minister mentioned three main areas which would be affected by the new program: the Gaspé peninsula, the Lower St. Lawrence region and the Abitibi region.

I am afraid, Mr. Chairman, that an area was overlooked. I am not sure and I am anxious to see the bill; that is why I do not want to say anything more before reading the bill; but I am afraid that the Saguenay-Lake St. John region was overlooked.

I think that that region is the weakest from an agricultural point of view; in short, it is the area most in need of help. Indeed, the Catholic Farmers Union, which has just submitted its brief and even sent a telegram to the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Greene) bears witness to that.

But I hope that the bill will at least contain something for the Saguenay-Lake St. John region. I hope in particular that this amount of $50 million will not all be spent in studies because, in our areas, all the money spent under ARDA was used mainly to pay for a study to determine the degree of poverty of our farmers, except, as I mentioned to the Minister of Forestry the other day, for the implementation in our region of a development program with regard to blueberry farms.

I think, Mr. Chairman, that the study must be completed by now and that the money, which always comes from the taxpayers, should be used for something concrete, that is

to submit concrete programs, especially programs which will really help the farmers and not only a small group of bureaucrats which will spend again $4 or $5 million in salaries and expenses of all kinds which will not benefit the farmers in any way.

I hope that this amount of $50 million will be spent to help the farmers and that we will not see again what happened in the Gaspé peninsula where over $3 million were spent and why? To pay the salaries of 75 to 90 investigators while the Gaspé farmers have not received nor completed anything yet. We do not want the same thing to happen again and that is why I call the government's attention to that matter so that it will submit concrete programs which will benefit the farmers of the province of Quebec, including those in my region.

Mr. Clermont: Mr. Chairman, just a word about the resolution. I, too, have heard Acting Minister of Forestry (Mr. Robichaud) enumerating the regions this bill is supposed to help.

I trust the Minister of Forestry (Mr. Sauvé) will also consider the Laurentian region, the valley of the Lièvre and also the Red River valley.

[*English*]

Mr. Ormiston: Mr. Chairman, I welcome the statement made by the Minister of Fisheries speaking for the Minister of Forestry on the resolution to provide $50 million for rural development. The word "comprehensive" is used in the resolution but I fail to see how we can have comprehensive rural development with only $50 million.

I know it is impossible for the minister to spell out further details at this time but we should like to know something about the administration of the fund, whether or not ARDA will be responsible or whether, if some areas in western Canada are designated, P.F.R.A. will also be in a position to make more funds available for research and extension of programs. I would only mention that there are many areas where Indians are living which are certainly underdeveloped and I wonder whether the minister had any of those areas in mind when he was making his statement?

• (2:10 p.m.)

Mr. Robichaud: Mr. Chairman, most of the questions raised by hon. members will be answered by the Minister of Forestry when he moves second reading, but what I wish to make clear at this time is that the fund of $50 million referred to is over and above the funds already available under the ARDA program. This special fund will be used for the specific purpose of developing certain designated rural areas, as I have mentioned.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Chairman, I should like to point out to the hon. member for Roberval (Mr. Gauthier) that it has always been my impression that the lower St. Lawrence region also included the Saguenay area, since the St. Lawrence river has a north shore and south shore.

[*English*]

The hon. member for Humboldt-Melfort-Tisdale asked whether the advisory board would administer the fund. My understanding is that the fund will be administered under ARDA. The advisory board will consider and review the proposals which will be made for use of this fund by the different provinces, and it will be administered under the Agricultural Rehabilitation and Development Act and regulations.

Mr. Alkenbrack: Mr. Chairman, I wish to make a few brief comments regarding this resolution. They will take the form of questions which have been in my mind and which I think have been in the minds of other hon. members. I am reminded that this resolution is probably the beginning of great changes in our rural areas and I wonder whether they will be changes for the better. I note that the resolution highlights the word "comprehensive" in the fifth line thereof. I cannot comprehend what the goal of the government is when I hear that the legislation will authorize—I suppose we will come to this point later—that farms be bought and grouped into larger economically paying units, and then sold back to the farmers. I cannot see any glowing future for the Canadian rural economy in the method which I understand the government is contemplating. I know that larger units are inevitable under present mechanized methods of agriculture.

Why not let the farmers undertake this development themselves? Who knows what type of unit a certain large block of land will be turned into by the government and its bureaucratic organizations? The new unit will comprise smaller farms of say 50 to 100 acres fenced into one area which the government will then call an economic unit. It may not be an economic unit for prospective buyers of that large new block of land. Anyone interested in acquiring one of these so-called

economic units might not use it for a purpose which would result in the government calling it an economic unit at all.

I am sure hon. members will get the point I am trying to make. It is that we should let the farmers, through their own private enterprise, buy up these blocks of land themselves and turn them into whatever type of unit individual farmers and their families find best for their future. I am sure these blocks of land would end up with a much more economical and easier to handle mortgage, one of which could be amortized well within their lifetime, instead of the farmers becoming mortgaged to the government for large sums of money which are sure to be entailed in the plan I understand the government is contemplating.

I am also concerned about other facets, Mr. Chairman. If in a rural area smaller farms are purchased to be combined into larger units, the occupants of the original holdings would be forced to move. There still exist today 50 acre and 100 acre blocks. My family has a farm of 125 acres in Richmond township which has been in our family now for three generations. This is the type of holding I have in mind. I am referring to quite productive areas of that kind. If three farms of that size were put into one holding, a holding that is much more adaptable to this age of automation and the economy of the day, the occupants of the original holdings could only move away to urban areas. But, Mr. Chairman, to what benefit? These people who will be displaced are at present making perhaps a meagre living but at least they are living on the farms. They will be cast on to a cruel and competitive labour market which is strange to them and will earn wages which will still be insufficient to enable them to cope with the highly inflated cost of living currently confronting our economy. In other words, these people can live just as well and much cheaper in their natural rural environment.

I claim that the government would do better to work diligently and steadily to remedy the present high cost of living which is a bugbear and an obstacle to the people engaged in agriculture in our rural areas as well as to people in urban areas of limited means.

These are some of the questions I have in mind, Mr. Chairman. I also agree with the hon. member for Humboldt-Melfort-Tisdale when he asks how far $50 million will go. It will not go very far, as he said, when spread over ten provinces. I am sure other hon. members will discuss these questions when we get past the resolution stage and into the readings of the bill, and I hope that the government in their rural development plan will govern themselves accordingly.

I might also ask what the government proposes to do to improve other good economic facets which already exist, especially in the province of Ontario. Hydro is available all through the province in almost every rural locality. The little red schoolhouse has now gone and modern schools have been built or are being built. There are good roads into almost every rural area. What can the federal government do to improve the economic and social status of rural areas in Ontario? I just point out these things, Mr. Chairman, and I look forward to sound discussion in the later stages of this measure.

Resolution reported and concurred in.

Mr. Robichaud (for Mr. Sauvé) thereupon moved for leave to introduce Bill No. C-151, to provide for the establishment of a fund for the economic and social development of special rural development areas.

Motion agreed to and bill read the first time.

• (2:20 p.m.)

AGRICULTURAL REHABILITATION AND DEVELOPMENT ACT

AMENDMENTS CHANGING NAME, AND EXTENDING APPLICATION

Hon. H. J. Robichaud (for the Minister of Forestry) moved that the house go into committee to consider the following resolution:

That it is expedient to introduce a measure to amend the Agricultural Rehabilitation and Development Act to change the name of the Act to Rural Development Act and to extend its application to all rural areas in Canada where projects of the nature already provided for can be advantageously undertaken; and to provide authority for the payment of remuneration to members of advisory committees.

Motion agreed to and the house went into committee, Mr. Batten in the chair.

Mr. Robichaud: Mr. Chairman, when I introduced the previous legislation I made a remark to the effect that the Minister of Forestry was detained at home because of illness and was unable to be here to introduce his resolution. It has since been brought to my attention that the Minister of Forestry was in the building some time today. I just want to clear up any misunderstanding. The minister has been advised by his doctor that

as he is recuperating from an attack of pneumonia he ought not to take part in any debate and should keep away from any kind of activity in the next few days.

The Agricultural Rehabilitation and Development Act, passed in 1961, provides authority for the federal government to enter into agreements with the provinces for the sharing of costs in connection with three types of undertakings in rural areas: First, those for the efficient use and economic development of submarginal agricultural lands; second, projects designed to develop income and employment opportunities and improve standards of living in rural agricultural areas; third, projects to develop and conserve water supplies for agricultural purposes and improve soil conditions for agricultural efficiency.

Since the launching of the program in 1962 effective program approaches have been jointly developed with the provinces to meet the adjustment needs in the rural agricultural areas of Canada. I am sure hon. members would be interested to know that so far $80 million has been committed for such programs and that all provinces have participated in them. I want to clarify remarks which were made during the introduction of the previous resolution and point out again that the amount of $50 million which was mentioned is over and above the funds made available under the regular ARDA program.

Studies undertaken under this program have indicated the widespread nature of rural low income. In fact, in 1961 almost 500,000 rural families had an income of less than $3,000 per year. A significant proportion of these families reside in areas in the Atlantic provinces and along the fringes of settlement throughout the rest of Canada where, strictly speaking, they cannot be said to live in rural agricultural areas. It is now obvious that the rural development program approaches which have been developed can be extended to meet the adjustment and rehabilitation needs of these rural people who are outside the agricultural sector. Through the proposed amendments to the Agricultural Rehabilitation and Development Act, the effective program approaches which can be devised under the present act may be made available to the outport fishing settlements of Newfoundland, to the isolated rural settlements of northern Quebec and Ontario, the native population of the northern fringe areas of the prairie provinces and to the scattered areas of rural population in British Columbia.

[Mr. Robichaud.]

Further proposed amendments to the Act provide for a change in the short title to "Rural Development Act" and provide authority for the payment of remuneration to members of the advisory committees.

These committees would be altogether different from the ones mentioned in the previous resolution. These were supposed to be committees formed to advise the federal government when definite proposals are received from the provinces. In this case the reference is to local committees that will be established within the province or within certain areas or municipalities in order to formulate programs to be presented to the provinces. Then the provinces will in turn submit their proposals to Ottawa under the ARDA program.

It is proposed that the term "ARDA" continue to be used to refer to the Act and the program collectively in a familiar or abbreviated way. The change in the title will more appropriately describe the program which will now be made available to all rural areas of Canada.

Mr. Danforth: Mr. Chairman, in speaking to this resolution I might say that when I first read it I was a bit disturbed about the change of name from the familiar "ARDA". I had not realized fully the intent of the government in this regard. It is true that under the Agricultural Rehabilitation and Development Act many short term and long term arrangements with the provinces have been made. I was somewhat uneasy as to the basic reasons for changing the name. However, after listening to the explanation of the resolution, given by the minister my doubts have been entirely dispelled. I think that the intent of the bill, with its amendments to extend financial relief and development to rural areas in all parts of the country that are not devoted to agriculture in any way, will do much to alleviate somewhat the poverty that is disturbing all of us.

With regard to the second part of the resolution which provides authority for the remuneration of members of advisory committees, I think the government will find that our party favours such a proposition. A tremendous amount of work has to be undertaken in searching for and devising ways and means to improve the lot of those suffering from poverty in rural areas. Also, we have to make sure that the right men and women take part in the work of research and making advisory recommendations in this regard. I think that the only way we can ensure that the

right people will come forward is to make sure that they receive proper remuneration as a reward for taking time out of their own activities and their own busy lives for the benefit of others.

I do not propose to belabour the resolution, Mr. Chairman. We may have more to say on it and the various subjects it covers on second reading, but in the main, having listened to the explanation so ably put forward by the minister, I think the principle of the resolution will be favourably received by this party.

• (2:30 p.m.)

[*Translation*]

Mr. Gauthier: Mr. Chairman, while the resolution was being read, my reaction was along the same lines as that of the previous speaker, because I sincerely believed that the original ARDA formula was perfect with regard to intended plans to improve the financial position of farmers and workers and to protect our water resources generally.

I do not think that the change in name will substantially modify the application of the previous legislation, but it should be rather beneficial so far as the advisory committee is concerned. I am very glad about the appointment of that committee, because we shall now be able to pay its members so they can work in co-operation with the provinces.

I think that, although the new measure will bear the name of Rural Development Act, the provinces will always decide what projects are to be carried out, and they can always count on that advisory committee. I can see, therefore, that their work can become far more efficient with the help of such a committee, although in our region, we already have similar agencies, such as C.E.R. and the Catholic Farmers Union which recommend to the provincial government what projects should be undertaken.

I am convinced that advisory committee will be of great assistance to existing provincial agencies.

Provided everyone is willing to work and co-operate, this act will surely help our farmers considerably.

[*English*]

Mr. Olson: Mr. Chairman, I am afraid I am not as easy to convince as the hon. member for Kent (Ont.). He said he had some misgivings about changing the name of the Act but that after listening to the minister's explanation he and his friends were satisfied there was good and sufficient reason for taking this action.

I can remember that a few years ago, when the former Conservative government brought in the Agricultural Rehabilitation and Development Act, some members of the Liberal party suggested that the terms of the Act were so broad that they gave the government of the day statutory authority to do anything short of building a subway in Montreal or Toronto. There were provisions in it for encouraging industry in rural areas, for recreation, for community pastures, almost anything one could think of which might be of benefit to a rural area.

What is more, there were even suggestions that the term "rural" did not mean that the activities carried out under the Act need be confined to small communities. It was pointed out that authority might have been granted to the government to enter into joint financial programs to undertake works of benefit to large communities which were not necessarily rural.

If there are substantial changes in the Act which should be made in order that the government can become involved in programs to help poverty-stricken areas, whether rural or semi-rural, we are all in favour of making them. But if this is an attempt to change the name of the Act simply for political purposes so that it can now be called a Liberal Act rather than a Conservative Act, then I do not think that is a sufficient reason for taking up the time of the house. If we look at the order paper we can easily see there are enough resolutions, bills and other items of legislation to take up our time more profitably not only for weeks but for months to come.

I am sorry if I have failed to understand clearly some of the suggestions the minister has made. I realize he is not the minister responsible for the operation of this Act. However, though I listened carefully I did not hear him say anything about an extension of authority which would grant the government legislative power to do anything which it does not already have authority to do. Under the Act as it stands now there is authority to enter into these cost-shared programs with the provinces for the purpose of carrying out every one of the specific projects he outlined.

I do not intend to make a great issue out of this. If the government can show us that it really needs this extension of authority by way of amendments to the Act, we shall support the measure. But the attitude today is at variance with some of the statements made in the past when members of the

Liberal party said that the ARDA legislation amounted almost to a blank cheque to the government, giving it authority to enter into any kind of program with the provinces.

Perhaps the minister would care to give us a fuller explanation of what is really intended. This is only the resolution stage. The bill is to come and consideration of the various stages of the bill may take up a good deal of the time of the house. In these circumstances there should be good and sufficient reason for spending our time in this way, bearing in mind there are so many other items on the order paper for our consideration.

Mr. Chatterton: Mr. Chairman, may I make a suggestion to the minister? It is that we give consideration to changing the name from "Rural Development Act" to "Agriculture and Rural Development Act". Such a change would overcome the accusation just made that the alteration in the name may be desired for partisan political purposes. A second advantage would be that many people who have been involved in the ARDA program are familiar with the term "ARDA", and the addition of the words "agriculture and" in front of the words "Rural Development Act" would mean that the initials would remain "ARDA". Moreover, since agriculture is involved the title I have suggested would be a more accurate description of this measure.

Mr. Robichaud: I wish to make it clear, in view of the remarks made by the hon. member for Medicine Hat, that the change now proposed has no political motive whatsoever. On many occasions when programs were approved or decisions reached in connection with ARDA, questions were raised as to the absolute legality of such decisions in the light of the terms which were originally agreed upon when the Act was introduced—the Agricultural Rehabilitation and Development Act.

• (2:40 p.m.)

The point is that on many occasions programs were approved which had no connection whatsoever with agricultural development. This is the reason it has been suggested that the name be changed to read "Rural Development Act." One hon. member has suggested that the term ARDA be retained. At the conclusion of my remarks on introducing the resolution I said it was proposed that the term "ARDA" would continue to be used with reference to the Act and to the application of this program.

Mr. Chatterton: I am pleased to hear the minister say it is hoped the word ARDA will continue to be used, but there is no assurance that this will be done. If that is the government's hope, why not ensure that it will be retained by inserting the word "agriculture" in front of the proposed name?

Mr. Robichaud: I am giving the committee an assurance in the name of the Minister of Forestry that the term "ARDA" will be retained, but I have no authority to change the name proposed in the resolution.

Mr. McKinley: I realize this resolution is merely for the sake of changing the name but I would appreciate the minister telling me how the government decides which projects under this Act should be approved for action and which should not.

Mr. Robichaud: All programs under the Act and the regulations have to be submitted for approval by the province concerned. They are then recommended by the Minister of Forestry and when they receive the approval of Treasury Board they are implemented.

Mr. Muir (Lisgar): Under whose authority are the members of advisory committees appointed and how are they appointed in various parts of the country?

Mr. Robichaud: I am subject to being corrected on this point but it is my understanding that the committees referred to in the resolution are local or provincial committees. They are appointed under the authority of the federal government. They are local regional committees appointed in co-operation with the provinces and the municipalities.

Mr. Olson: Do I understand the minister to say the government is asking for authority to pay remuneration even to members of local and provincial advisory committees?

Mr. Robichaud: My understanding is that payment would be made to recognized committees that are working to prepare ARDA programs within the different provinces and municipalities.

Mr. Olson: I do not want to belabour the point because I appreciate that the Minister of Fisheries is not as familiar with the Act as he would be with matters coming within his own department, but I see a problem if the federal government is required to pay remuneration to committee members appointed by

other bodies. I can quite understand the federal government paying people it appoints to federal ARDA advisory committees, but if this is extended to provincial and municipal committees there may be some difficulty as to what nominations will be accepted.

Mr. Robichaud: I want to clarify the statement I made previously to make it clear that payments will be made to committees which have been established for the purpose of carrying out the provisions of the Act. Those committees will first have to have the approval of the responsible minister. The point raised by the hon. member was a good one. Maybe I did not understand his question at first, but I would point out that these committees must first be approved by the minister.

Mr. Danforth: I have twice heard the minister say that this legislation will still be known as ARDA. Would he not consider the proposition put forward that the name in the resolution be changed to "the Agricultural and Rural Development Act"? That would carry the same initials as previously, ARDA, and would serve the same useful purpose.

Mr. Robichaud: I will bring this suggestion to the attention of the minister responsible, but again I want to make it clear that it is the intention to retain the name "ARDA" in the administration and any time that the legislation is mentioned.

Mr. Danforth: I know the minister has repeated this several times but is it not true that once the name is changed to "Rural Development Act" it will not be necessary to retain the word ARDA? The government, at its will, could refer to it as R.D.A. or something else.

Mr. Robichaud: I have just said I will bring this suggestion to the attention of the Minister of Forestry. The word "ARDA" was not part of the Agricultural Rehabilitation and Development Act. It was a name that was used whenever the Act was referred to and I repeat that it is proposed to retain it.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Latulippe: Mr. Chairman, with regard to this resolution, I am pleased to say a few words about the farmers and the ARDA program. The resolution states, and I quote:

> That it is expedient to introduce a measure to amend the Agricultural Rehabilitation and Development Act.—

Why is it, Mr. Chairman, that the value of farm land has gone down? Why is it that farmers can no longer provide for their own needs?

It was once thought that agriculture could be saved through provincial loans, a scheme which was initiated by Mr. Duplessis, and which was supposed to save agriculture in the province of Quebec. Today, farmers are worse off than ever before.

Now, we are offered another plan, a joint plan called ARDA.

Will ARDA solve all problems? Will the technicians, engineers, or economists employed by ARDA be able, for instance, to show farmers how to breed hogs? I suggest that farmers know how to do it as well as any economist.

What is lacking, Mr. Chairman, is not so much plans and rataplans, but rather the recognition of the fact that farmers are unable to make a living because their lands are mortgaged. The assets of agriculture have fallen into the hands of finance. It is not the farmers who own the farms they operate, it is the financiers, and to get out of the red, agriculture would have to get out of the hold of finance.

• (2:50 p.m.)

Then, Mr. Minister, what should you do? Where should you toil? If you do not work in that direction, you will never get the farmer out of his stagnation with or without the ARDA act, or whatever you want.

Agriculture is in a bad shape, and that is due to finance. It is not only by setting up plans and granting loans, by lending again to the farmer, by purchasing his debts, by lending him more money, in short, by getting him deeper into debt, that his difficulties can be solved.

What the farmer needs, is interest-free loans. Farmers cannot even meet the interest payments on the money they owe. That is why they are discouraged. They cannot go on; they do not make enough profit and the interest on the money they owe is too costly for them. Over 30 or 40 years, they have to pay for their farms three or four times. That is why they can no longer make ends meet.

That problem should be studied to find out if something can be done to improve the financial angle. If ARDA was not concerned only with financing, because we seem to be concerned only with financing and voting amounts of money to get the farmer deeper into debt, things would go better. You know

how administration is done in all departments. For instance, with regard to the Department of Agriculture, in 1965 we voted $115 million and spent $121 or $131 million or something like that. Therefore, if the same thing happens again with regard to ARDA, if administration costs so much, how will we improve farming if all that money is spent for administration?

Therefore, it is absolutely necessary for the government to reconsider its administrative costs. Let them see how much the various departments spend for administration. No wonder they have hardly anything left to finance all their projects. Everything goes for administration. If they are unable to administer otherwise, they are not true administrators.

Several people in the present government take themselves for great administrators. They are nothing of the kind. They are great for getting people in debt. If they administered their own money like that, I can tell you they would not go very far.

Therefore, it is absolutely necessary to see that administration does not cost so much. If administration costs more than it gives, all those acts are worth nothing.

Again, farmers are in debt over their heads; they are waiting for ways to get out of debt. The government is trying to find ways and means to get farming out of its desperate situation. If farmers are having a hard time, it is not their fault; the economic situation must be blamed. There is no other reason. If that problem is not considered, it is useless to set up all kinds of organizations to try and get agriculture out of this desperate situation.

We will save agriculture from stagnation if we really take the necessary steps, if we do what should be done. For example, if we could reduce administrative costs to a bare minimum, it would be a big saving. It is well known that in administration, ten men do the work of one and, where only one man is necessary, ten are paid salaries for no reason.

If agriculture is not given the setup it needs, it is useless to create various bodies, be they called ARDA or otherwise.

Mr. Chairman, farmers expect a great deal. Agriculture is in need of help. It can still survive if it is given the means and the necessary advantages. For example, money could be lent to farmers without interest and the 11 per cent tax on building materials could be abolished.

[Mr. Latulippe.]

Agriculture does not need eminent economists. Some farmers are more competent than economists who are graduates from universities in London or Canada but who have never bred pigs. The farmer can show them a great deal, even how to breed pigs.

So, Mr. Chairman, I wanted to say a few words about that. If the minister is willing to take those few observations into consideration and try to do something really worthwhile for agriculture, for the farmers, it would not be too costly.

But that method, ARDA, is like all other methods. What I mean is that I fail to see how it can solve the problem facing agriculture. In fact, administration costs being what they are, there will not be much money left at the other end where it should really go.

To my mind, the minister should try to spend money where it is needed, and not only to defray the cost of administration, but where it would really help agriculture. Otherwise, the agricultural situation will not be improved.

[*English*]

Mr. Baldwin: Mr. Chairman, I wish to make one or two suggestions. I have been greatly taken by the thought that ARDA does mean something to a great many people in Canada and has a connotation which I think people have come to accept. While it well may be that the Act has not lived up to all of the things which we hoped it would do, nevertheless under that name it is known across Canada, and I think it would be a great pity to lose it.

I know the minister has already made it plain that he is not in a position to make any commitment himself, but I would offer the suggestion to him that when the bill itself is introduced it might be that the short title might be so changed that it would retain ARDA, the first letters of the words "Agricultural Rehabilitation and Development Act", and that this could be done very well by changing the name of the Act to "an Act for Rural Development and Administration", or something similar. The short title of the Act might be cited as the Act for Rural Development and Administration.

I throw that out only as a suggestion. A number of combinations could be used. I think there is enough ingenuity on the part of those who draft legislation that they can come up with a short title which would permit the act to be known as the ARDA legislation. I think this would be very useful

and I think it would be a great pity if we lost the benefit we have derived through all parts of rural Canada.

There is one other brief comment I should like to make. I really am putting this forward by way of a caveat. I spoke on this bill when it first went through and at that time I likened it to the Tennessee Valley legislation which has done a great deal in the United States in that particular area. I recognize that a bill of this kind cannot be suddenly developed to cover all the things which those of us who are interested in this matter would have wished it to, but if we are going to have the type of development in this country which is so essential, if we are to have the decentralization which is very necessary to a proper growth and if we are to discontinue the type of ungainly and disproportionate growth we have in Canada, there must be some ways and means to develop, enlarge and enrich many of the rural areas of Canada.

I have always felt, Mr. Chairman, that the use of the designated area type of legislation has militated against this. The ability to use as a criterion degrees of unemployment, which then permit the introduction into a certain industrial area of income and other tax benefits, has militated against the normal and ordinary growth which we might have anticipated in rural areas. It seems to me, if legislation of this kind really is going to do the job it is designed to do—I know this is farther than the minister is going or this Act is aimed but I am putting this forward as a caveat of what I intend to say later —some consideration will have to be given by the government to the introduction of benefits of this nature and the same type of income tax and other tax benefits and concessions will have to be provided for many of the rural areas in Canada if we are going to see the type of normal and proper growth which is so essenital to the proper development of this country.

• (3:00 p.m.)

Mr. Mather: Mr. Chairman, apparently the purpose of the resolution before us is to change the official name of the act from ARDA to something else. I just want to say that we in the New Democratic party are not very much concerned about what the government wants to name this legislation because we think, as was said many years ago, a rose by any other name would smell as sweet. This legislation probably has as much relation to cabbages as it has to roses in this connection. We are concerned with trying to make the best use of public funds that are available for the development of rural Canada. We will have plenty to say about this subject at the later stages of this legislation. At this time we are not particularly concerned with the change of the official name.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Ricard: Mr. Chairman, I also wish to say as others have before me, that it is not necessary to change the title of the act under study.

The word "ARDA" has already conquered many a region; it is known and recognized. I feel that this legislation can achieve its purpose without any change of title and before agreeing to this change, it seems to me we should await the return of the minister so that he might give us the reasons justifying it.

The mere fact that the government wants to change the title simply because that might give the impression that this is a new act, that it might take credit for the program known until now as ARDA, is not, to my mind, good enough a reason to make the change.

As I said a while ago, I should like to hear the Minister of Forestry (Mr. Sauvé) himself give us the reasons for which he concludes the word "ARDA" should be changed in the measure now being considered.

[*English*]

Mr. Pugh: Mr. Chairman, I just have a few words to say about the resolution as it now stands. I am very much against changing the name of ARDA. I was particularly impressed by the remarks of the hon. member for Peace River who suggested that if the name is changed the new name should include the inititals "ARDA". There is a very simple reason for that suggestion. Throughout all the rural areas of Canada the people who may benefit under the provisions of this act know the name "ARDA".

As far as I can gather from the resolution the proposed change is from the Agricultural Rehabilitation and Development Act to the Rural Development Act. This seems to me to be a waste of time. At some other stage I should like to speak in greater detail about this change, but I did want to register my protest against changing the name of this act which has been of so much value to many Canadians.

Apparently this resolution contains a provision to extend the application of this legislation to all rural areas in Canada. I hope when the bill does come before us the minister will take the trouble to explain just what rural areas will not come within the provisions of the new act. Under the broad wording of the original act there was no question at all as to who might come under its provisions. Almost any activity associated with the rehabilitation of the agricultural industry in Canada could come under the ARDA legislation. One need only look at the number of payments made in conjunction with the provinces to realize that the provisions of the ARDA legislation extended to almost any field, including the building of docks for forestry products. I hope when the bill comes before us we will be given a great deal more detail than we now have before us.

The last part of the resolution states that authority will be provided for the payment of remuneration to members of advisory committees. This is an excellent idea. We now have many good men on these committees and it is hard to get men of ability to undertake this task. I do not believe that this remuneration will attract better men but it will compensate these men now on committees for their participation.

Resolution reported and concurred in.

Mr. Robichaud thereupon moved for leave to introduce Bill No. C-152, to amend the Agricultural Rehabilitation and Development Act.

Motion agreed to and bill read the first time.

AERONAUTICS ACT

Hon. G. J. McIlraith (for Minister of Transport) moved that the house go into committee to consider the following resolution:

That it is expedient to introduce a measure to amend the Aeronautics Act to authorize the Governor in Council to prescribe charges for the use of facilities and services provided by the Minister of Transport and to impose charges for the availability to aircraft during flights within Canada of facilities or services provided by the minister; and to authorize the minister to establish boards of inquiry to investigate aircraft accidents and provide for the payment of the expenses of witnesses appearing before these boards; to provide that the Air Transport Board shall consist of not less than three and not more than five members; to provide that members of the board shall be appointed for a term not exceeding ten years and to provide for retirement of members of the board appointed after the coming into force of the proposed measure at seventy years of age; and to provide further for certain changes in connection with administration of the act.

[Mr. Pugh.]

Motion agreed to and the house went into committee, Mr. Batten in the chair.

Mr. Turner: Mr. Chairman, this legislation contains proposals which were presented to parliament by the hon. member for Ottawa West, who then held the portfolio in the Department of Transport, in December of 1963. Certain additional items have now been added and a few changes have been made in the original proposals, in part as a result of this additional material.

The original bill related to the inspection of premises in connection with airworthiness of aircraft, and the preservation and removal of aircraft involved in accidents. Then, attendance at accident investigations has been maintained, and the use and operation of rockets, moored balloons and kites. These and other matters have been retained.

The earlier bill also contained provisions which would permit charges to be made for the provision and use of aviation facilities and services provided by the department. At present these charges exist but are levied under the Financial Administration Act.

• (3:10 p.m.)

It is desirable to provide and consolidate the necessary authority for them in the Aeronautics Act, in other words, one global bill. One important change has been made since the bill was first introduced in 1963. The earlier suggestion that the authority levy these charges on aircraft operating outside Canada as well as inside Canada has, as a result of consultation with international airlines, been dropped.

These new proposals relate primarily to investigation of accidents as a result of experience we have gained within the department in the last two years; and to certain powers of the Air Transport Board. It is proposed that the size of the board be increased from three to five members and that the retirement age for members be established at 70 years. It is also proposed that the area of appeal to the minister against decisions of the board be broadened to allow interveners or third parties as well as applicants to originate appeals.

Most of the amendments are of a technical nature. We will be prepared, of course, to deal with them on a broader basis when the bill is introduced and is before the house for second reading.

Mr. MacEwan: Mr. Chairman, the words which I have on this resolution are very

short. I have listened to the introduction of the resolution by the minister without portfolio. May I say that we in this party generally approve of them in principle. However, at a time when a similar resolution was introduced certain reservations were made, by the member for Yukon who has studied this matter and is experienced in it. Undoubtedly he will have an opportunity when the bill is presented to the house to make his suggestions.

As the minister has pointed out, a number of the matters he dealt with are of a technical nature. Certainly the clause which deals with the authorization of the minister to establish boards of inquiry to investigate aircraft accidents is a good one, whereby the mechanics of procedure will allow these inquiries to be set up very quickly. I take it that the extension to ten years of board members' appointments is compatible with other boards such as the Tariff Board. The establishment of the retirement age at 70 is also compatible with other boards.

This is about all I have to say on this matter, except I am wondering if the fact that the minister without portfolio is introducing this measure is a preview of things to come. I recall not long ago a speech in Montreal by Mr. McGregor, the president of Air Canada, in which he suggested that an air ministry be set up. I am wondering whether, if the Prime Minister sets up an air ministry, it would be in order to suggest that the minister without portfolio be appointed. That is all I have to say at this time. We look forward to the bill, and to its various clauses which we will study very closely when it is presented to the house.

Mr. Mather: Mr. Chairman, the reference in the resolution which is before us to the Aeronautics Act and the desire to amend it to facilitate, among other things, the investigation of aircraft accidents, prompts me to bring to the attention of the minister something which might very well have to do with air accidents and their investigation.

My information, Mr. Chairman, which I think is very reliable in this case, is to the effect that there exists in Canada a very serious shortage of aircraft control personnel in some Canadian centres, and that this situation poses a potentially dangerous air traffic condition.

I have figures which indicate a shortage across Canada of some sixty of these key people in this profession. At the Montreal International Airport, for example, my figures would indicate that while there has been an increase of approximately 95 aircraft movements a day, there has actually been a decrease of air traffic control and related personnel during the same period within the last two years. This decrease, Mr. Chairman, has resulted in the problem that, in place of having an establishment of 84 people approved by the legislation and by the department, there were only 64 on the staff on February 15.

I should like to quote very briefly from observations by the Canadian Air Traffic Control Association on that point. They say that the Montreal centre controllers have now been working overtime for well over a year, during which time, little or nothing has been done to alleviate this situation. The association agrees with the feeling that the present air traffic control situation is a potentially dangerous one in relation to air safety. Normal recruiting through the Civil Service Commission is much too long, and the training period required is such that only emergency action taken immediately can solve this problem.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I take this opportunity of bringing this condition to the attention of the minister, in this instance the Minister without Portfolio, in the hope that in line with the legislation which we are discussing, he will pass it on to the Minister of Transport. I urge that this situation, not only in the Montreal airport but in others which I am told are affected, be looked into speedily.

Mr. Olson: Mr. Chairman, I realize that the terms of this resolution and the bill to follow appear to deal primarily with the functions of the Air Transport Board in so far as accidents and safety are concerned. However, Mr. Chairman, there is a reference here to increasing from three to five the size of the Air Transport Board. I believe he also said there were new procedures for appeals to the minister from the decisions of the board. The resolution also points out that these appointments shall now be for a period not exceeding ten years. I hope the Minister without Portfolio will not consider me out of order if I suggest to him that it is about time something was done with respect to the Air Transport Board, because there have been some rather sad experiences in the Prairies with regard to the consequences of certain decisions which have been made by the board.

Aeronautics Act

• (3:20 p.m.)

Now, Mr. Chairman, having said that, I must hasten to add that I am not criticizing the Air Transport Board by itself or suggesting that there was any prior knowledge of some of these mistakes which I think have been made. However, it appears that there were some mistakes and it also appears that there was some kind of a deal, if I may call it that, between TransAir and Trans-Canada Air Lines which was not brought to the attention of the Air Transport Board hearings. I am talking about the application of TransAir to provide services from Winnipeg to Brandon, Yorkton, Regina, Swift Current, Medicine Hat and Calgary. There was never any indication before the Air Transport Board hearings that Trans-Canada Air Lines was going to give or transfer $500,000 worth of equipment to the line that was successful in taking over the service from Trans-Canada at the time. Yet, Mr. Chairman, that is exactly what happened after the decision was handed down.

We complained when this happened, Mr. Chairman. Time after time we complained that something was wrong, that something was unfair about the fact that all these assets were given by Trans-Canada Air Lines, as it was then, to TransAir after Trans-Canada Air Lines had been relieved of providing the service and TransAir had been given the francise or the right to provide the service by the Air Transport Board ruling.

Had any of the other air carriers known that they would receive two DC-3 aircraft, I believe it was, one Viscount aircraft and all the other equipment necessary to service these aircraft, communications facilities, and so on, then there would have been an altogether different kind of application made for this so-called milk run or southern prairie service. What hurts even more, Mr. Chairman, is that after TransAir received all this equipment it provided this service for only 11 months and then withdrew.

The reason I bring this matter up again is that TransAir are apparently going to withdraw from some more services they undertook to provide on the prairies. Yet I do not see any action on the part of the Minister of Transport, or by Air Canada for that matter, to recover some of the $500,000 worth of equipment which was given to TransAir. This is why I should like the Minister without Portfolio to know that a lot of people on the prairies are greatly disturbed about the withdrawal of all their regional air services. They are disturbed that a company which has been given what is, in effect, an enormous grant at public expense in the form of aircraft and parts is withdrawing from services it should be providing, leaving them with nothing.

During the course of Board of Transport Commissioners hearings, and in hearings before the Committee on Transport and Communications, we are told day after day by C.P.R. witnesses that the reason the C.P.R. is withdrawing from railway passenger services is that the air lines are taking over the business of transporting passengers from one city to another. Yet it seems all these cities in western Canada are also having their air line services withdrawn, particularly those provided by TransAir.

When TransAir and several other companies attended the hearings before the Air Transport Board, I am not sure of the date but I believe in late 1962 or 1963, they undertook to provide a service and were granted the franchise for particular routes. Some of the people on the prairies believe that they never really gave those services a chance to succeed. While some of the other applicants may have been successful, though it is difficult to know because they never had the opportunity, we do not believe that TransAir gave the service a chance to succeed.

Looking at this in retrospect, I should like the minister to know that we do not like the fact that these assets were handed over to TransAir, who then withdrew their services. These old DC-3 aircraft and the equipment necessary in the provision of ground services, and so on, may not be too important, and perhaps they were not too valuable. But included in the subsidies or gifts, or whatever you want to call them, was a Viscount aircraft which we are told is worth about $350,000. Why that was included we cannot understand, because the aircraft was not even used on that route. What is so difficult to understand, Mr. Chairman, is that there was never any indication that Trans-Canada Air Lines was going to give TransAir that equipment until after the decision of the Air Transport Board had been rendered.

As I said, Mr. Chairman, it is difficult to criticize the Air Transport Board, because perhaps they did not know about this equipment either. But T.C.A. was, and still is, a publicly owned corporation, and any time they give away $500,000 worth of equipment I think it is the business of this parliament to look into the matter.

When we asked the Minister of Transport questions about this matter, as far as I am concerned we did not get any satisfactory answers. The minister said he would ask the president of Air Canada, as it is now, about it, but to my knowledge there has never been a satisfactory explanation given to this house, in spite of all the representations which were made, as to why and under what circumstances this $500,000 worth of equipment was given to TransAir. That company has now withdrawn services from all of the routes it undertook to provide, I believe with the exception of one, which is Regina-Saskatoon-Prince Albert. All the other routes in the southern prairie regional air service have now been discontinued.

As I said at the outset, Mr. Chairman, I do not want to labour this point greatly. Several months ago when we were much exercised about it we raised the question with the Minister of Transport but were not given any satisfactory explanation. We still expect an explanation, and this matter becomes even more important in view of TransAir having made further applications to withdraw other routes within the last few days.

Mr. Cowan: Mr. Chairman, I would ask the Minister who introduced this resolution to amend the Aeronautics Act whether the words in the second and third lines of the resolution "to prescribe charges for the use of facilities and services provided by the Minister of Transport" refer to such things as the fees collected for these monopolistic taxicab and limousine services at airports like Malton, Dorval, and other Canadian airports, and fees collected through the monopolistic parking arrangements which are made. I shall not proceed further on this matter if I receive a favourable reply, but I do have a third item which I should like to take up.

Mr. Turner: No, Mr. Chairman, this act makes no provision for or reference to what the hon. member is talking about. It applies merely to services rendered to aircraft in flight.

Mr. Cowan: Mr. Chairman, I think you will have to agree with me that the wording of the resolution could be interpreted to read "charges for the use of facilities provided by the Minister of Transport". Certainly facilities are provided by the Minister of Transport at various airports for taxicab service or limousine service—as they call it, to get around the law—and for parking facilities.

I have a third point I wish to make, but before I do so I should like to congratulate the hon. member for Medicine Hat upon the comments he made on the resolution.

This resolution will provide, among other things, that the Air Transport Board shall consist of not less than three and not more than five members. I should like to be able to stand up in this house and congratulate the Minister of Transport—and I am referring to the Minister of Transport now, not to the Minister without Portfolio—on finally having realized the proper way to bring in these changes which are so necessary. I say that because I have in my hand *Hansard* for April last year, when quite a few members of the house, including myself, were discussing at some length supplemental estimates. It is very nice to have the proper procedure followed on this resolution, which is to provide that the Air Transport Board shall consist of not less than three and not more than five members.

• (3:30 p.m.)

I hold in my hand supplementary estimates E and at page 29 we have an item that was withdrawn after opposition from all parts of the house, because we were opposed to legislation by supplemental estimates. The item under vote 75d reads:

> Vote 75d—Salaries and Other Expenses—To extend the purposes of Transport Vote 75 to the Main Estimates, 1964-65 to authorize the Governor in Council notwithstanding section 7 of the Aeronautics Act, to appoint two members of the Air Transport Board in addition to the number provided for by that Act, such members to hold office during pleasure for a term not exceeding three years and to be paid such salary as may be fixed by the Governor in Council, $1.

I draw to the attention of the house the fact that the proper type of legislation is now being introduced. I sincerely hope that since it is proper, it will pass. I do believe that we are entitled to comment on the manner in which this was first brought down as a supplementary estimate in March of 1965, and what was done at that time by people who are opposed to this type of legislation.

When I stated that I could congratulate the Minister of Transport for having brought in the bill properly, I am not unaware of the fact that during the past three weeks we have been forced to rush through supplementary estimates without any consideration being given to the great bulk of them. We were told that if we were to discuss at length the estimates for the year ending March 31, 1966, we would be holding up the legislation of the

country, the civil service could not be paid, and we must not hold them up. Supplementary estimates for the items of $1 went through at a rate that can only be decried as unseemly by people who believe that things should be done in order.

Bill No. C-140, for the House of Commons of Canada, which was passed in the last three weeks has 18 $1 items, practically every one of which is legislation by supplementary estimates.

That was a proper bill, coming under a proper resolution. Now, as I refer to item No. 9 I can hardly congratulate the government for doing the proper thing, as compared with legislation by supplementary estimates one year ago, when within the last three weeks they have put through 18 items of legislation under the $1 supplementary estimates.

Under the Department of Transport, in Bill C-140, item 8b reads:

To authorize in accordance with such terms and conditions as the Governor in Council may prescribe, the transfer of the assets and administration of the Pension Fund of the British Columbia Pilotage District established under the Canada shipping Act, 1934,—

And so on.

—$1.

This is brand new legislation, and it is under the Department of Transport, under supplementary estimates of $1.

Then I refer to the Department of Transport, air services. There is an item passed under supplementary estimates. This is legislation by supplementary estimates. I do not like it and I believe the great majority of the members of the House of Commons do not like it.

Vote 35b reads:

Construction or Acquisition of Buildings, Works, Land and Equipment including national airports (as determined by the Minister of Transport.) and related facilities, including authority, notwithstanding section 30, of the Financial Administration Act, to increase to $16,216,500 the commitments for the current fiscal year for Radio Aids to Air and Marine Navigation—$1.

Still, under the Department of Transport, vote 83b reads:

Notwithstanding any limitation that may be contained in section 265 of the Railway Act, to authorize the payment of an amount not exceeding $2 million from The Railway Grade Crossing Fund to be applied towards the cost of any relocation of the Canadian Pacific Railway line in Sault Ste. Marie pursuant to an Order of the Board—$1.

[Mr. Cowan.]

I have only read you three items where you have legislation by supplementary estimates of the Department of Transport. Exactly the same thing has been done in the last three weeks that was blocked one year ago. If what we did in the last three weeks is perfectly in order and something which we should all admire, why did they bring in the new resolution under item No. 9 relating to the Aeronautics Act? I submit that this resolution now being introduced is proper and is right, and should be passed. I would point out at the same time that while the Minister of Justice is doing one thing correctly with his left hand, I have just quoted Department of Transport supplementary estimates showing things are being done wrongly with the right hand.

I believed the lesson that we endeavoured to teach one year ago could have been learned permanently. In the case of supplementary estimates one year ago vote 75d which was withdrawn and now appears properly as a resolution, will be properly included in the bill.

I have to make these comments because I do not like legislation by supplementary estimates. I have said that for the past several years, and I will continue to say so as long as I am a member of this house. By one of these supplementary estimates of $1, there is brought about an alteration in the terms of an international treaty relating to fish, and to the Great Lakes. This is done by means of a $1 supplementary estimate.

I raise this objection in the same manner in which the hon. member for Medicine Hat raised his.

Mr. Lambert: I should like to add a few words to what was said by the hon. member for Pictou. Before I do so I must say that I was rather intrigued by the hon. member for York-Humber this afternoon. I am not too sure that he fully understands the principle of $1 votes. I am surprised that somebody on the government side did not raise the question that the hon. member was casting a reflection on a decision of the house, and therefore that he was off base in that. However, he did not carry on for too long a time; therefore that point was not raised.

The appropriate bill that was passed and the decisions taken by this house, according to the rules of the house, are not subject to criticism in the way put forward by the hon. member. However I will agree with some of the things the hon. member said, although I

think that if he had realized what is being done by the proposed legislation he might have had second thoughts.

The hon. member suggests by his remark that last year the request to appoint an additional two members to the Air Transport Board by way of a supplementary estimate was legislation by the back door. That measure may have been necessary because it was wanted at that time. It would not have affected the possible composition of the board. Now, with the changing of the board, since the legislation has been passed, those people who are in office may be through, and the minister and the government need not reappoint the members who are in. This is the neatest way of putting the guillotine to any surviving board members. I am not suggesting that that may happen; but it could happen. Under the aegis of this particular minister, I am sure if they are not of the proper political stripe they can pack their bags.

I can tell the hon. member that amending the act and creating a board under a slightly different name, or under a different section, puts an end to the old board. That is what they did with the Economic Council of Canada. The National Productivity Council was killed off simply by changing its name.

In addition to this, Mr. Chairman, I want clarification from the minister piloting the bill. It is not disclosed in the resolution, but did he not also say that the act would provide for appeal from the Transport Board to the minister? Am I not correct in that?

An hon. Member: Yes.

Mr. Lambert: My worst fears are confirmed. If a decision of the Air Transport Board is subject to an appeal to the minister, the board then becomes a direct instrument of government policy, because the board members will first clear with the minister as to what the board's decision must be. Under no circumstances should there be an appeal to a minister from a board. Certainly if it is the intention to appeal to the minister, that is abominable. We do not make the Income Tax Appeal Board responsible to the Minister of National Revenue. We do not allow that an appeal shall lie to the Minister of National Revenue. No other boards that I recall may have their decisions referred to an appeal before the minister.

Let us create some other body; or, for that matter, let an appeal go to the Exchequer Court. But an appeal from the decision of the Air Transport Board to the minister is abominable. We have something new in that concept.

• (3:40 p.m.)

Mr. Olson: Would the hon. member permit a question? Is he not aware that the Railway Act provides for appeal from the judgments of the Board of Transport Commissioners to the Governor in Council?

Mr. Lambert: Yes, and I say this: the Governor in Council is not the minister. I think it has been salutory in many instances that provision has been made for an appeal to the Governor in Council. But in this particular instance the provision for appeal makes the board an instrument of government policy, or part of the executive, and this I think is wrong.

Instead of some of the other matters which the minister brought forward I should like to have heard a declaration from the government with respect to a regional air carrier policy, something for which the hon. member for Medicine Hat has been pressing. I recall this was to have been one of the great pronouncements during the 60 days of decision. This was to have been a source of pride and joy.

Certainly, when the former member for Laurier (Mr. Chevrier) sat on this side of the house, two weeks could not go by but he was asking: When is there to be a regional air transport policy? Shortly afterwards, he and his friends took over—and they have been deciding ever since. The result has been the sort of morass which the hon. member for Medicine Hat has indicated. I know carriers who are waiting to determine whether to buy this or that type of aircraft; they have to wait until the government reaches a conclusion as to what the regional air carrier policy is to be.

In the interval, who suffers? The public. As far as TransAir is concerned, this looked like a tidy deal. I know that Pacific Western and Northwest Industries made applications for a part of this franchise at least, and were turned down. But we know that the former president of TransAir was a good friend of the present administration. I do not know what the arrangements with the company are now, but certainly the net result has been

that there is uncertainty with regard to passenger transport on the prairies in the secondary centres. Carriers who would like to double their fleets and who have an opportunity to buy aircraft, cannot do so.

Has no one tried an aerial bus service on regional air routes? We have one between Edmonton and Calgary and it is highly effective. I will admit there is a high concentration of passengers. Maybe the Department of Transport does not like this bus service because it does not use Department of Transport airports. Maybe the department would like to force this traffic to the international airport at Edmonton. But the passenger service started initially in 1963 using DC-8s and less. The company has now gone through DC-6Bs and is now moving into Electras. There is every indication that this type of service would be well patronized. It is not supplied for week end travel, but that is all right; I am sure that a number of these secondary places on the prairies would be satisfied if they had regional service five days a week. Certainly it would be better than nothing.

I am not entirely sanguine about the amendments which have been proposed. Some of them may be in order. It is inconsequential to suggest that we must amend the act so that the Minister of Transport may charge $1 or $1.25 for lunch when passengers are using a Department of Transport plane. This is a question which the Auditor General raised a few years ago, and it is one of the amendments. There is nothing very serious about that.

However, the other matters, the provision of the right of appeal from the Air Transport Board to the minister, this change in the personnel of the board, appointments to run for ten years, are of more substance. I note that the retirement age is the age of 70. Why, I do not know. In the case of the Supreme Court the age is 75. In the case of other boards, it is 65. Someone will have to explain why that age 70 was chosen. It is one of the magical years, I suppose. In any event we shall be interested in seeing the bill when it comes down. We shall also be interested in having the minister here.

Today we are putting through a good deal of legislation by substitution; there is a bare complement of ministers on which to operate the house. Some of these questions may be skipped over but we do not intend to let this happen when second reading comes along.

[Mr. Lambert.]

Mr. Cowan: Would the hon. member permit a question?

Mr. Lambert: I will try to answer it.

Mr. Cowan: I should like to ask the hon. member for Edmonton West if he has read the comment of his former cabinet colleague who sits in the other place as recorded in Senate debates for March 9 on pages 286 and 287, in which the hon. Senator reflects the opinions I expressed a year ago, which are those I expressed just now with regard to legislation by supplementary estimate.

Mr. Lambert: I do not know to which hon. Senator the hon. member is referring. Again, if I may refer to the rules, I am not at all sure whether it is proper to refer to this year's proceedings in the other place.

Mr. Prittie: I have some comments to make on that part of the resolution which relates to an increase in size of the Air Transport Board. I did not realize until it was mentioned by the hon. member for Edmonton West that the effect of this legislation would be to give the government an opportunity completely to re-open the question of the board's composition. Should this be the case I imagine that some of the present members would be re-appointed. But this does provide for an increase of five members.

Lately a number of ex-politicians have been appointed to various government boards. I do not want to be personal; some of these people are friends of mine and I think a case can be made for looking after ex-politicians. Nevertheless I believe there are certain types of government boards to which appointments ought to be made on the basis of technical and professional competence. I wish to express the hope that additional appointments to the Air Transport Board will be of this type and that the vacancies will not be used merely to find a resting place for candidates who have been defeated in elections.

• (3:50 p.m.)

Another point on which I should like to comment briefly arises from that part of the resolution which deals with inquiries into aircraft accidents. This is an important subject. Unfortunately there have been a good many accidents lately and these have received a great deal of publicity. I should like to emphasize the remarks of my hon. friend from New Westminster on the subject of the prevention of accidents. This whole question

of air traffic control, including the adequacy of the control staff, is one of great importance. It becomes more important all the time as the major airports of this country are handling more and more air movements. It becomes more important as the aircraft themselves become bigger and faster, and carry more passengers.

I have had some discussions with people who work in this field. I am not satisfied that at our major airports we have sufficient people working at air traffic control to allow them to work on a regular schedule without working overtime a great deal. This is very demanding, nerve wracking work, and I want to emphasize that the question of staffing air traffic control centres is of the utmost importance and we should do more than we are doing at present to help prevent air accidents.

Mr. Turner: Mr. Chairman, I would just like to make one or two brief comments on points that have been raised. I have noted what the hon. member for Pictou has said on the question of an air safety control program. The hon. member for Medicine Hat raised a question which I think we can develop elsewhere at more length about the regional air policy and the problem of TransAir at some of the western points between Winnipeg and Saskatoon.

The Air Transport Board has notified all the communities and other enterprises concerned that they have until April 1 to present material to the board by way of objection to the proposed application of TransAir to withdraw from the service. I understand date and place have not been set for that hearing, but it will probably be in Regina. The points the hon. member raised about the transfer of equipment will be mentioned to Air Canada, and I am sure raised before the board. In any event the Air Transport Board will be apprised of the debate this afternoon.

There were two or three points raised by the hon. member for Edmonton West which I deem it advisable to reply to at this stage, even though he will have an opportunity on second reading of the bill to go into them further. It is my understanding that the Aeronautics Act has always had in it a provision for appeal to the minister, and that this provision is not new. What it does in this case is to extend the right of appeal to third parties as well as to applicants. That is the only novel feature in that respect.

I am also advised that this legislation will not remove the present members from the Air Transport Board. The reason for the increase is to accommodate the increased business the board has, because of the increase in air traffic, and the increased responsibilities the board will have, especially with respect to accident investigation, if parliament approves this legislation.

Finally, we have taken note of the remarks of the hon. member for Burnaby-Richmond, and I agree with him that the standard of appointments is an important essential which must be taken into consideration. In conclusion, I wish to thank the hon. member for St. John's East for having presided over this stage of our committee proceedings.

Resolution reported and concurred in.

Mr. Turner thereupon moved for leave to introduce Bill No. C-153, to amend the Aeronautics Act.

Motion agreed to and bill read the first time.

BILLS OF EXCHANGE ACT

PAYMENTS OF CHEQUES ON NON-JURIDICAL DAYS

Hon. G. J. McIlraith (for the Minister of Finance) moved the second reading of Bill No. S-14, to amend the Bills of Exchange Act.

Mr. Jean Chrétien (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Finance): Mr. Speaker, the amendments to the act that are proposed in this bill are, I think, well explained in the notes, but in view of their importance to the business community perhaps I might make a few remarks.

The first amendment would enable a cheque to be presented and paid on a Saturday or on a non-juridical day, if the drawee branch is open for business, and further would enable the drawee, where applicable, to return as dishonoured a cheque presented on such a day. The purpose of the amendment is to permit the bank if it wishes to remain open on a Saturday or on a non-juridical day to conform with the business custom in a community, to follow the same practice with cheques that are presented as it would on any other business day on which it is open.

The second amendment would provide that where the bank closes on what otherwise would be a business day to give a holiday to its employees in compliance with section 26 of the Canada Labour (Standards) Code, where applicable to banks, all matters relating to bills or notes are deferred to the next business day. This amendment would also

permit a bank to adjust its business days to fit the custom of a community. For example, a branch might close on a Monday and remain open on a Saturday, if that was the local business custom.

This bill would also remove Easter Monday from the list of non-juridical days. It is not a general holiday under the Canada Labour (Standards) Code or in the business community generally today. For many years the observance of a holiday on Easter Monday has created an awkward situation for the bank staffs, as, rather than close for four consecutive days, it has been considered necessary to open on the Saturday following Good Friday, notwithstanding that it is not regarded as a business day under the act.

It is also proposed to remove from the act the provisions that required, in the province of Quebec only, that if a bill of exchange is dishonoured it must be protested in order to have recourse against the drawer or endorsers. With this change the practice will be the same in all provinces.

This amendment was suggested by a learned counsel from Quebec and has received the approval of the Premier of Quebec, the Executive Committee of the Chamber of Notaries, whose members are now required to prepare and serve the protest documents, and has also been approved by the banks.

Because of the importance of this bill in the business life of the country it is the intention, following the debate on second reading, to refer the bill to the house Committee on Finance, Trade and Economic affairs for study and further explanations if required.

Hon. Marcel Lambert (Edmonton West): Mr. Speaker, this bill, frankly, can be categorized as a form of clean-up bill following passage of the Canada Labour (Standards) Code and is an indication of what we may have to do in a number of areas as the result of the passage of that act, although I must say this is going to be a difficult proposition.

• (4:00 p.m.)

It also indicates, by reason of a rather doctrinaire approach by the former minister of labour and the administration with regard to certain aspects of the Canada Labour (Standards) Code, that we are going to affect vitally legal rights of citizens, as under the Bills of Exchange Act, and I will come to the point of how this comes about. In banking circles, under this act, there is going to be introduced an element of uncertainty, since there is a provision for the conducting of business by the banks according to the customs of the community. In addition there is a provision to enable the banks to close on what would ordinarily be a business day. Does this mean that banks will carry this out uniformly? Are we going to get another day of the week during which banks are going to be closed?

Almost 30 years ago I went to work for one of the chartered banks. We worked on Saturdays in those days. I know the present act was amended in 1951 as a consequence of the five-day week. Now we are going to have an amendment, as a result of the Canada Labour (Standards) Code, which will permit the banks to close on the days of choice by the banks. However, the banks are involved with their clients, with their customers, and the customers are involved one with another, with resulting legal obligations.

How are you going to spell out the days of grace on a bill so that you can determine precisely what are the legal rights? When are bills going to be presentable for honour, if in a local community it has been decided to follow the customs of business and you cannot predict ahead of time what they are going to do? These are some of the consequences we must consider in respect of the amendments as proposed. In addition, of course, the first amendment is a complete reversal of the law since 1951. For some reason or other in 1951, when the act was amended to do away with banking hours on Saturdays, except when the banks have been closed on a subsequent Monday or on the previous Friday, you could get away with presenting a dishonoured bill; there was no legal obligation which flowed from it. But now, after 15 years, it has been decided to reverse that completely and return to the law as it stood; that is, that if a bill was presented for payment at any time that a bank was open for business and it was dishonoured, certain legal consequences ensued. Why this was done in 1951 to somehow give us a chance to bounce a cheque or to bounce a note on Saturday morning, I do not know; but such was the case.

Now it is proposed to return to the law as it stood prior to 1951. I do say, with the application of the Canada Labour (Standards) Code, the banks must have the opportunity to close in order to conform with that act; it is not in respect of the scale of pay requirement under the Canada Labour (Standards) Code, but rather the hours of work. Here again we have the doctrinaire approach of the farmer

minister of labour who obviously never worked in a bank. I am going to ask him right now, what do you do if there are errors and one has to balance off? There is only one thing you can do, and that is work until you have found your errors. But under the Canada Labour (Standards) Code one may have to call in somebody else who has never worked on the books, again because I have made errors today and worked tonight to clean them up, you have to give me a holiday tomorrow. If I were in a bank, I could get an extra day by making a mess of my books and having to stay late; they would have to let me off on another day.

This is one example of results of the doctrinaire approach. Others apply in the transportation and oil industry, where the whole act is riddled with illogicalities and impraticalities. We are seeing one of them now; it is a minor one, but it is there. Go to a rural branch out in the Prairies in the autumn months when there is a heavy volume of business. I can tell you it was my personal experience as a teller to have to put in long hours on busy days because of the volume of business. Are we going to quit because the Canada Labour (Standards) Code says we have to work only so many hours? Of course you don't. Here we have the same doctrinaire approach with regard to the Canada Labour (Standards) Code, and it is impracticable.

Now, there are other amendments which have to do with holidays; I am not going to go into them in detail. However, in looking at the act as it stood before I must say it indicated that one of the days on which there could be a bank holiday was any day appointed by proclamation for a public holiday or for a general fast, or a general thanksgiving throughout Canada. I guess perhaps fasting is out of style today—that is for religious purposes—so we now are going to get a day of general prayer or mourning; then it says a general thanksgiving throughout Canada.

• (4:10 p.m.)

Now we are going to have in addition a day of public rejoicing. Well, of course one really could speculate for some time on what should be public rejoicing; it all depends. On this side of the house, I think we could go into a number of things which would lead to public rejoicing in Canada. Is it going to be the day, perhaps, that this administration would fall and be replaced by a much better one? Should that be deemed to be a bank holiday? Or should it be on the occasion that Canada might win the tournament in world hockey—should that be a day of public rejoicing? Or should it be the day we land the Olympics, or any number of other things on which we could speculate? Who is going to determine what shall be a day of public rejoicing? This will be done by proclamation, so it will be the Governor in Council who will decide what shall be a day of public rejoicing. Maybe the day following the presentation of a budget which discloses no new taxes will be proclaimed as a day for public rejoicing.

I should like to ask the parliamentary secretary some questions regarding a certain part of the printed bill, as compared with section 113 of the Revised Statutes of Canada. I should like to draw his attention to the wording that exists in the notes to section 3 of the bill and the actual words as contained on page 318 of the revised statutes. They are as follows:

> Where an inland bill has been dishonoured, it may, if the holder things fit, be noted and protested for non-acceptance or non-payment as the case may be;—

These are the words I want particulary to direct to the parliamentary secretary's attention:

> —but it is not necessary to note or protest an inland bill in order to have recourse against the drawer or endorsers.

When we look at the explanatory notes of the bill regarding the proposed section 113 we read the section as follows:

> Where an inland bill has been dishonoured, it may, if the holder thinks fit, be noted and protested for non-acceptance or non-payment as the case may be; but it shall not, except in the province of Quebec, be necessary to note or protest—

In one the words are "it is not", and in the other they are "it shall not". I should like to draw this obvious error between the printed version and the explanatory note to the attention of the parliamentary secretary, and I hope when this bill comes before the appropriate standing committee an explanation can be given about this error in that the amendment is written in the present tense rather than in the future. Someone may suggest tht I am quibbling, but having regard to legal interpretation of the Bills of Exchange Act, which is one of our oldest and most important acts, it is incumbent upon the government to make absolutely sure that the proper legal phraseology is used.

The principle of this bill is that there shall be certain amendments made to the Bills of Exchange Act. On their face these amendments would appear to be innocuous, but

they are not. They must be related to certain provisions of the Canada Labour (Standards) Act, and I am just wondering how often we are going to have to amend other acts as we find that the provisions of the Canada Labour (Standards) Act have an affect on many occupations. I frankly believe that if that act was amended and made a little more practical we would not find it necessary to amend various other acts to fit the circumstances.

Mr. Colin Cameron (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands): Mr. Speaker, it is a little difficult to figure out just what is intended by some of the clauses of this bill. There may be a very practical explanation for the first proposed amendment and the explanatory notes thereto which suggest such an amendment would enable a drawee to pay cheques on a Saturday or non-juridical day on which the drawee is open for business. On the face of that explanation one might consider that this amendment is an invitation to banks to stay open on Saturday. If that is the case, will there be some provision made for banks to close on another day in order to protect the rights of their employees?

I notice also a certain discrepancy between the proposed subclause 4 and the explanatory notes to the proposed amendment in that the explanatory notes suggest that the banks would be able to adjust to the business customs of a community. The clause itself merely refers to the carrying on of business if a branch of a bank is not open for business on a business day. That is to say, it makes provision for banks to do business on days when for some reason or other the banks normally would be closed.

The explanatory note suggests there may be a wider intention, that is, to permit a bank to adjust to the business customs of a community. I think these business customs referred to should be explained. There may be some communities so benighted that the businesses wish to stay open every night of the week. Will this proposed amendment mean that the bank branches, in providing for community customs, will be able to stay open at night in areas where there are no municipal ordinances governing hours of business? I think this is puzzling because the explanatory note is not in accordance with the proposed amendment in the bill.

I notice in clause 2 of the bill, which is the clause dealing with holidays and non-juridical days which apply to banks, we have a list which includes, among others, Victoria and Dominion days. The explanation as to the purpose of this amendment is to remove Victoria and Dominion days from the list of non-juridical days that are to occur the next Monday when the named days fall on a Sunday. Perhaps I am unable to read this correctly, but there seems to be a contradiction. These two days are included as being non-juridical days, but the explanation suggests they are to be removed. Perhaps I am misreading this clause.

I am not going to make any reference, as did the hon. member for Edmonton West (Mr. Lambert), to the possibilities of what might constitute a day of jubilation in Canada. We all have our own views about that and I am sure mine would not coincide with those of the hon. member. There is wide scope for interpretation in this clause and it would be of benefit to know what the government had in mind in proposing it.

At some time I should like to hear a serious answer regarding what I consider to be an inadequacy in the explanatory note, in that it appears to be in contradiction of the words of the bill now before us.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order. I must advise the house that if the parliamentary secretary speaks now he will close the debate.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Jean Chrétien (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Finance): Since the two hon. members who spoke on this bill can understand quite well this country's other official language, I should like to make my comments in French.

To begin with, I ask that the bill be referred to the appropriate committee so we may obtain the explanations requested by the hon. members.

If I refer to the statement made by Mr. Elderkin, the inspector general of banks, before the Senate committee on banking and commerce, I find that he gave explanations that the hon. members will be able to get in the appropriate committee of the house.

As for the comments made by the hon. member for Edmonton West (Mr. Lambert), I would point out that there are obviously adjustments to be made when you are going through a period of social progress such as the one we are experiencing now. The house decided that the labour code should apply to banks as well as to other institutions, and I think that is perfectly normal. In the past, some banking institutions might have taken an unfair advantage of their employees by having them work long hours for little pay.

In my opinion, it is quite normal for those people to be subjected to the labour code and we have to make the required amendments to enable those financial institutions to adjust themselves to other legislation passed in this house.

With regard to business customs, some communities decide, for instance, that Monday will not be a business day, and others choose Wednesday or Saturday.

Since banks will have to change their operational procedures to comply with the provisions of the new Labour Code, I think we should allow those procedures to be adjusted to the customs of a community. It seems to me it would be beneficial to all businessmen. When a bank is open on Wednesday while all stores are closed, it is not very beneficial to the bank.

At any rate, members will be able to put all the questions they want to the bank superintendent when we consider this piece of legislation in the committee on finance, trade and economic affairs.

• (4:20 p.m.)

[*English*]

Motion agreed to, bill read the second time and the house went into committee thereon, Mr. Batten in the chair.

Mr. Churchill: This was to go to the standing committee.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Chrétien: Mr. Speaker, I believe there is a mistake and that the bill should be referred to the committee on finance, trade and economic affairs.

The Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Robichaud) will move a motion to that effect.

[*English*]

Mr. Robichaud: Mr. Chairman, I should like to move, seconded, if a seconder is required, by the Minister without Portfolio, that the present bill be sent to the—

Mr. Lambert: Mr. Chairman, I think we will have to rise and report progress. Then the minister may make his motion.

Progress reported.

Mr. Robichaud (for the Minister of Finance) moved that Bill S-14 be referred to the Standing Committee on Finance, Trade and Economic Affairs.

Motion agreed to.

BRETTON WOODS AGREEMENTS ACT

PROVISION FOR PAYMENT OF SUBSCRIPTIONS BY CANADA

Hon. John N. Turner (for the Minister of Finance) moved the second reading of Bill C-144, to amend the Bretton Woods Agreements Act.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Jean Chrétien (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Finance): Mr. Speaker, following the very interesting discussion at the resolution stage, I have not much to say on second reading, since we intend to refer the bill to the committee on finance, trade and economic affairs.

Before doing so, however, I ask the consent of the house to table two returns requested by the member for Edmonton West, namely, the first return.

[*English*]

The first document dealt with the financial implications of Canada's increased contribution to the International Monetary Fund and the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development. The second recommendation is a list of the three countries who are members of the I.M.F. and their increased contributions to the fund.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Does the parliamentary secretary have the permission of the house to table the documents referred to?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Hon. Marcel Lambert (Edmonton West): Mr. Speaker, it is a little unfortunate that we did not have these tables at the resolution stage because we could have commented on them at that time. I am not in any way holding the parliamentary secretary to account for this, however, it does make it a little difficult to deal with the matter at this time. I know he did have one table but was cut short by the time. As a matter of fact, it was the clock which prevented the parliamentary secretary from tabling at least the one chart. In any event, we will be able to look at this in the Committee on Finance, Trade and Economic Affairs. As a result of this schedule which has been tabled, it will be very instructive to see that Canada has made certain economic progress relative to other member countries in the International Monetary Fund.

• (4:30 p.m.)

There is little more that we can say at this time, except I will also be interested in the

point raised by the member for Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands, and that is something I agree with. I had first thought that this bill could have gone to the committee of the whole, but on reflection I find I am more in agreement with the member for Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands that it should go to the finance committee, so that we can get a full discussion and explanation of the moves being made by one or more major countries of the world to get a modification in the international payment standards. Perhaps that is something which might have been sloughed over, and I think we should be grateful to the hon. member for having insisted on that. I hope we will get a chance next week or within the next ten days to have an appropriate explanation. Other than that, I have no further remarks at this particular stage and I recommend the adoption in principle of this bill.

Mr. Colin Cameron (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands): Mr. Speaker, I have just one or two things to say at this stage. I am delighted, as is the hon. member for Edmonton West (Mr. Lambert), that this bill is to go to the committee for study, because it has always seemed to me that this is one of the occasions on which we get some education for ourselves which is very badly needed, and by that means perhaps pass on some of that education first of all to our parliamentary colleagues and later to the general public.

I recall some 12 years ago now, when I had the privilege of being a member of the banking and commerce committee of that day, we had a revision of the Bank Act which was made the occasion for an extremely interesting and quite prolonged series of what one might almost call lectures on the operations of the monetary system, which I know added a great deal to my knowledge and to the knowledge of other members of the committee.

As I suggested the other day, Mr. Speaker, we are now facing another problem in the international field which requires similar treatment. I would hope that the Minister of Finance (Mr. Sharp) when he arranges for hearings before the Committee on Finance, Trade and Economic Affairs, would not limit himself in the way of witnesses and officials from our own central bank or our own Department of Finance, but would seize the opportunity to ask to appear as witnesses before that committee some of the more outstanding exponents of new international units of exchange, such as Professor Robert Triffin of Yale and Professor Beurnstein, I think it is, of Chicago, both of whom in recent years have presented ideas for a new international exchange unit.

I am fairly confident, sir, that Professor Robert Triffin would be as willing this year to come to Ottawa to appear before the committee as he expressed himself willing last year when I wrote to him about the possibility of there being a bill before the committee on which his advice would be extremely useful. At that time Professor Triffin told me that he would be very glad to come to Ottawa, and I hope that the parliamentary secretary could say a word to the Minister of Finance and suggest that one or both of these gentlemen might be available. The committee would then have the benefit of some of the more advanced views with regard to this problem of international liquidity when it proceeds to discuss this bill at that time.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: I must advise the house that if the parliamentary secretary speaks now he will close the debate.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Jean Chrétien (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Finance): Mr. Speaker, I thank the two previous speakers for their support in sending this bill back to the appropriate committee.

Obviously, as people interested in the operation of the International Fund and in the problems of international liquidity, we need more specific information from the officials in this country who are better informed on the problem.

As for the suggestion of the hon. member for Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands (Mr. Cameron) to have Professors Triffin and Bernstein appear before the committee, I think it is an excellent idea, but the committee must take the initiative through a resolution passed by the committee itself. It would also be easy to have available the officials of the Bank of Canada and of the Department of Finance to supply the required information. I think the Department of Finance and the Bank of Canada also have made a thorough study of the liquidity and of this new theory that we should have a new international exchange unit to serve as monetary reserve.

During discussions held in Paris in the last few months, Canada made representations on this question.

Therefore, it might be interesting at that time to have additional explanations given before the committee if possible, so that the public may be better informed on this most important problem which has tremendous implications on international trade and on the economic development of the whole country.

[*English*]

Mr. Deputy Speaker: May I ask whether it is the intention to have this bill go to the committee of the whole?

Mr. Turner: To the standing committee.

Motion agreed to, bill read the second time and referred to the Standing Committee on Finance, Trade and Economic Affairs.

FISHERIES

PROVISION FOR DEVELOPMENT OF COMMERCIAL FISHERIES

Hon. H. J. Robichaud (Minister of Fisheries) moved the second reading of Bill No. C-145, to provide for the development of the commercial fisheries of Canada.

Mr. Churchill: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, I am not objecting to this bill coming up at this time, but I do note it was not called as a matter of business for today. Naturally I do not want to go back into the past, as some people have been doing recently, and call attention to criticism which arose then. But here we are with this bill now called before us without prior notification, and some members who might have liked to speak to it are not present.

Incidentally, a lot of those people who, when we were defending the rights and privileges of members a little while ago, said "Let us get on with the business of the house" are certainly not here today, particularly on the government side.

Mr. Robichaud: Mr. Speaker, I am not too sure whether the hon. member who has just spoken is objecting to second reading of this bill, although I very well understand the position he is now in.

It is not my intention to make extensive remarks at this stage, Mr. Speaker. This bill will be discussed before the committee of the whole house. Furthermore, the estimates of the Department of Fisheries will, I hope, be before the Standing Committee on Fisheries very soon. I suggest that this would be the appropriate time, hon. members on all sides of the house expressing this desire on different occasions, to discuss in detail administration of the Department of Fisheries.

Formerly different programs implemented by the Department of Fisheries have been carried out through appropriations. This is the first time that a bill has been introduced to take care of all aspetcs of fisheries development. As hon. members will have noticed, when the bill was introduced on first reading, provision is made for the first time for a cold storage assistance policy. Up till a few years ago a program was administered by the Department of Agriculture which provided for certain subsidies applicable to construction of cold storage facilities for agricultural and fisheries products. At the time of the austerity program it was decided that no further subsidies would be awarded under this program. In view of requirements under the new inspection legislation a large number of existing cold storage facilities will either have to expand or be modified.

• (4:40 p.m.)

We felt that due to revision, or new inspection requirements, in many cases private enterprise was not in a position to finance on its own, or under existing capital available, the modernization or expansion which was required for existing cold storages. This bill provides for this type of assistance.

It also provides for general support for the modernization of the fishing fleet. In recent years there has been substantial progress in this field. Subsidies have been available for a number of years, and modifications have been made in recent months.

This is also the first time that we find any federal legislation relating to the authority or details of co-operation with the provinces on a number of cost shared programs. Such programs have been accelerated particularly since the federal-provincial conference on fisheries was convened in Ottawa in January of 1964. Since that time a number of meeting have taken place with representatives of all the provinces.

I noted, when the resolutions stage of this bill was discussed in the house, that reference was made to the federal participation with regard to fresh water fisheries. I am pleased to state at this time that there have been, since the federal-provincial conference, many meetings. Many meetings have taken place with representatives of the inland provinces

in order to determine what participation the federal government could take in the development of the inland fisheries.

Reference was also made at the resolution stage to the participation of the province of British Columbia in these matters. I want to assure hon. members of this house that it is the policy of the government, the policy of the Department of Fisheries, to make available on a national scale all the facilities and the programs which are now in existence within the Department of Fisheries. It is not our intention to force or induce the provinces to share or to take part in these programs. What we have done is to amend, if needed, the regulations in order to make these facilities available to all provinces. There might be one exception and this has to do with the bait service in Newfoundland. The bait service in Newfoundland is provided under a special agreement which was reached at the time that Newfoundland joined confederation. It is our intention to meet this obligation.

Reference has also been made at the resolution stage of this bill to the possibility of training fishermen for the deep sea fishery. In recent months there has been an unprecedented demand for such fishermen. During the last 10 or 12 months we could see that such a demand would come about, before too long. It might be interesting to note what we have done in this respect. We have had a series of discussions on manpower and educational needs, particularly with the eastern provinces. A special meeting was held; a symposium was held with the representatives of the industry and representatives of the provincial governments, at Pictou, last summer.

Within the next few weeks we shall have on the staff of the Department of Fisheries in Ottawa, for the first time, an educational officer. It is our intention to co-operate with the Department of Labour in its vocational training program, in order to train an adequate number of fishermen and to qualify them to participate in the expansion which is now taking place in the fishing industry, and particularly in our offshore fishing fleet.

We have now in existence three fishing schools on the east coast; one at Pictou, Nova Scotia; one at Caraquet, New Brunswick, and one at Grande Rivière in Quebec. We have the college, or the fishery university at St. John's, Newfoundland.

It is our intention to co-operate with those institutions in order that they be in a position

[Mr. Robichaud.]

to improve their facilities and to provide adequate training for young fishermen who are interested in getting involved in deep sea fishing operations.

Mr. Chairman, there is very little that I can add at this time on this bill. I sould be prepared to answer any questions from hon. members when the bill reaches the committee stage.

Reference has been made in the house to the fact that the fisheries department was considered as the orphan of the government. I do not want to cast aspersions on any previous administration, but I want to make it clear to hon. members that when I was assigned the responsibility for this department, the total estimates for the Department of Fisheries were in excess of $23 million. In less than three years the total estimates of the department have now reached, as evidenced by the estimates for the coming fiscal year tabled some weeks ago, a figure of over $40 million.

• (4:50 p.m.)

I dare say that when the supplementary estimates have been introduced for the coming fiscal year the total estimates of the Department of Fisheries will be in the vicinity of $43 million, an increase of 90 per cent in the last three years. It is evident that this act now under consideration will give the minister and the department authority to proceed with certain programs either totally federal or cost-shared with the provinces for the development of the fisheries of Canada and I hope this initiative will receive full support from all sides of the house.

Mr. H. W. Danforth (Kent (Ont.)): I am certainly interested in the introduction of this Bill C-145 to provide for the development of commercial fisheries in Canada. I was particularly interested to hear the minister speak of fresh water fishing and of conferences with the provinces in this connection.

I admire the ambitious program set out in this bill but I hope it will not follow the course of so many actions taken by the Department of Fisheries in the past—the department seems to concentrate all its efforts on the development and promotion of deep sea fisheries, forgetting we have a multi-million dollar fresh water fishing industry in Canada right here in Ontario.

For the past few years fishing along the shores of the Great Lakes has been in dire

circumstances. For too long fishermen engaged in this industry have prayed for government intervention both provincial and federal to make it possible for them to maintain this industry. You will recall, Mr. Speaker, that the stock of fish in the Great Lakes suffered seriously throught the depredations caused by an invasion of lamprey eels. Tremendous efforts were made by the province of Ontario in conjunction with the United States to put an end to this serious situation, and these efforts may have been successful. But there has always been a feeling among fishermen around the Great Lakes that they are the forgotten segment of the industry. They have seen their waters depleted of fish. Moreover, neither the dominion government nor the provincial governments seemed to provide for them the same measures of subsidy or financial assistance as were enjoyed by coastal fishermen.

They have seen the numbers of species of fish in the lakes reduced until at the present time there are only two main varieties of fish which can be taken in any quantity—I speak especially of Lake Erie. These two varieties are perch and smelt, and if it were not for the tremendous efforts of local fishermen in developing a market for these fish the industry around Lake Erie would have passed out of existence.

Mr. Robichaud: Would the hon. member permit a question? I wonder whether he heard what I said a while ago when I stated that in recent months, or since last year, we have made available to the inland provinces, including the government of Ontario, most of the programs and most of the facilities which were previously available on the east coast or the west coast. So now it is really up to the provinces concerned to take advantage of these programs which are available to them.

Mr. Danforth: I thank the minister for his intervention. I have no quarrel with him there. It may be, as he has said, that this is the situation. But the fact remains that the lakes are being depopulated and tremendous efforts must be made to determine the cause. Some people have attributed it to water pollution. Some attribute it to the development of a particular species which, being cannibal in its nature, is harmful to the young of other species. Various reasons are given, but the fact remains there are fewer fish left each year for fishermen to take and the livelihood of these people depends on the quantity and quality of the fish they are able to catch.

I hope that as a result of this bill aggressive steps will be taken jointly with the province to determine the basic reason for the decline in the fish population. I hope steps will be taken to replenish the lakes with the stock necessary to provide the living to which these fishermen are entitled, having spent their lives in the industry and invested their life savings in equipment.

I understand that the United States government has taken a deep interest in the repopulation of the lakes, and it is my understanding also that some $5 million will this year be spent on this worth-while project. I earnestly hope that our government in conjunction with the province of Ontario will work with the government of the United States to launch a project which will determine once and for all the basic causes of the depletion in fish stocks, and then do something to restock the lakes.

For far too long we have seen the fish hatcheries either working at half their capacity or not working at all. I have seen hatcheries along the lakes shut down completely at a time when the fishermen were worried because they were unable to garner sufficient fish to provide them with a living. This is a serious matter as far as these men are concerned and I am looking forward to this bill having the scope necessary to make it possible for the province of Ontario, the federal government and the fishermen themselves, whose livelihood depends upon it, to do something in accord to settle this basic problem once and for all. These men are in dire straits. They must have help right away.

Motion agreed to, bill read the second time and the house went into committee thereon, Mr. Batten in the chair.

Mr. Knowles: Five o'clock.

Progress reported.

• (5:00 p.m.)

Mr. Speaker: Order. It being five o'clock the house will now proceed to the consideration of private members' business as listed on today's order paper, namely, public bills and private bills.

CONSUMER CREDIT

MOTION TO REFER SUBJECT MATTER OF CERTAIN BILLS TO JOINT COMMITTEE

Mr. J. B. Stewart (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Public Works): Mr. Speaker, I should like to ask the consent of the house to move that the subject matter of certain bills

be sent to the Joint Committee on Consumer Credit.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Does the house give unanimous consent to move this motion?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Mr. Stewart: Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the hon. member for Spadina (Mr. Ryan):

That the subject matter of the following bills be referred to the Joint Committee on Consumer Credit: C-4, C-21, C-24, C-29, C-39, C-53, C-65, C-76, C-91 and C-92.

Motion agreed to.

HOUSE OF COMMONS

PROVISION FOR DEFINING LENGTH OF PARLIAMENTARY SESSIONS

Mr. S. Perry Ryan (Spadina) moved the second reading of Bill No. C-6, to provide for the length of sessions of parliament.

He said: Mr. Speaker, Bill C-6 was originally prepared and introduced in the last parliament at a time when there was a great deal of discussion about the need for reform of the proceedings and rules of this house. It was never debated in the twenty sixth parliament because it was not reached in private members' hour.

This is a bill to provide for the length of sessions of parliament. Since the first introduction of this bill, a special committee on procedure and organization has made numerous reports as a result of which the rules of the house have been improved and amended in many ways. I personally believe, however, that a great deal of further improvement could be brought to pass if parliament were to plan its sessions and the House of Commons were to plan its sittings, and to fix the normal times of such sittings.

Hon. members may be of the opinion that it is better to look first of all at the forest and then at the trees. I submit if the size of the forest is first determined, then the number and location of the trees can be better determined.

In recognition of the fact that parliament must sit much longer than formerly, to deal with the increasingly complex and numerous matters of public interest, and that this places a great deal of strain on the staff of parliament; in recognition of the fact that ministers of the crown have departmental duties, and all members have constituency duties which must be attended to in periods free of parliamentary duties, I have caused this bill to be re-introduced in this parliament.

[Mr. Stewart.]

I feel that if this bill, or an analogous bill, were enacted, most of the necessary routine work of parliament such as estimates, supply and minor amendments to existing legislation could be programmed for a first mandatory session in each year, and that most legislation bringing in innovations could be given first reading in the mandatory session but could be programmed for the permissive session later in the year.

I submit that this would bring order in the conduct of our business where there is now chaos. This would prevent the use of estimates and interim supply in the annual game of fox and goose played between the house leaders, a game in which they try to outfumble each other. This would stop the kind of emotional brinkmanship which creates the atmosphere that even brings down a government, all too unreasonably sometimes to be in the interests of the country.

In clauses 2 and 3 the bill provides for a mandatory session that commences the last Thursday of January and could continue to the second Thursday of September each year. This is the first session of the year, the mandatory session. However, the House of Commons would not normally sit beyond the last Friday of June. The Senate could continue to sit, if it so desires, to finish its business without the pressure that it has now of having to rush in order to meet a House of Commons deadline. The Senate must rise, however, some time before the second Thursday of September, whereupon the session would end. Hon. members should keep clearly in mind, as I am speaking now, the distinction between the session of parliament and the sitting of the House of Commons.

If necessary, and I believe it usually would be, there would be a fall session in which the house would finish sitting on the second Friday of December, at the latest. The Senate could continue to sit until the last Thursday of January in the new year.

Clause 4 of the bill provides for an adjustment of the sittings in an election year, and also for emergency sittings.

Clause 5 provides for a day's debate in the house on the necessity of emergency sittings, if 50 members give notice that they do not consider the call to be one of urgent public importance. This is designed to be preventive and to discourage sittings that are not really necessary and in the public interest. It is also designed to concentrate opposition criticism to one day, rather than have such criticism continue through the sittings.

Clause 6 is a very important clause as it provides for government business and private business to be carried over from one session to the next, as if the two sessions were one continuous session. This provision would continue committees, for example, into the next session until their business is completed. Hon. members will appreciate that this would save a great deal of lost time, repetition and expense.

• (5:10 p.m.)

Clause 7 provides that the Speaker and two officials of the House of Commons may, after the house has stopped sitting, complete the formalities of receiving bills from the Senate that have been passed without amendment, without the necessity of the members of the House of Commons attending at the royal assent. This measure would come into force upon royal assent, but would first apply to the year 1967.

This bill, Mr. Speaker, would modernize section 20 of the British North America Act of 1867, 30 Victoria, Chapter 3, which simply provides that there shall be a session of the parliament of Canada once at least every year so that 12 months shall not intervene between the last sitting of the parliament in one session, and the first sitting in the next session.

As our constitution now stands, a prime minister could, in theory, call parliament to sit for one day a year and prorogue it at the end of that day. In practice, of course, a prime minister would, so acting, have great difficulty continuing in office even with recourse to Governor General's warrants. This is an area, however, in which a prime minister has exceptional power and freedom to manoeuvre. This bill, if enacted, would in large measure curtail existing prerogatives of a prime minister. This is not the motivation for this bill, but it would be a result.

Mr. Speaker, most democratic legislative assemblies in the world now have regular dates for the commencement of their sessions, and many spell out the duration of a session with precision. In West Germany the length of sessions generally is fixed by the parliamentarians themselves. There is a so-called steering committee made up of the president—the equivalent of our Speaker—and 30 members of all parties represented, according to their strength in parliament. In each month of a session, one week is devoted to committee work; one week is for the whole parliament; one week is half committee sessions and half for the whole parliament. The final week is free. The West German parliament normally begins in the first two weeks of October and adjourns at the end of July, with three free weeks at Christmas and two weeks at Easter. These parliamentarians draw up a calendar for each year and spell out precisely the program for the year in respect of it, so that everybody who desires to have dealings in or with parliament has a better opportunity to plan or perform his parliamentary business.

Mr. Speaker, I am not recommending that the West German method be adopted here. I am merely illustrating the businesslike approach of another free legislative assembly.

The bill at hand would initiate the framework within which Canadian parliamentarians, by setting up a joint committee of the house and the other place, could further reform our rules and procedures to meet modern day requirements.

Mr. Heath Macquarrie (Queens): Mr. Speaker, I always have been very fond of the private members' hour, especially on Friday when one gets a lift out of the crowded house and the packed expectant gallery.

Mr. Nicholson: Mr. Speaker, would the hon. member permit a question.

Mr. Macquarrie: Certainly.

Mr. Nicholson: Are you sure you have not used the wrong words; should you not have said the "quality" of the members rather than the crowded number of those present.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Macquarrie: I may say that both give me great pleasure.

Mr. Knowles: It is nice to have two ministers here today.

Mr. Macquarrie: Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman who has moved this bill I am sure has been motivated by the kind of concern which must disturb a great many Canadians, especially those interested in public matters, because in recent months and indeed in recent years, there have been many aspects of our system here which, in unkind terms have become chaotic, and which in kind terms have become awkward. We have had so many elections that we sometimes find ourselves giving close scrutiny to the estimates of a previous year. We find ourselves facing a speech from the throne with items which are

very familiar; in fact, sometimes one's memory slips, and I am not sure there are not some things in the present throne speech which were read at the time that our party formed the government.

Mr. Dinsdale: Lots of them.

Mr. Knowles: They will still be there if you ever take office again.

Mr. Macquarrie: Over the years things have happened to the length of sessions, although so much has happened to the machinery for dealing with this matter. In 1867, in the first parliament when the country was being built and brought together, they met on November 6, 1867 and were through in May the following year. The next session began April 15 and ended June 22. I know they had a tremendous prime minister in those days, but nevertheless there is a contrast all down through the years, and I am not going to take up the time of this crowded house here today to go over all of them.

Even in 1908, at the turn of the century, the session commenced on March 8 and ended on July 13. In the depths of the depression, which in Canada began in 1929 and ended in 1939, in 1932 the third session of the seventeenth parliament, ran from February 4 to May 26. It grappled with the great problems which it had, and a tremendous amount of legislation, some of it of a new kind that was quite shocking, especially to some of the members of the party that was passing it. Then there was the session which commenced on January 17, 1935 and ended on July 5 of that year. This was one of the great dynamic sessions of all times, because this was the famous reform session of R. B. Bennett.

We have found great expansion in the estimates. One has only to compare the figures recently given by the Minister of National Revenue with the few millions of earlier days. We have to recognize, in short, Mr. Speaker, that this now has become a year-round task. No matter how we try to streamline our procedures, a member of the House of Commons of Canada today will find that the whole year must be devoted to his public duties. Now we have, as the mover has mentioned, improved the rules, and the committee and the Speaker in the past parliament deserve great credit.

• (5:20 p.m.)

I think there are many internal improvements which we can yet make. I shall continue to champion the installation of voting machines. As I sit here hour after hour waiting for votes to be taken I can ruminate and reflect on the value of such a device. I am sure I will have the thing well thought out before this session is over.

We could benefit from the situation which exists in other legislatures. As we pass through crises, and we have passed through crises in recent years and in recent days, the mother of parliaments shows the way. Great fundamental issues of monumental concern and of deep emotional content have been met and dealt with in the British parliament in one day, and when the sitting expired the issue was resolved one way or the other.

I like many of the suggestions contained in this bill. I think we have reached the stage where we should know at least, if not where we are at, when we are going to get there, so to speak. We should know in years when there are not elections when the house will meet, when it will adjourn and when, as the hon. member so rightly pointed out, members can be in their constituencies for a good deal of time.

It is my suggestion that sessions should commence in January and have a proper break during July and August. This is where I would be inclined to differ from this measure. I think we should keep one session with an adjournment, rather than, as he has put it, two sessions on a mandatory and permissive basis. I am concerned about the fact that many of the functions and formula-like activities—opening ceremonies, set debates and what have you—devour a great deal of time, where an adjournment of a session would obviate this.

It is extremely important that we face up to the fact, as the British have done to a great degree, that we should work on a calendar year with set adjournments, so that our constituents and ourselves can prepare beforehand for a known and sustained period of time when we perform that important part of our work in our constituencies.

Reasonable adjournments at other times, such as at Easter and certainly at Christmas, should be provided. If there is one thing that pains and humiliates me as a member of parliament, it is the dangling of an adjournment before members suggesting that if we get through these, and these, and these—then emerges a great long list of legislation—we might have an adjournment. This is not a sin exclusively of the party now in power. I remember, the suggestions that if we got all the proposed legislation through we would prorogue, if not late in June perhaps in the

middle of July, but we were still telling this to one another on September 1. It is far more reasonable to decide beforehand that an adjournment will take place at a certain time, and I suggest this should be placed and set out right on the order paper. For instance, this house should now know, and this should be on the order paper, when we shall have an Easter recess and for how long. There is some psychological lift in knowing when you have to come to the end of a discussion. I think there is nothing like a self-imposed piece of discipline to bring great results, and to this extent I am very pleased with the hon. gentleman's suggestion.

I accept the hon. member's phraseology, that all these things should be spelled out with precision. This is a restraint upon the executive, but we have in other ways, through the passage of statutes, put similar restraints upon the executive before. If this bill be enacted it would perhaps require an amendment to section 38 of the British North America Act in reference to the Governor General calling together the House of Commons. I think the house has lost greatly over the years through a mad rush to prorogue; through crowded haphazard agendae and through the belittling of its own performances in the uncertain hope of finding a suitable time for an adjournment.

I think we will have to face up to this fact, Mr. Speaker, as other legislatures have. I am not sure that I am attracted by the West German method. I rather like the idea of committees functioning simultaneously with parliament. I believe that our new system of committees will greatly improve the over-all parliamentary performance.

Mr. Stewart: May I ask the hon. gentleman a question?

Mr. Macquarrie: Certainly.

Mr. Stewart: I have listened carefully to his remarks, and I should like to ask him whether he does not regard the proposal he is now supporting as one which would encroach upon the essential prerogatives of the Crown, specifically the prerogative of prorogation?

Mr. Macquarrie: I touched upon that subject very lightly when I used the word "executive". I did not want to get into a discussion of the powers and prerogatives in a classical sense. I suppose if I wanted to be classical in my response I could say that a parliamentary body which could depose a minister and dethrone a monarch is not inhibited from moving into this field. I did not wish to go quite so far because I do not think we have to discuss this in that realm.

Mr. Ryan: Would the hon. member permit another question?

Mr. Macquarrie: Certainly.

Mr. Ryan: Does the hon. member not think that clause 4 provides an answer to the question asked by the parliamentary secretary, in that it states "except where necessarily consequent upon a dissolution"? Does that not make it clear that the prime minister's prerogative of proroguing would be maintained?

Mr. Macquarrie: The parliamentary secretary, my fellow maritimer, used the word "prorogation" rather than "dissolution". The bill does clearly provide for contingencies of dissolution.

Mr. Stewart: May I ask the hon. gentleman another question prompted by his reply? On what occasion did a monarch lose his head by an act of parliament?

Mr. Nicholson: Did he say "head" or "throne"?

Mr. Macquarrie: Mr. Speaker, I actually said "dethroned" rather than "decapitated".

Mr. McCleave: He lost his seat, not his head.

• (5:30 p.m.)

Mr. Macquarrie: Mr. Speaker, I am afraid that in 20 minutes I could not get back with my learned colleague into the 17th century, but I do think that the actions of parliament had a profound effect on the final phases of the monarchal performance. I would like to engage in a discussion with the learned gentleman about the steady advances in parliamentary rights and the consequent decline of privileges and powers. But with this packed house I am not sure that the great majority of our colleagues are philosophers, and whether or not we should become philosophic. Conservatives are notoriously pragmatic and I might lose my membership in my party if I spend too much time philosophizing or theorizing.

Mr. Knowles: They are not notoriously pragmatic: They are just notorious.

Mr. Macquarrie: Now we have someone to the far left who is neither pragmatic nor a philosopher, but a cynic.

Now, to get down to something which is practical and concrete, Mr. Speaker, I should like to turn to another clause of the bill which concerns me, and that is the procedure whereby the Speaker and two officials of the House of Commons may, after the house stopped sitting, complete a formula for the receiving of bills from the Senate which have been passed without amendment, and not attend at the Royal Assent. I am thinking that this would seriously limit this important and powerful upper house if, in order to have brought to completion measures of importance, they would accept them from us without amendment. I believe this would put that powerful chamber, in effect—although certainly the bill is not headed that way—in a position explicitly to limit their powers and restrict their perusal as a chamber of sober second thought, and one with powers in almost every respect coequal with the House of Commons. I would have concern about this.

I have a great regard for the rights and privileges of that body. I realize how important it has been during the years. I do not wish to take up any further time, Mr. Speaker, because there may be others who would like to deal with this bill. I will say in conclusion and in summary that it is very timely and if this bill is not adopted soon, then some similar measure will have to be put into effect; otherwise our parliamentary performance will be greatly hampered by our failure to arrange logically, properly, and beforehand a satisfactory use of the time in any given year. I believe we have passed the stage where it is sufficient to have a haphazard calling together of parliaments, proroguing we know not when, catching an adjournment as we can best catch it, pushing through the ever-growing legislative mill, and questioning assiduously and carefully estimates at one early stage, only to be presented later on with multitudes of estimates in a minimum of time. I believe more careful organization is required. It is often said that this is not the place for efficiency, that there are other values. Certainly there are, Mr. Speaker. This is far greater and far more significant than any economic or commercial organization. But to change our techniques, our performance and our patterns when change is needed is surely a good and proper course. I am a conservative, but I am not a reactionary; the two are not ever the same thing.

Mr. Churchill: No conservative is.

[Mr. Macquarrie.]

Mr. Macquarrie: And certainly no Progressive Conservative could ever be a reactionary. However, I welcome this bill and I believe it is something which all of us and the Canadians whom we represent should think of. If some of these suggestions are a bit new, they are also quite worth while and I congratulate and commend the hon. gentleman for his initiative.

Mr. Stanley Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Mr. Speaker, I hope the hon. member for Spadina (Mr. Ryan) who introduced this bill will not feel badly if we tend to give it the "you have got a good idea but we don't like the way you work it out" treatment. I suspect that that will be the verdict of this house during this private members hour.

I should like to join with the hon. member for Queens (Mr. Macquarrie), despite the mistaken way in which he identified me, in saying that I too welcome an effort such as the hon. member for Spadina has made to get us to consider the planning of our parliamentary sessions. He has made it clear in his explanatory notes that this is the purpose of his bill. The member for Queens (Mr. Macquarrie) made a few references to the time consumed by earlier sessions. He did so by referring to the Parliamentary Guide. However, when you count the precise number of days that parliament sat in some of those earlier sessions, you will see that they were even shorter than appears from the dates given by the hon. member for Queens (Mr. Macquarrie). I only mention this to underline the fact that there has been a tremendous change in the amount of work with which parliament must deal. In the first decade or two sessions of forty and fifty days were long sessions. Now we have enough work to take 150 to 250 days in a year to accomplish. Therefore the problem is with us and there is no use saying that we have to keep on doing things in the same old way. The problems are here and they call for some very real changes.

• (5:40 p.m.)

I would also like to draw attention to the fact that many years ago Dr. Beauchesne, in one of his writings, urged that parliament consider the idea of dividing the session into three parts. If I recall his paper correctly, he suggested that certain formalities such as the address in reply to the speech from the throne and items of that kind might be dealt with in one section of the session; legislation might be dealt with in another and estimates in the third. I forget which of the sections of

the session the budget was to be in, but I mention this just to indicate that people who have thought of parliament have had ideas of this nature from time to time, namely that it is not good enough just to go on as they could in the 1870's and 1880's, without any planning. We have come to the point where we have to do some planning of our parliamentary session.

To the extent that the hon. member for Spadina, in introducing this bill, is making us think of this fact, he has done us a service. I also say to him that it is a service to us for him to suggest some precise details. At the same time, Mr. Speaker, I think I must point out that in my view some of the details which he suggests are a bit unworkable and would tend to stultify parliament in a way which I think would defeat the hon. member's purpose. When one takes a first look at the bill it looks as though the aim is to have a House of Commons session which begins in January and ends in June, but then the hon. member admits that in most years there would be a second session. So right away the notion that we are going to shorten our sessions is admitted by the hon. member himself to be invalid.

I agree with him that the aim in all of this is not just to shorten our sessions. There is really nothing wrong with our having to work most of the year to do the nation's business. But what we should be aiming at is the efficient use of the time we spend here. As I say, the hon. member immediately admits that what he proposes as the exception, namely a second session each year, is likely to become the rule.

Then I should point out to him that in his bill he has so many deadlines that I think we would find ourselves doing what we have already done to the Electoral Boundaries Act. We very solemnly passed in the last parliament legislation regarding electoral boundaries and we put into that legislation a provision as to what parliament must do. We said that members of parliament must debate any objections members have within a fixed number of days from a certain point. I think that is the first example, in recent times at any rate, of putting into a statute what parliament must do.

What have we done with that legislation, Mr. Speaker? We passed a bill through all three readings very quickly, and then the Senators did the same thing, just to change that deadline. I would suspect that if the hon. member's bill went through in its present form with its various deadlines we would find ourselves at each and every session of parliament, both in the main session and in the second session, having to pass bills to amend the basic law relating to the sessions, so that we could do what needed to be done under the circumstances.

Therefore I think that the idea of fixing a precise calendar schedule by statute is one which would be pretty hard to stick to in the free kind of parliament that we have. After all, we are not just a business organization of the kind which can program its work as though we were turning it over to a computer. We are a living organization representing the life of the Canadian people as it exists in 1966 or 1967. The things which will happen and the needs which will arise create differing situations, and if we try to deal with all of them in a timed program which has been restricted and stultified, then I fear we would get into difficulty.

I do not say these things critically as though the hon. member should not have put these ideas into this bill. After all, he can come back to me and say that we have certain restrictions now. For example, we sit at 2.30 in the afternoon and quit at ten at night, except for the late show. We sit at eleven o'clock on Friday mornings and quit at six. We do not sit on Saturdays or Sundays. So we already have a great many restrictions. But so far as our work is concerned, a good deal of it is determined by the program which the government brings in and by the reaction of the opposition to the legislative program. I believe this necessitates a certain amount of freedom on the part of the House of Commons during the session to deal with its work as the situation seems to demand.

Having said this, having been critical of the hon. member's precise program, I want to come back and say I welcome the idea that parliament should discuss the planning of its work. I think we should take another look at Dr. Beauchesne's suggestion of some years ago of dividing the session into two, three or four parts and trying to see whether we can deal with some of the work in one part of the session, certain work in another part, and so on.

I also think—and here I hope my hon. friend from Queens (Mr. Macquarrie) will not mind if I disagree with him—that if we are going to plan our work there is something else we must do. I think we have to look at the importance, and I think the potentially greater importance, of our committee work.

If we are to do this, then where I disagree with my hon. friend from Queens (Mr. Macquarrie) is that I think we will have to provide time in the parliamentary year when committees can sit when the House of Commons itself is not in session. I have twice had the experience in the years I have been here of being on committees which sat when parliament was not actually in session, and it is my judgment that the committees which sit under those circumstances have a much better chance to do an effective job than committees which sit while the house is actually in session.

I am not suggesting that we take away from the executive any of the powers it has as far as legislation is concerned, but I am suggesting that committees could be upstaged and be given more importance and more work to do. This question was discussed last year or the year before in connection with our changes in the rules. Some misunderstanding developed; some people thought we were trying to arrange for holiday time, or what-have-you. I hope that those misunderstandings can be resolved and that we can take another look at this whole question of upgrading our committee work as part of the planning of the whole session.

I emphasize the fact that, in my view, this is probably the answer to our present problem, because we have so much more work to do now than we had 30, 40 or 100 years ago. Some of us have already talked about the length of sessions, which was six or seven weeks at the beginning of this country's history. I may say that the sessions really did not get lengthy until the second world war. Even the long sessions complained about just before the first world war were sessions which, in terms of total length of time, did not amount to more than six or seven months, or 25 or 26 weeks out of the 52.

We have much more work to do now because the amount of money we must consider has multiplied manyfold. We no longer deal as a parliament just with post offices, roads and defence. We deal with everything which affects our lives from the cradle to the grave. We go under the earth, into the sea, and we are concerned with outer space. Everything concerns us. I think it is unrealistic to think that, without any change in the rules or any changes in the matters we handle, we can do everything right here on the same floor in the same procedural structure in which we conducted our business 85 to 90 years ago in a matter of six or seven weeks.

[Mr. Knowles.]

To me the answer is not to pass the excess work to the executive or to the bureaucracy. To me the answer is to make greater use of our committees structure. But I plead the point that we are not going to get the full advantage out of our new committees structure, with smaller numbers on committees and so on, if we continue having committees sit while the house is in session. To me this is one of the major matters, as I say, which we should look at in connection with the whole business of planning our parliamentary year.

• (5:50 p.m.)

Obviously I could go on but I see the clock is moving and I think others should have the chance to speak. I will sit down by saying that even though I find many flaws in the details of the bill presented by the hon. member for Spadina and he will agree with me that he does not want to end up by stultifying the parliamentary year nevertheless, he has done us a service, by making us think about planning our parliamentary year. I hope that we will get around to planning it soon.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Gérard Laprise (Chapleau): Mr. Speaker, I only want a few minutes to discuss this bill.

First, I wish to congratulate the hon. member for Spadina (Mr. Ryan) for presenting this bill to us tonight, even if it does not seem to have the unanimous approval of the house. He has at least allowed the expression of several new ideas and the present discussion on this subject seems to indicate that we may soon have the opportunity to amend parliamentary procedure. Fixed dates for the opening and closing of parliament is quite a good idea.

As the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Knowles) pointed out several minutes ago, our present work load cannot be compared with that of sessions several years ago. I believe it would be advantageous to set dates for the opening and closing of sessions, so that members of parliament would know where they stand.

I know that this would have been difficult these past few years because of the many sudden elections.

I think that, in addition to determining the length of parliamentary sessions, this would exclude the risk of elections during the four years of the life of a parliament, and therefore it would be much easier to apply the bill introduced this afternoon by the member for Spadina.

I shall not pursue the subject further tonight, but I think that this idea should be carried further and studied in greater detail; I am convinced that we will find a way to improve, not the present debates, but the duration of parliaments, which will thus become more efficient.

Mr. Jean-Eudes Dubé (Restigouche-Madawaska): Mr. Speaker, I should like to add a few personal comments on the bill now before us, that is Bill No. C-6, an act to provide for the length of sessions of parliament.

As pointed out by the sponsor of the bill, the hon. member for Spadina, the purpose of this measure is to set definite dates for the opening and length of sessions. As a matter of fact, the bill provides as the opening date the last Thursday of January and as the closing date for the House of Commons, the last Friday of June. The bill also provides for an Easter recess of at least five days and the possibility of a second session in September.

At first sight at least, there can be no doubt that it would be quite desirable to limit the length of sessions and especially to know beforehand and with certainty the schedule of future sessions.

As one of the previous speakers said, sessions are getting longer because of the increasing complexity of the problems considered by the house.

A quick review of the parliamentary history of our nation shows that, in the first years of confederation, the sessions lasted between two and two and a half months. The 1912-13 session went on for six and a half months, but it was at the time of the famous debate on the naval forces bill. Of course, that session was an exception to the rule.

During the first world war, the sessions lasted about four months.

During the second world war, Parliament began to sit all year round, but sessions were broken by adjournments.

In fact, at the time of the second world war, Parliament did not sit more than six months per year. But since that time, the length of the sessions has grown constantly and we now sit almost the year round, except when we take holidays to go electioneering.

It is to be hoped that this type of holiday will not occur too soon.

It is, therefore, expedient to study the problem, to examine the bill and the reasons for setting definite limits to the length of sessions.

Mr. Speaker, I believe the role of a member does not only consist in sitting in the house, taking part in debates and working in committees; a member must also be the spokesman of his constituents. It is very difficult for him to perform this duty and to carry out this most important task effectively if he does not have the opportunity to understand their needs fully and to consider their views. Therefore, a member must have, as far as possible, some spare time to meet with his constituents, discuss with them and, at times, live among them several weeks during the year.

I believe the interests of democracy would be better served if hon. members could keep in touch constantly with their constituents and, especially if definite periods were set aside every year to allow them, not to take a holiday, but to pay a visit to their constituents.

Adjournments at definite dates, as proposed in this bill, would also allow ministers to catch their breath and to visit their own ridings as well as to prepare long-term programs for their department.

Mr. Strathearn Gordon published some years ago a rather interesting book entitled *Our Parliament.*

It deals, of course, with the British parliament at Westminster, but his remarks can be applied as well to our own parliament in Ottawa. And I quote, Mr. Speaker—

[*English*]

I quote from page 58 of *Our Parliament* by Strathearn Gordon:

> Another subject which is often raised is the length of the session. Why don't M.P.'s work for more than eights months in the year? The answer is that they do—but not at Westminster. Most Ministers undoubtedly look forward to the 'holidays', when they are free from parliamentary cares, as the periods when they can put their best work into their Departments. But for ordinary Members, too, reasonably long adjournments are a practical necessity. When a man has for many weeks been living a sort of double life, spending late nights at Westminster, speaking in his constituency at the weekends, working in the train in between, with his private affairs neglected and his nerves in shreds, it is surely right to allow him time to recuperate and think. Three hundred and seventy years ago the Lord Keeper was expressing the idea in almost lyrical style:

There the author goes on to quote the Lord Keeper:

> The sessions (he said) cannot be long; by reason of the springtime, 'tis fit that gentlemen should repair to their countries; the justices of assize also to go to their circuits.
>
> So the good hours should not be lost in idle speeches, but the little time we have should be bestowed wholly on such businesses as are needful to be considered of.

Finally the author quotes also the great parliamentarian himself, Sir Winston Churchill:

> If you wish to say what is wrong with Parliament . . . it is that it sits far too long in the year. I would lay down that except in times of war or great national emergency Parliament should not sit more than five months, with the ordinary short intervals, say, occupying six months of the year. That ought to be the maximum.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Speaker, it seems that the dates suggested by the sponsor of this bill are not so far removed from those suggested by the spokesmen of the other parties in the house.

The question has been brought up several times. I note, for instance, that the hon. member for Queens (Mr. Macquarrie) who spoke previously, said in 1965, as shown in *Hansard*, page 1623, that we should be out of here in time to celebrate St. Jean Baptiste Day and come back after Labour Day.

During the same session, in 1965, the hon. member for Villeneuve (Mr. Caouette) as shown in *Hansard*, page 2139, said that sessions should begin about September 10 and adjourn on December 20 to resume afterwards on January 10 till June 30. This year, the leader of the house—

[*English*]

Mr. Churchill: Six o'clock, the end of today's sitting.

At six o'clock the house adjourned, without question put, pursuant to standing order.

APPENDIX

NATO—AIDE MEMOIRE FROM FRANCE TO CANADA

For some years the French Government has stressed on many occasions, both publicly and in conversations with Allied governments, its view that the North Atlantic Treaty Organization no longer meets, as far as the French Government is concerned, the conditions which prevail in the world at the present time and which are basically different from those prevailing in 1949 and the following years.

2. In fact, the threat which weighed upon the Western world, particularly in Europe and which was the reason for the conclusion of the Treaty has changed in nature. It no longer presents the immediate and menacing character it once had. At the same time, the European countries have restored their economies and, as a consequence, are recovering their former strength. France in particular is developing an atomic armament, which, by its very nature, precludes its integration. In the third place, the nuclear balance between the Soviet Union and the United States of America which has replaced the monopoly held by the latter, has transformed the general conditions of Western defence. Finally, it is a fact that Europe is no longer the center of international crises. This center has moved elsewhere, notably to Asia, where the Atlantic Alliance countries are as a whole not evidently involved.

3. This evolution in no way leads the French Government to question the Treaty signed in Washington on April 4, 1949. In other words, and barring developments which, in the years to come, might basically modify relations between east and west, it does not intend to avail itself in 1969 of the provisions of Article 13 of the Treaty, and it considers that the Alliance should remain in being as long as the need appears evident.

4. The above position having been stated unequivocally the problem of the Organization itself arises, that is to say all agreements, arrangements and decisions subsequent to the signing of the Treaty, whether they be multilateral or bilateral in form. The French Government considers that this Organization no longer corresponds to what in its opinion seems to be required.

5. One could undoubtedly have envisaged that negotiations could have been undertaken to modify by common consent the provisions in force. The French Government would have been happy to propose this had it had reason to believe that such negotiations would have led to the result it has in mind. Unfortunately everything indicates that such an attempt would be doomed to fail since all of France's partners seem or profess openly to favour maintaining the status quo, or reinforcing all that which is henceforth unacceptable from the French point of view.

6. France accordingly is led to recognize the consequences for it in this situation and to take the measures which seem required and which in its opinion are not in the least incompatible with its participation in the Alliance, nor in military operations with its Allies should the need arise. Already in the past the French Government has taken steps of this nature with regard to its naval forces serving with NATO whether in the Mediterranean or in the Atlantic. What is now in question are its land and air forces stationed in Germany and assigned to the Allied Command in Europe. France intends to bring their assignment to an end. This decision will entail France's simultaneous withdrawal from the two integrated commands under which its forces are serving and to which it is contributing within the framework of NATO, i.e. the Supreme Allied Command in Europe and the Central Europe Command, and consequently the transfer of the headquarters for these two commands outside French territory. The implementation of all these measures raises of course a number of problems, which the French Government is now prepared to discuss with its allies. There will be a need to consider the liaison which should be established between the French Command and NATO Command as well as to determine the conditions under which French forces, particularly in Germany, would participate in wartime, should Article 5 of the Washington Treaty be evoked, in joint military actions, with reference to Command and operations themselves. This implies in particular that French land and air forces which are stationed at present in Germany would be maintained in that country under the agreements of October 23, 1954. This for its part the French Government is disposed to do.

7. Consideration should be given, on the other hand, to problems which may present

themselves to France with regard to the Military Committee and the Standing Group, including the problem of liaison between these bodies and the French Command.

8. Such are the broad outlines of measures contemplated by the French Government which it regards as necessary to adapt to new conditions the modalities of its participation in the Atlantic Alliance. It is prepared to enter discussions with regard to the implementation of these measures, and it hopes that appropriate arrangements may be agreed upon by all its Allies.

9. Multilateral problems are not however the only ones to be considered as far as Canada and France are concerned. Both countries have concluded agreements in the past concerning the construction and the operation of airports on French territory intended for the use of the Royal Canadian Air Force.

10. The French Government considers that these agreements no longer meet present conditions, which lead it to recover the full exercise of its sovereignty on French territory, or in other words no longer to accept that foreign units, installations or bases in France should in any way be responsible to authorities other than French. It is ready to examine, and eventually to settle with the Government of Canada, the practical consequences this policy entails.

11. Moreover the French Government is ready to discuss the military facilities which could be placed at the disposal of the Government of Canada on French territory in the event of a conflict to which both countries would participate under the Atlantic Alliance. These facilities could be the object of an Agreement to be concluded between both Governments.

HOUSE OF COMMONS

Monday, March 21, 1966

The house met at 2.30 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS

PRESENCE IN THE GALLERY OF DELEGATION FROM CANADIAN INDIAN YOUTH COUNCIL

Mr. Grant Deachman (Vancouver Quadra): Mr. Speaker, may I call the attention of the house to the presence in the gallery of a delegation from the Canadian Indian Youth Council, who have come here from coast to coast to discuss problems affecting Indian youth and Canadian Indians generally.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

QUESTIONS

(Questions answered orally are indicated by an asterisk.)

C.B.C. FREE TIME TO POLITICAL PARTIES

Question No. 320—**Mr. Caouette:**

1. Did the C.B.C. offer, free of charge, periods of time to the various provincial political parties during the last election in each province?

2. If so, how many hours were allocated to each party in each province?

3. What is the cost of these hours based on the rates of rental for every provincial party in each province during the last provincial election in these provinces?

4. What is the total cost of the expenses incurred by each political party during the official period of the last federal election campaign for the rental of facilities of private television stations, and of the government-owned network, as reported to the B.B.G.?

Hon. Judy V. LaMarsh (Secretary of State): I am informed by the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation and the Board of Broadcast Governors as follows:

1. Yes.

2.

HOURS ALLOCATED TO EACH PARTY IN EACH PROVINCE

English and French radio and television

	Network					Local			
	LIB.	P.C.	U.N.	N.D.P.	S.C.	LIB.	P.C.	N.D.P.	S.C.
Newfoundland	2:15	2:15	—	1:15	—	:30	:30	—	—
Prince Edward Island	1:30	1:30	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Nova Scotia	1:40	1:55	—	1:25	—	:15	:15	:15	—
New Brunswick	3:00	3:00	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Quebec	5:30	—	4:30	—	—	—	—	—	—
Ontario	2:50	3:20	—	1:50	—	:30	:30	:30	—
Manitoba	1:00	1:30	—	1:00	:30	:15	:15	:15	:15
Saskatchewan	1:15	:45	—	1:30	:30	—	—	—	—
Alberta	1:00	1:00	—	1:00	2:00	—	—	—	—
British Columbia	1:22½	1:07½	—	1:37½	1:52½	:22½	:22½	:37½	:37½

3. To be answered later.

4. The following are the costs incurred by each political party for private stations, including the C.T.V. network: Liberal, $317,704.40; P.C., $236,133.52; N.D.P., $93,047.26; Social Credit, $25,070.20; Creditiste, $20,173.50; Others, $24,836.85.

Questions

WORKING CONDITIONS, REPRESENTATION COMMISSIONER EMPLOYEES

Question No. 480—**Mr. Bell (Carleton):**

1. Pursuant to section 10 of the Representation Commissioner Act chapter 40 of the Statutes of Canada, 1963, did the Treasury Board give approval to the salaries and expenses of officers and employees of the Representation Commissioner as fixed by the commissioner and/or did the Treasury Board approve the prescription by the commissioner of their conditions of employment?

2. If so, what are the names of such persons whose salaries and expenses were so approved by Treasury Board and what were the salaries and expenses so approved by Treasury Board?

3. What were the conditions of employment prescribed for each such person to which Treasury Board gave approval?

Hon. E. J. Benson (Minister of National Revenue): 1. Yes. The Treasury Board approved the salaries and expenses of officers and employees of the Representation Commissioner and the prescription by the commissioner of their conditions of employment.

2. The Representation Commissioner appointed the following persons at salaries which the Treasury Board had approved. The Treasury Board directed that such persons may be paid expenses e.g. travelling expenses, in accordance with the regulations made pursuant to the Financial Administration Act governing such payments to civil servants.

Name	Salary on Appointment Per Annum
Albert J. Gravelle	$11,800
Ronald L. Stewart	8,310
Robert A. Pasch	6,300
Arthur J. Linegar	5,730
Madeleine Strelbisky	5,340
Richard Lalonde	4,260
*Susan Petrie	4,260
Elizabeth L. Leger	3,750
Gloria L. Bureau	3,750
*Ruth Petrie	2,970
Agnes Pigeon	2,970
Nancy Haigis	2,970
*Victoria S. Delaney	2,820
Oneita May O'Meara	4,410
Robert L. Fillman	3,090
Claire D. Papillon	3,150
*Margaret A. Henderson	4,050

*These persons are no longer on the staff of the Representation Commissioner.

[Miss LaMarsh.]

3. The conditions of employment approved by the Treasury Board are comparable to those prevailing in the civil service.

WORKING CONDITIONS, ELECTORAL BOUNDARY COMMISSION STAFF

Question No. 481—**Mr. Bell (Carleton):**

1. Pursuant to section 14(2) of the Electoral Boundaries Readjustment Act, chapter 31 of the Statutes of Canada, 1964-65, did the Treasury Board give approval to the salaries and expenses of any persons employed by any electoral boundary commission as technical advisers or other staff, including a person to act as secretary and/or approve the prescription by any such commission of their conditions of employment?

2. If so, what are the names of such persons whose salaries and expenses were so approved by Treasury Board and what were the salaries and expenses so approved by Treasury Board?

3. What were the conditions of employment prescribed for each such person to which Treasury Board gave approval?

Hon. E. J. Benson (Minister of National Revenue): 1. Yes. The Treasury Board approved the remuneration and expenses of persons employed by electoral boundaries commissions and the prescription by the commissions of their conditions of employment.

2. The commissions set up under the Electoral Boundaries Readjustment Act do not report to the government so that the government does not have records giving the names of the persons employed by the commissions. The Treasury Board approved payment of remuneration: (1) to a secretary of a commission, of up to $180 per week; (2) for stenographic, typing or clerical services, at rates prevailing at the location in each province for the provision of such services; (3) for professional and technical services, at a fee of up to $75 per day.

When travelling on commission business outside their normal place of residence, the Treasury Board authorized payment to secretarial help of a living allowance of $15 per day plus actual transportation expenses. Other employees were authorized to be paid a $20 per diem living allowance plus actual transportation expenses.

3. The conditions of employment approved by the Treasury Board are comparable to those prevailing in the civil service.

SCOTSBURN MARSH DRAINAGE SURVEY, N.S.

Question No. 511—**Mr. MacEwan:**

1. Did the Minister of Forestry receive a letter dated July 4, 1965 from a George A. MacLeod of

Scotsburn, Pictou county, Nova Scotia, charging M.M.R.A. officials with an error of approximately 2,000 feet in the Scotsburn marsh drainage survey?

2. Did the drainage plan proposed by the M.M.R.A. engineers for this area approximate 1,200 acres at a cost of $47,610?

3. Was the total estimated reclaimed land in the report by the M.M.R.A. engineers set at 270 acres?

4. What would be the difference in the length of the drainage ditch necessary for reclaiming the 270 acres as contrasted to 1,200 acres?

5. Is M.M.R.A. under the jurisdiction of the Minister of Forestry?

6. Did the Minister of Forestry ask his M.M.R.A. officials to compute a revised estimate of the cost of draining the 270 acres and, if not, for what reason?

7. Did the M.M.R.A. engineers propose the construction of a culvert approximately 150 feet to the west of the present bridge at an estimated cost of $12,000?

8. Did the M.M.R.A. engineers consider adapting the present bridge to the proposed drainage plan and, if not, for what reason?

Hon. Maurice Sauvé (Minister of Forestry):

1. Yes.

2. No. The drainage as planned would service an estimated maximum of 800 acres.

3. Yes.

4. No difference for the estimated 800 acres. For additional 400 acres, no information.

5. Yes.

6. No. This would be a provincial responsibility. However, the provincial officials have since made such a request and it is being acceded to.

7. Yes.

8. Yes.

SUPPLY OF ELECTRICITY TO INDIAN RESERVES, MANITOBA

Question No. 566—**Mr. Schreyer:**

1. When was the first request for electric power made of the Department of Northern Affairs and National Resources and/or the Indian affairs branch by (a) the Hollow Water Indian reserve (b) the Little Black River Indian reserve?

2. Has either the Indian affairs branch or the Department of Northern Affairs and National Resources entered into negotiations with Manitoba Hydro in order to arrange for the supply of this electric power?

3. If negotiations have not yet been entered into, when is it the intention to commence?

Hon. Arthur Laing (Minister of Northern Affairs and National Resources): 1. (a) A request from the Hollow Water Indian reserve to extend the power line from Pine Falls to the hamlet of Manigotagan was made to the superintendent of the Clandeboye Indian agency on February 1, 1961. (b) No request has been received from the Little Black River Indian reserve.

2. Yes.

3. Not applicable.

ARDA PROJECTS, PONTIAC AND TÉMISCAMINGUE COUNTIES, QUE.

Question No. 629—**Mr. Lefebvre:**

1. What projects under the ARDA program were undertaken in 1965 and what is their value in (a) the county of Pontiac, Quebec (b) the county of Témiscamingue, Quebec?

2. What projects have been approved for 1966 and what is their value in (a) Pontiac county, Quebec (b) Témiscamingue county, Quebec?

3. What projects are under study for Pontiac and Témiscamingue at the present time?

Hon. Maurice Sauvé (Minister of Forestry): 1. The answer to parts (a) and (b) of this question is as follows: The province of Quebec has not to date submitted to federal ARDA any project proposals for consideration, to be undertaken in the counties of Pontiac and Témiscamingue, Quebec.

2. Answered by 1 above.

3. The federal government has not to date received from the province of Quebec any projects for consideration for the counties of Pontiac and Témiscamingue, and as it is the responsibility of the provinces to initiate and administer the majority of projects and programs under the ARDA agreement, this information would only be available from the province of Quebec.

ROAD CONSTRUCTION, BELLETERRE-LE DOMAINE, QUE.

Question No. 630—**Mr. Lefebvre:**

1. Is a road being built from Belleterre, county of Témiscamingue, to Le Domaine in 1966 and, if so, how much in federal funds will be allocated for this project?

2. What amount has been spent so far on this project from federal funds?

Hon. Maurice Sauvé (Minister of Forestry): 1. Particulars of the program for 1966 are not yet available.

2. The federal share of expenditures made to date on this project amounts to $92,983.60.

FORT CHURCHILL RECREATIONAL ASSOCIATION

Question No. 639—**Mr. Brand:**

With reference to the answer to question No. 246 (a) is the government aware whether the Fort Churchill Recreational Association has a legal

status as a corporation or association and, if so, what is that status (b) are any moneys paid to this organization by civilian firms in order to obtain franchises in the buildings owned by the Department of Public Works (c) has the Hudson Bay Company paid any moneys to this association in order to obtain a concession at Fort Churchill (d) if so, what has been the disposition of these moneys and by whose authority were they collected?

Hon. G. J. McIlraith (Minister of Public Works): (a) The association has not yet been chartered under provincial legislation. It exists with the approval of the Treasury Board of Canada.

(b) No.

(c) During the summer of 1964 the Department of Public Works called for public tenders for the operation of a grocery store and a variety store at Fort Churchill. The specifications showed the rental rate to be charged for the space involved in each concession and required the bidders to indicate in their tender form the amount of fee they were prepared to offer to provide a basis on which a choice between bidders could be made. Only one tender was received on each call and that from the Hudson Bay Company. The fee offered was $8,000 for the grocery store and $4,000 for the variety store. These bids were accepted by the Department of Public Works.

(d) When the Department of Public Works took over from the army the administration of Fort Churchill, it became necessary to set up a recreational association to replace the Maple Leaf Services which had been providing recreation and welfare facilities at this location. The association needed financial assistance to be able to operate and the Treasury Board ruled that $5,000 of the total fee paid by the Hudson Bay Company be turned over to the recreational association and that the remaining $7,000 be paid to the Receiver General. The recreational association has used this money to support a community library in Fort Churchill.

SARCEE INDIAN RESERVE, ALBERTA

Question No. 670—**Mr. Thompson:**

1. Has the Minister of Citizenship and Immigration received a petition requesting an investigation into the activities of the representatives of the Indian affairs branch at the Sarcee Indian reserve, southwest of Calgary?

2. If so, was the petition heard?

3. Was it superseded by a request that it be dropped?

4. Do officials of the Indian affairs branch require detailed accounts of distribution of funds to the tribes and an accounting as to how the funds are spent?

[Mr. Brand.]

5. Is it mandatory that minutes be kept of meetings of the tribal council and are such minutes available for scrutiny by the members of the tribe?

6. Are minutes available for scrutiny by Indian affairs branch officials?

Hon. Arthur Laing (Minister of Northern Affairs and National Resources): 1. No, but a petition dated October 20, 1965, was received requesting an investigation into the affairs and administration of the band under the present leadership.

2. Yes.

3. No, but it was followed by a petition from another group endorsing the leadership of the present chief and council.

4. In the case of band funds managed by the band council under section 68 of the Indian Act, the Indian affairs branch does not require detailed accounts of the distribution of such funds. However, a copy of the audit report by an outside auditor, which is provided by the band at band fund expense, is required.

5. Regulations governing procedure at Indian band council meetings make provision for the keeping of minutes of regular meetings of band councils elected in accordance with section 73 of the Indian Act. Such minutes are available for scrutiny by the Sarcee band members.

6. Yes.

ASSISTANCE TO PRINCE ALBERT PULP CO.

Question No. 749—**Mr. Douglas:**

1. Have any representations been received to assist the Prince Albert Pulp Company Limited under the Area Development Incentives Act and, if so, who made such representations?

2. Has any financial assistance been promised or granted to the Prince Albert Pulp Company Limited and, if so, to whom were such promises made and how much assistance has been promised or granted?

3. Have any studies been made by the Department of Industry or any other government department into the pulp mill proposed by the Prince Albert Pulp Company Limited and, if so (a) who made such a study or studies, and (b) what recommendations were made in the study or studies?

4. Did the Minister of Industry or any of his officials receive any adverse reports connected with the granting of financial assistance to the Prince Albert Pulp Company Limited, and, if so, who submitted such adverse reports and what were the reasons given for submitting such reports?

Hon. Judy V. LaMarsh (Secretary of State): I am informed by several departments as follows:

1. The premier of Saskatchewan advised the Minister of Industry in September 1965

of the importance of a proposed pulp mill at Prince Albert to the economy of Saskatchewan, and expressed the hope that the project would be able to meet the requirements of the Area Development Incentives Act and Regulations in order to qualify for a development grant. Also, the area development agency has received an application for a development grant under the Area Development Incentives Act from the Prince Albert Pulp Company Ltd.

2. No assistance has been promised or granted to the Prince Albert Pulp Company Ltd. The company was advised that the type of industry proposed was eligible, providing they met all conditions set forth in the act and regulations.

3. No studies into the pulp mill proposed by the Prince Albert Pulp Company Ltd. have been made by the Department of Industry or any other government department. The area development agency is presently studying the company's application for a grant under the Area Development Incentives Act.

4. No adverse report has been received by the Minister of Industry or his officials.

FOREIGN SHIPS WITHIN 12-MILE LIMIT

Question No. 770—**Mr. Forrestall:**

1. In each of the past two years, how many reports of foreign registry ships operating inside the 12-mile limit have been brought to the attention of the Department of Fisheries on the east coast and on the west coast?

2. How many ships have been involved in such reports?

3. Of what registry were these ships?

Hon. H. J. Robichaud (Minister of Fisheries): 1.

	East Coast	West Coast
1964	7	None
1965	4	8

2. East coast, 29 (2 fishing); West coast, 17 (none fishing).

3. East coast, 3 Spanish; 25 U.S.S.R.; 1 United States.

West coast, 17 U.S.S.R.

NATIONAL AND PROVINCIAL PARKS ASSOCIATION

Question No. 778—**Mr. Horner (Jasper-Edson):**

1. Has the government given any direct financial assistance to the National and Provincial Parks Association of Canada?

2. Are government employees distributing literature for the National and Provincial Parks Association and soliciting funds on their behalf?

3. Do they do so for any other group?

4. Does the government feel that this is a truly national organization?

5. Are funds to this association allowed as income tax deductions?

Hon. Arthur Laing (Minister of Northern Affairs and National Resources): 1. On April 18, 1964, a grant of $20,000 to the National and Provincial Parks Association of Canada was made. This is the only grant made and was for the purpose of assisting the association to establish itself as an independent private, non-profit organization to "promote the benefits and assure the protection of our great national and provincial parks so that Canadians, as well as visitors to this country, may enjoy them unimpaired for all time", as set out in its objectives.

2. Not at the present time. Literature was distributed to park visitors to advise of the organization's existence in the early stages.

3. At present, federal government employees are officially authorized to solicit funds for the United Appeals of Canada, and the Carleton University campaign for the Ottawa-Hull area and the government of Canada through the sale of Canada savings bonds. During official fund raising activities, they are authorized to distribute literature related to the campaign, the fund raising organization, and the purposes for which donations will be used.

4. I am informed that the National and Provincial Parks Association of Canada's board of trustees is composed of men whose official places of residence are: Vancouver, Campbell River, British Columbia; Calgary, Edmonton, Alberta; Ottawa, Ontario; Toronto, Ontario; Simcoe, Ontario; Thorold, Ontario; Quebec City, Montreal, Quebec; Lancaster, New Brunswick; St. John's, Newfoundland; and Yellowknife, N.W.T. Additional trustees residing in Manitoba and Saskatchewan will be appointed. It is incorporated under federal charter. The membership of the association appears to be national in scope.

5. Donations to the National and Provincial Parks Association of Canada in excess of the annual membership dues are an allowable deduction for income tax purposes.

Questions

FEED GRAIN IN EASTERN STORAGE

Question No. 786—**Mr. Horner (Acadia):**

1. How much feed grain was placed in storage last fall in eastern elevators for use under the feed grains assistance program for eastern Canada?

2. How much feed grain was in storage on February 15, 1966, in eastern elevators for use under the feed grains assistance program?

3. What was the cost of this storage for the months of October, November, December 1965, and January 1966?

Hon. Maurice Sauvé (Minister of Forestry): 1. As the quantity of western grain stored in eastern elevators in the fall can be diverted at a latter date to livestock feeding, industrial uses and export, it can only be identified as specifically eligible to feed grain storage assistance as it comes out of such elevators.

Quantities of grain in western wheat No. 5 and lower, oats, barley in eastern elevators (in '000 bushels)

October	December	February
27, 1965	22, 1965	9, 1966
20,346	37,297	27,045

2. Nearest reporting date February 9, 1966 —27,045,000 bushels.

3. Expenditures on storage assistance—October 15-31, 1965, 0.0; November, 1965, 12,218.73; December, 1965, 50,640.87; January, 1966, 22,006.87 (incomplete).

PRINTING BUREAU COMPETITIONS 65-721 AND 65-722

Question No. 791—**Mr. Irvine:**

1. Were competitions Nos. 65-721 and 65-722 for the Department of Public Printing and Stationery prepared by the staff training and development section of the Canadian Government Printing Bureau?

2. On what dates were these competitions posted?

3. Who authorized the competitions?

4. What is the normal salary for these positions?

5. What was the salary quoted?

6. How many applications were received?

7. Who was the successful applicant?

8. Have these competitions been withdrawn and, if so, who authorized the withdrawal and for what reason?

Hon. Judy V. LaMarsh (Secretary of State): I have been given the following information by the Civil Service Commission:

1. No.

2. November 5, 1965.

3. The Civil Service Commission.

[Mr. Laing.]

4. When advertised as technical officer 4, ((a) competition 67-721, planning and estimating officer, (b) competition 65-722, copy editors) the salary was $6480-$7140. As a result of salary revisions announced on December 9, 1965 the salary for this class is now $6804-$7497.

5. $6580-$7140.

6. Competition 65-721—12 applications; Competition 65-722—23 applications.

7. None declared since the competitions were cancelled before selections were made.

8. These competitions were cancelled by the Civil Service Commission at the department's request because the positions had been reclassified to printing and stationery officer 3 ($7119-$7609).

CIVIL SERVICE COMPETITION 66-H517

Question No. 803—**Mr. Muir (Cape Breton North and Victoria):**

1. What are the names and addresses of the applicants in the recent civil service commission competition 66-H517, park warden (seasonal), Cape Breton Highlands National Park?

2. Who was the successful candidate and when will his duties commence?

Hon. Judy V. LaMarsh (Secretary of State): I have been given the following information by the Civil Service Commission:

1. Having regard for the right to privacy of candidates and the possibility that the release of information could prove not only embarrassing but prejudicial to them, the commission holds in confidence information concerning candidates whose names do not appear on the eligible list.

2. The information requested is not available since the competition has not been completed.

HARBOUR IMPROVEMENTS, MCBETH POINT, MAN.

Question No. 830—**Mr. Stefanson:**

Has the government any plans for improving the breakwater and harbour facilities at McBeth Point on Lake Winnipeg, Manitoba and, if so (a) what is the nature of the work (b) what is the estimated cost (c) when will the work be carried out?

Hon. G. J. McIlraith (Minister of Public Works): Yes; (a), (b) and (c). Since this is still in the planning stages it is not possible to provide the answers to these questions at the present time.

PEOPLE REPORTED LOST

Question No. 833—**Mr. Godin:**

1. How many people have been reported lost during the following years: 1955, 1956, 1957, 1958, 1959, 1960, 1961, 1962, 1963, 1964 and 1965, in each of the following provinces and territories (a) Newfoundland (b) Prince Edward Island (c) Nova Scotia (d) New Brunswick (e) Quebec (f) Ontario (g) Alberta (h) Manitoba (i) Saskatchewan (j) British Columbia (k) Northwest Territories (l) Yukon Territories?

2. For the same years and with respect to the same provinces and territories, how many (a) have been found (b) have not been found?

3. For the same years and with respect to the same provinces and territories, how many female persons of each of the following age groups have disappeared (a) 10 to 20 years of age (b) 20 to 30 (c) 30 to 40 (d) 40 and over?

4. For the same years and with respect to the same provinces and territories, how many female persons (a) have been found (b) have not been found?

5. For the same years and with respect to the same provinces and territories, how many male persons of each of the following age groups have disappeared (a) 10 to 20 years of age (b) 20 to 30 (c) 30 to 40 (d) 40 and over?

6. For the same years and with respect to the same provinces and territories, how many male persons (a) have been found (b) have not been found?

[*Translation*]

Hon. Robert Winters (Minister of Trade and Commerce): 1 and 2. Information requested is not available as data from 1955 to 1965 are not comparable. In 1962, the uniform crime reporting system was implemented and data reported by the police under this reporting system for 1962 to 1964 are given in the attached table. Data for 1965 are not yet available.

3, 4, 5 and 6. Information requested is not available.

NUMBER OF PERSONS REPORTED MISSING, BY POLICE, NUMBER LOCATED AND NUMBER NOT LOCATED
1962-1964

	1962			1963			1964		
	Missing Number	Located Number	Not Located Number	Missing Number	Located Number	Not Located Number	Missing Number	Located Number	Not Located Number
Canada	34,767	33,699	1,068	40,441	39,524	917	45,218	44,233	985
Newfoundland	511	508	3	621	621	—	1,212	1,206	6
Prince Edward Island	26	25	1	29	26	3	122	120	2
Nova Scotia	684	643	41	941	918	23	1,022	970	52
New Brunswick	626	616	10	689	685	4	858	851	7
Quebec	5,932	5,665	267	6,795	6,630	165	8,581	8,402	179
Ontario	14,561	14,259	302	17,328	17,077	251	19,114	18,775	339
Manitoba	2,509	2,359	150	2,512	2,325	187	2,778	2,629	149
Saskatchewan	1,228	1,211	17	1,269	1,256	13	1,232	1,215	17
Alberta	3,512	3,368	144	4,431	4,235	196	4,981	4,886	95
British Columbia	5,118	4,994	124	5,763	5,694	69	5,304	5,167	137
Yukon and Northwest Territories	60	51	9	63	57	6	14	12	2

SALE OF PLANTS BY DEFENCE PRODUCTION

Question No. 840—**Mr. Caouette:**

Is the Minister of Defence Production contemplating sale of any plants and, if so, (a) what was the cost of construction (b) what was the maintenance cost during the last five years (c) what were the profits and losses of each such plant for the past five years (d) what is the estimated value of such plant (e) for what reason does the Department of Defence Production intend to sell them?

Hon. C. M. Drury (Minister of Industry): In so far as Canadian Arsenals Limited is concerned: Yes—The Val Rose Plant of Canadian Arsenals Limited, located near Quebec City; (a) Original cost of land, buildings and equipment, $21,906,000; (b) and (c) The Val Rose Plant was one of three plants in the Quebec area which were operated as the Quebec Division of Canadian Arsenals Limited. Since accounts are maintained on a divisional basis, it is not possible to obtain the maintenance costs, profits, or losses of the individual plants which form the Division; (d) Negotiations for the sale of the plant are being proceeded with at the present time and therefore it is considered that it would not be in the public interest to give this information; (e) To provide more extensive utilization of plant facility by the introduction of commercial products, to increase employment and to stimulate the economy of the area.

[*English*]

SPRINGHILL PENAL INSTITUTION SUBCONTRACTORS

Question No. 844—**Mr. Coates:**

How many subcontracts have been awarded by the prime contractor for the young offender's penal institution at Springhill, N.S., what are the names of the subcontractors, and what is the amount of each subcontract awarded?

Hon. G. J. McIlraith (Minister of Public Works): Securing of tenders for sub-trades and awarding of subcontracts including the amount of each subcontract is the responsibility of the general contractor. Consequently, this question cannot be answered in total. However, the general contractor nominated the following 10 main subcontractors in his tender form: Precast, prestressed and architectural precast concrete, Schokbeton; Aluminum windows, Robert Mitchell; Security hardware and metal work, Chubb, Mosler and Taylor; Kitchen equipment, Rideau Aluminum; Laundry equipment, Canadian Laundry Limited; Roofing, Tasco Roofing and Sheet Metal; Structural steel, Canada Iron; Water storage tanks, Steen Mechanical Contractors; Plumbing, heating and ventilation, Steen Mechanical Contractors; Electrical work, Canadian Comstock.

RECRUITING TRIP BY ASSISTANT TO DEPUTY WORKS MINISTER

Question No. 883—**Mr. Coates:**

1. Did the executive assistant to the deputy minister of public works go to Europe to secure staff for the department?

2. For what period of time was he in Europe, where did he visit during this period of time, and for what period of time was he located in each area?

3. What was the total cost of the visit?

4. Why was this work not carried out by officials of the Department of Citizenship and Immigration?

Hon. Judy V. LaMarsh (Secretary of State): I have been given the following information by the Civil Service Commission:

1. The executive assistant to the deputy minister of public works went to the United Kingdom on February 25, 1966 as a member of a three man examining board under the direction of the Civil Service Commission. The board, consisting of the executive assistant who is an engineer; an engineer from the Department of Transport; and an officer of the Civil Service Commission, went to the United Kingdom to interview candidates, who responded to advertising by the Civil Service Commission in the United Kingdom and France, for professional engineers required by a number of departments, including public works.

2. The itinerary of the team is as follows: London, February 26 to March 6; Birmingham, March 7 to 10; Liverpool, March 11 to 14; Glasgow, March 15 to 19.

The executive assistant, being bilingual, will visit Paris on March 21 to 25 to interview candidates there, returning to Ottawa on March 26.

3. The total cost of the executive assistant's travelling is not known at this time but is estimated at $1500.

4. While officials of the Department of Citizenship and Immigration have been most helpful in making all the preliminary arrangements for the recruiting team, it was advisable to have the two departments most interested in the engineers to be recruited, participate in their selection. A detailed and first hand knowledge of the specific needs of departments was important if candidates were to have as complete a picture as possible of the employment opportunities offered.

Questions

SALT WATER PIPE LINE, LOCKPORT, N.S.

Question No. 908—**Mr. Bower:**

1. Has the Minister of Fisheries in process an investigation as to remedial action on the salt water pipeline at Lockport, Nova Scotia?
2. Has the investigation been completed?
3. If not, when is it estimated it will be completed?
4. If it has been completed, when will a report on the findings be available?

Hon. H. J. Robichaud (Minister of Fisheries): 1. Yes.

2. Yes.

3. Answered by No. 2.

4. The report is now under consideration.

CUSTOMS OFFICER, GRINDSTONE, MAGDALEN ISLANDS

Question No. 914—**Mr. Keays:**

Did the Civil Service Commission recently call for applicants to fill a position of Customs Officer at Grindstone, Magdalen Islands and, if so (a) how many applications were received and what were the names of the applicants (b) how many wrote the examination and what were their names (c) how many were called for the oral examination and what were their names (d) who was the successful candidate (e) were there any veterans included in the above list and, if so, was any additional credit given to them?

Hon. Judy V. LaMarsh (Secretary of State): I have been given the following information by the Civil Service Commission:

Yes. (a) 12. Having regard for the right to privacy of candidates and the possibility that the release of information could prove not only embarrassing but prejudicial to them, the commission holds in confidence information concerning candidates whose names do not appear on the eligible list; (b) 11, see (a) above regarding names; (c) 5, see (a) above regarding names; (d) There were two qualified candidates, namely, Mr. Ade Devau, Mr. Joseph Pierre Paul Langford; Mr. Devau was appointed to the position, collector 1, Grindstone, on February 16, 1966; (e) Neither of the successful candidates was entitled to the statutory (veterans) preference for war service. This preference becomes operative only with respect to candidates who have attained a sufficiently high general rating to be declared qualified.

ASSISTANCE IN SECURING OLYMPIC GAMES FOR MONTREAL

Question No. 921—**Mr. Allmand:**

Has the mayor of Montreal requested any federal assistance in his attempt to obtain the 1972 Olympic Games for Montreal and, if so, what assistance has been or will be given?

[Miss LaMarsh.]

Hon. A. J. MacEachen (Minister of National Health and Welfare): The mayor of Montreal has not requested any federal assistance in his attempt to obtain the 1972 Olympic games for Montreal.

*LEGISLATION TO SHORTEN ELECTION PERIOD

Question No. 927—**Mr. Knowles:**

Since it requires only three or four weeks to hold a general election in the United Kingdom, is the Prime Minister planning to recommend legislation to shorten the period of time for the holding of a general election in Canada?

Right Hon. L. B. Pearson (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, this question inquires whether the Prime Minister is planning to recommend legislation to shorten the period of time for the holding of a general election in Canada.

I agree, Mr. Speaker, that it is desirable to shorten the period of time for the holding of a general election in Canada, but a number of steps must be taken before any improvement can be contemplated. Because of very different geographical conditions it may never be possible to be in a position to adopt as short a period as that adopted by the United Kingdom.

In addition to the time required to select enumerators, it now takes 37 days to prepare voters lists, that is to complete enumeration and to print and revise the lists.

Under section 9 of the Representation Commissioner Act which was passed in 1963, the commissioner is required to review, study and report on methods of registration of electors and absentee voting. This study is to get under way after redistribution is in effect and the commissioner, under the law, has two years to complete his study. It is hoped that this study will show that permanent voters lists are feasible, for only then will it be possible to reduce the period of time for the holding of a general election.

C.B.C. PROGRAM "TELESCOPE"—PAYMENT FOR APPEARANCE

Question No. 943—**Mr. Howard:**

1. Did one Alanis Obomsawin or Helen Riley, or Helen Robert(s), or Helen Robert Riley appear on the C.B.C. program "Telescope" recently and, if so, was she paid for that appearance or for anything connected with the said show?

2. In what form was she paid, and if by cheque what was the name of the payee thereon?

Hon. Judy V. LaMarsh (Secretary of State): 1. Yes. Alanis Obomsawin was the subject

of a "Telescope" program on February 10 and she was paid.

2. By cheque, made out to Alanis Abomsawin.

SYMPOSIUM ON WARM WATER POND FISH CULTURE

Question No. 948—**Mr. Crouse:**

1. Is it the government's intention to participate in a world symposium on warm water pond fish culture which will be sponsored in Rome during May by the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations?

2. If so, what are the names of the Canadian delegates who will be in attendance?

3. Will representatives of the Canadian fishing industry be invited to participate?

Hon. H. J. Robichaud (Minister of Fisheries): 1. Yes.

2. C. P. Ruggles, chief biologist, maritimes area, Halifax, N.S.

3. No. So far as is known no one in industry is interested in warm water pond fish culture.

PROCESSED FOOD PRODUCTS, ATLANTIC PROVINCES

Question No. 952—**Mr. Flemming:**

What was the value in dollars of processed food products produced and exported from the Atlantic provinces in the years 1960, 1961, 1962, 1963, 1964?

Hon. Robert Winters (Minister of Trade and Commerce): (*a*) Value of shipments from manufacturing plants of processed food products[1] Atlantic provinces.[2] 1960, $259,772,-144; 1961, $280,910,527; 1962, $301,592,751; 1963, $343,168,488; 1964, not available.

[1]Including fish products industry but excluding beverage products industry and feeds industry.

[2]Atlantic provinces include Newfoundland, Prince Edward Island, Nova Scotia and New Brunswick.

(*b*) Domestic exports of all processed foods (including fish and fish product foods) cleared through customs ports in the Atlantic provinces during the years 1960-1964 were as follows:

Calendar Year	All Processed Foods
1960	$ 71,108,000
1961	72,440,000
1962	76,543,000
1963	83,762,000
1964	101,126,000

OLD TOWN CLOCK, HALIFAX

Question No. 958—**Mr. McCleave:**

1. What was the last day in which the old town clock on Citadel Hill, Halifax, kept proper time?

2. What is the cause of the current breakdown, and when will repairs be effected?

Hon. Arthur Laing (Minister of Northern Affairs and National Resources):

1. February 1, 1966.

2. A broken glass face is binding the clock hands. Replacement glass has now been received and will be installed by contractor as soon as weather permits.

DUTY ON ATHLETIC TROPHIES

Question No. 970—**Mr. Harley:**

1. Is a duty imposed on trophies brought into Canada by Canadian athletes who are successful in winning such trophies?

2. If so (a) under what authority is this done (b) what is the rate of duty charged (c) is the government considering the removal of this duty?

Hon. E. J. Benson (Minister of National Revenue): 1. Trophy cups of metal and other metallic prizes, not usual merchantable commodities, won abroad in bona fide competitions by Canadian athletes are admitted free of duty under item 69200-1 of the Customs Tariff.

2. N.A.

SECOND NATIONAL PARK, P.E.I.

Question No. 973—**Mr. MacDonald (Prince):**

1. Has the Minister of Northern Affairs and National Resources received an offer of land from the government of the province of Prince Edward Island for the development of a second national park?

2. If so, when was the offer made and where is that land located?

3. Are negotiations still being carried on with regard to the establishment of a second national park in Prince Edward Island?

Hon. Arthur Laing (Minister of Northern Affairs and National Resources): 1. Yes.

2. On May 19, 1965; the land is situated in Prince county in the West Point area.

3. Yes.

GOVERNMENT PUBLICATION "INVITATION TO CANADA"

Question No. 981—**Mr. Howe (Hamilton South):**

1. In the new government publication "Invitation to Canada," what criteria were used to decide which cities and places would be mentioned?

Questions

2. On what grounds was Hamilton, Ontario, excluded from this publication?

Hon. Robert Winters (Minister of Trade and Commerce): 1. The concept of the booklet called for two pages of space to be allotted to each province, and two pages jointly to the two Territories, covering 22 of the booklet's 52 pages. Then, two pages each were devoted to the following 15 subjects: map of Canada, introductory message, transportation, government, accommodation, outdoor recreation, national parks, water sports, events, shopping, culture, fishing and hunting, winter sports, annual events and addresses of travel offices. The objective was to indicate the wide variety of tourist attractions and facilities of Canada while space limitations.

In deciding what cities and places would be mentioned, selection was made from amongst the best colour photographs available with particular attention to their ability to attract visitors.

2. Hamilton is identified on the map on the inside front cover but is not specifically represented in the pictures or text. Given the size of the booklet and its concept, it is not possible to show or mention every important Canadian city, travel attraction or event.

AREA INCENTIVE PROGRAM, NOVA SCOTIA

Question No. 988—**Mr. Forrestall:**

1. Have many firms have been assisted in Nova Scotia under the area incentives program?

2. Where in Nova Scotia are these firms located?

3. What are the names of these firms?

4. To what dollar extent has each been assisted?

Hon. C. M. Drury (Minister of Industry): 1. The area development agency of the Department of Industry has been informed, as at February 28, 1966, of 29 projects in which businesses have declared their intentions to establish facilities in designated areas in Nova Scotia in order to qualify for the benefits under the area development program.

2. Ten of the eleven National Employment Service office areas which have been designated in Nova Scotia have shared in these projects as follows: Amherst 3, Bridgewater 2, Inverness 1, Kentville 2, Liverpool 1, New Glasgow 8, Sydney 2, Sydney Mines 1, Truro 4, Yarmouth 5.

3. It is not in the public interest to divulge the names of the businesses which may benefit from the provisions of section 71A of the Income Tax Act and the Area Development Incentives Act. However, 15 of the businesses have received letters of assurance indicating that their plans for the projects, if carried out, should meet the requirements of section 71A of the Income Tax Act or the Area Development Incentives Act. Among these, the following nine businesses have announced publicly their intentions to establish:

Designated N.E.S. Area	Company
Amherst	Amherst Woodworking (Maritime) Ltd.
Inverness	Eastern Land & Housing Limited
Liverpool	K. & W. Enterprises Limited
New Glasgow	Acadia Fisheries (Canso) Ltd.
New Glasgow	Clairtone Sound Corporation Ltd.
New Glasgow	Benro Forest Products Ltd.
New Glasgow	Bickerton Co-operative Ltd.
Sydney	C.L.A. Cape Breton Ltd.
Sydney	Deuterium of Canada Ltd.

4. Businesses which qualify under section 71A of the Income Tax Act may receive an exemption from income tax during the first three years of operation. Eligible businesses which elect to take the capital grant under the Area Development Incentives Act will receive payment in three parts during the first two years of operation. None of the businesses which have qualified to date have been in production long enough to have received the full benefits. Thus actual levels of financial assistance by the government in each instance cannot be determined at this time.

[Mr. Howe (Hamilton South).]

ASSISTANCE TO SKI ASSOCIATION OF CANADA

Question No. 1002—**Mr. Mather:**

1. Does the government spend public funds to alert young people to the health dangers of cigarette smoking?

2. Does the government spend public funds to promote amateur sport and physical fitness programs and, if so, is the Ski Association of Canada one of the sport groups thus aided by public funds?

3. Does the government approve of the acceptance by the ski association of awards sponsored by cigarette companies?

Hon. A. J. MacEachen (Minister of National Health and Welfare): 1. Yes.

2. Yes.

3. The federal government does not have jurisdiction over this or other sports governing bodies and therefore any question of approval does not arise.

NATIONAL DEFENCE PAY RATES, HALIFAX-DARTMOUTH

Question No. 1003—**Mr. Douglas:**

1. What is the rate of pay at each of the Department of National Defence establishments in the Halifax-Dartmouth area, including Shannon park, the naval magazine, the Albro Lake radio station and the armament depot, for the following classifications: driver; light equipment operator; driver (heavy); and heavy equipment operator?

2. How are the rates of pay in each instance calculated?

3. Do the members of the motor transport section at H.M.C. *Dockyard*, Halifax, and at H.M.C.S. *Shearwater* do the same type of work?

4. If not, what is the difference in the work performed between the two establishments?

Hon. Paul Hellyer (Minister of National Defence):

1.

	Shannon Park Naval Magazine, Armament Depot	Halifax-Dartmouth area Albro Lake
Driver	$2.05	$1.85
Light equipment operator	2.10	1.90
Driver (heavy)	2.25	2.05
Heavy equipment operator	2.35	2.15

Note: Motor transport services are provided to Shannon Park, naval magazine and armament depot by Halifax *Dockyard* employees who are carried on the *Dockyard* payroll.

2. The rates of pay are calculated by Treasury Board based upon recommendations of the Department of Labour.

3. Yes.

4. Not applicable.

WAGE COMPLAINTS, H.M.C.S. "SHEARWATER"

Question No. 1004—**Mr. Douglas:**

1. Has there been any investigation into wage complaints at H.M.C.S. *Shearwater* since September 1, 1965?

2. If so, on what date or dates was such an investigation or investigations held?

3. What were the names and positions of the people who participated in such an investigation or investigations?

4. Were formal reports submitted to the government?

5. If so, who signed the reports?

6. What recommendations were made in the reports?

7. What action has been taken on these reports by the government?

Hon. Paul Hellyer (Minister of National Defence): 1. Yes.

2. After a meeting between Hon. Léo Cadieux, Associate Minister of National Defence, and representatives of the Halifax *Dockyard* Trades and Labour Council in Ottawa on 7 September, 1965, a thorough investigation was carried out by members of the Department of National Defence, Department of Labour, and Treasury Board staff, culminating in a meeting in H.M.C. *Dockyard*, Halifax, on 2 December, 1965.

3. Associate Minister's Committee: Mr. Kenneth R. Scobie, (Chairman)—Director General, Civilian Personnel, DND; Mr. Cameron A. Smith, Director, Civilian Personnel, Industrial Relations and Compensation, DND; Mr. Robert P. Smith, Treasury Board Staff; Mr. Gordon E. Hotchkiss, Department of Labour; Mr. Hugh R. Stewart, (Secretary) —DND.

Dockyard Trades and Labour Council: Mr. James Johnson, President; Mr. Eric Sharp, Vice President; Mr. Basil Conrad,

Recording Secretary; Mr. Leslie Brown, Financial Secretary; Mr. Dennis Bona, Sergeant-at-Arms.

Dockyard Management: Commodore Edward N. Clarke, Commodore Superintendent Atlantic Coast; Captain Frank Harley, Manager Ship Repair; Mr. John B. Breen, Administration Officer Atlantic Coast; Mr. George H. Logie, Civilian Personnel Officer Atlantic Coast; Mr. Edward C. Waddington, Industrial Relations Officer Atlantic Coast.

Dockyard Local Union Representatives: Mr. Ross Isenor, President, Local Union 1723, International Association of Machinists; Mr. James W. DeYoung, President, Local Union 1250, International Association of Machinists; Mr. Thomas Kimber, President, Boatswain Section, Local Union 273, Canadian Labour Congress; Mr. Richard Butler, President, Local Union 1133, International Association of Electrical Workers; Mr. Allen W. Cooke, President, Local Union 1405, United Brotherhood of Carpenters and Joiners of America; Mr. George Dunham, President, Local Union 409, Sheet Metal Workers' International Association; Mr. John Conrad, President, Local Union 282, United Association of Journeymen and Apprentices of the Plumbing and Pipe Fitting Industry of the United States and Canada.

4 and 5. Yes, Hon. Leo Cadieux, Associate Minister of National Defence.

6. (1) Proposal: Halifax Dockyard drivers and garage employees to receive same "call-back" pay as ship repair employees (ie four hours minimum pay).

Recommendation: Recommended. (2) Proposal: Dockyard drivers and garage employees to receive same shift differential as for ship repair (ie time and one eighth). Recommendation: Recommended. (3) Proposal: Forty hour week for fire tug crews. Recommendation: Subject to decision on Fire Fighter Class under study. (4) Proposal: Board and lodging expenses for prevailing rate and ships officers, ships crews to be equalized. Recommendation: Recommended. (5) Proposal: Two levels of seamen class to be established instead of existing single class. Recommendation: Agree, should be studied by Bureau of Classification Revision. (6) Proposal: Triple time for work on statutory holidays. Recommendation: Recommended. (7) Proposal: Double time for all overtime worked in excess of four hours, Monday to Saturday. Recommendation: Recommended. (8) Proposal: That Prevailing Rate employees be permitted to retain their Jury Duty fees in addition to their take-home pay. Recommendation: Recommended.

7. The government agreed with the recommendations.

[Mr. Hellyer.]

PAY RATE COMPARISON, HALIFAX

Question No. 1005—**Mr. Douglas:**

1. With reference to the answer to question 476, what is the one comparison used to determine all rates of pay in H.M.C. *Dockyard*, Halifax?

2. Do the wage rate data used for determining the wages paid to the motor transport section at H.M.C.S. *Shearwater*, Dartmouth, referred to in the answer to question 476, include such outside employers as E.M.I. Cosser, Imperial Oil Limited, Volvo, Fairey Aviation and Texaco?

Hon. Paul Hellyer (Minister of National Defence): 1. Except for a small number of highly specialized occupations which are not found in the shipyards, rates of pay for prevailing rate employees at H.M.C. Dockyard, Halifax, N.S., are determined by reference to the rates paid by seven shipyards in the maritime and St. Lawrence areas.

2. Since the selection of employers from which wage rate observations are drawn is a matter which comes within the purview of the Department of Labour, this information should be obtained from that department.

CANADIAN CARS SOLD IN U.S.

Question No. 1006—**Mr. Korchinski:**

How many Canadian cars were sold in the United States in each year since 1960?

Hon. C. M. Drury (Minister of Industry): Exports of Canadian cars to the United States were as follows: 1960, 637 units; 1961, 615 units; 1962, 1,136 units; 1963, 3,504 units; 1964, 19,094 units; 1965, (Jan.-Oct. incl.), 29,202 units.

CANADA-U.S. VISITORS—RACIAL ORIGIN

Question No. 1035—**Mr. Howe (Hamilton South):**

1. Do officials of the Department of Citizenship and Immigration take cognizance in any way of the racial origin of American citizens entering Canada as visitors and, if so, is any discriminatory action based on this?

2. Has Canada any reciprocal agreement with the United States concerning the racial origin of Canadian citizens entering the United States as visitors?

Mr. J. C. Munro (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Citizenship and Immigration): 1. No. 2. No.

QUESTION PASSED AS ORDER FOR RETURN

ATLANTIC DEVELOPMENT BOARD GRANTS AND COMMITMENTS

Question No. 717—**Mr. MacRae:**

1. Between the period of June 1, 1965, and February 15, 1966, what grants have been approved by the Atlantic Development Board in each of the four Atlantic provinces?

2. What grants were actually paid in the above period?

3. What is the total of the commitments to each of the four Atlantic provinces to date and what grants have actually been paid?

Return tabled.

• (2:40 p.m.)

EXTERNAL AFFAIRS

RHODESIA—INQUIRY AS TO EXTENT OF EMBARGO

On the orders of the day:

Right Hon. J. G. Diefenbaker (Leader of the Opposition): My question is directed to the Prime Minister, in the absence of the Secretary of State for External Affairs. Is the right hon. gentleman in a position to report to parliament regarding the Canadian oil lift to Zambia, it having been confidently predicted some months ago that the Smith administration would have collapsed by the end of March? What has the Prime Minister to say? Is there any information he can give the house as to whether the oil embargo is proving successful and, in general, the degree to which through third country or third party assistance supplies of oil have been finding their way into Rhodesia?

Right Hon. L. B. Pearson (Prime Minister): I am sorry I cannot give the right hon. gentleman a detailed reply to this question at the moment, though I will be in a position to do so tomorrow or the next day. As the right hon. gentleman and the house know there have been, if I may use the expression, oil leakages into Rhodesia though not, I am informed, to the extent which some press reports would indicate and not to the extent that there is not pressure on the Rhodesian economy because of the shortage of oil and petroleum products. I would be very glad to try to secure full information, and to make a considered statement tomorrow or the next day on this matter.

Mr. Diefenbaker: Would the Prime Minister at the same time give the house and the country information as to the amount of oil transported by the Canadian air lift, by the use of Canadian aircraft and the like?

Inquiries of the Ministry

Mr. Pearson: That is another question. I am sure I can get the information. This concerns the amount of oil transported to Zambia?

Mr. Diefenbaker: That is right.

FARM MACHINERY

INQUIRY AS TO GOVERNMENT ACTION RESPECTING PRICES

On the orders of the day:

Mr. T. C. Douglas (Burnaby-Coquitlam): I desire to ask a question of the Minister of Agriculture. I wonder whether the minister could tell the house when he plans to launch the investigation into the high prices of farm machinery, which he promised to undertake when he was in western Canada last fall.

Hon. J. J. Greene (Minister of Agriculture): The matter is under advisement and an announcement will be made very shortly, I hope.

Mr. Reynold Rapp (Humboldt-Melfort-Tisdale): Would the minister not consider setting up a royal commission, if a house committee cannot be set up to investigate these prices?

Mr. Greene: The machinery of the inquiry, if any, will be announced in due course.

INDUSTRY

HEAVY WATER—REQUEST FOR STATEMENT ON SECOND PLANT

On the orders of the day:

Mr. R. N. Thompson (Red Deer): Mr. Speaker, my question is addressed to the Minister of Mines and Technical Surveys. In view of the fact that the expiry date for the suggested proposal for developing heavy water through the Canadian General Electric Corporation was reached last week, does the minister have any announcement to make as to what has been decided in relation to this matter, particularly with regard to the location of a possible second plant?

Hon. Jean-Luc Pepin (Minister of Mines and Technical Surveys): Atomic Energy of Canada has received a proposal from Canadian General Electric. At the present time the proposal is being considered by Atomic Energy of Canada and senior officials of the government. A joint recommendation is to be made to the government, and I would hope a decision may be reached so that a further announcement may be made shortly.

No decision has yet been made by C.G.E with respect to location. If the government accepts the offer made by C.G.E a contract will be let within the next 60 days and in the contract other matters, including the proposed source of energy, will be included.

Mr. R. R. Southam (Moose Mountain): As a supplementary question, Mr. Speaker, would the minister indicate whether he has made representations to Canadian General Electric to take a serious look at locating this plant at Estevan, which was the site originally intended for the heavy water plant to be constructed by Western Deuterium Limited?

Mr. Pepin: Mr. Speaker, Atomic Energy of Canada receives offers from C.G.E., and I think the responsibility for trying to attract C.G.E. to any particular place is more in the hands of provincial premiers, one of whom is in the gallery today.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

[*Later:*]

Mr. Donald MacInnis (Cape Breton South): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Mines and Technical Surveys. I would ask the minister whether the government has ascertained if Canadian General Electric have an improved process for the manufacture of heavy water.

Mr. Pepin: Mr. Speaker, when there will be an agreement between Atomic Energy of Canada and Canadian General Electric, the understanding will be that C.G.E. will fulfil the terms of the contract.

Mr. MacInnis (Cape Breton South): A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Is not the minister aware of the British American process that failed to materialize?

Mr. Speaker: Order.

DOSCO—REPORTED INTENTION TO REMOVE EQUIPMENT FROM SYDNEY PLANT

On the orders of the day:

Mr. Donald MacInnis (Cape Breton South): Mr. Speaker, I wish to direct a question to the Minister of Industry and ask him whether the government is aware of Dosco's intention to remove production equipment from their wire and nail mill at the Sydney steel plant. If so has the government received a request for aid, or does it intend to give aid to that area?

Hon. C. M. Drury (Minister of Industry): I was not aware of this intention, Mr. Speaker, but I shall make inquiries.

[Mr. Pepin.]

Mr. Robert Muir (Cape Breton North and Victoria): Mr. Speaker, supplementary to the question posed by the hon. member for Cape Breton South, may I ask the minister is he aware of the statement made in the Nova Scotia legislature by the former Nova Scotia minister of trade and industry that the Sydney area could wither and die within 15 years unless an answer is found to the problems facing the steel industry? I would ask the minister whether he agrees with this, and if he has not seen this statement would he check and give his views to the house as soon as possible?

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. The hon. member is suggesting a debate, not asking for information.

Mr. Muir (Cape Breton North and Victoria): With all due deference to you, sir, I am not asking for a debate. I am asking for information because we are very worried about the steel industry in Nova Scotia.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

THE BUDGET

INQUIRY AS TO PROBABLE DATE OF PRESENTATION

On the orders of the day:

Hon. George Hees (Northumberland): Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct a question to the Minister of Finance. Is he yet in a position to advise the house and the country when he intends to bring down his forthcoming budget?

Hon. Mitchell Sharp (Minister of Finance): Mr. Speaker, I expect to be able to make that announcement very shortly indeed.

DEFENCE PRODUCTION

R.C.A.F. OVERHAUL AND REPAIR CONTRACTS

On the orders of the day:

Hon. C. M. Drury (Minister of Industry): Mr. Speaker, I would like to answer a question asked by the hon. member for Calgary North relating to overhaul and repair contracts for the Department of National Defence. His question was:

Is it correct that overhaul and repair contracts for the R.C.A.F. have been grouped into three categories which have been let to three large corporations, two of which are American subsidiaries, with the result that a considerable number of smaller Canadian companies, which are dependant for their existence on this work, are now going to have to close down?

Mr. Speaker, the policy of the government has been, where adequate specifications exist, to call for overhaul and repair work to be done on a competitive tender basis. About a year ago the companies engaged in overhaul and repair work for the R.C.A.F. in relation to aircraft instruments—not the aircraft themselves but merely the aircraft instrumentation—were advised that we were now reaching the point where it would be possible to issue specifications to enable competitive tenders to be called. This advice was not only given to the industry but in particular to the four companies engaged in this kind of instrument overhaul work during the previous year.

As a consequence about a year later—and that was some months ago—the overhaul and repair work for instrumentation was divided into three packages. Competitive tenders were called and contracts awarded on this basis. It is estimated that the saving to the government as a result of this competitive arrangement will amount to some $1 million. Further, when four contractors were engaged two of them were American subsidiaries. Now under the new competitive basis only one of the successful tenderers is an American subsidiary.

I would also like to advise the hon. member that we have no information that this change in procedure is going to cause any company to close down.

HATE LITERATURE

INQUIRY AS TO COMMISSION REPORT

On the orders of the day:

Mr. David Lewis (York South): Mr. Speaker, I should like to direct a question to the Prime Minister in the absence of the Minister of Justice. I wish to ask the right hon. gentleman whether he could inform the house when we may expect the report of the Maxwell Cohen committee on legislation concerning a possible amendment to the Criminal Code dealing with hate literature.

Right Hon. L. B. Pearson (Prime Minister): I would be very glad to look into that matter and try to reply tomorrow or the next day.

Mr. Lewis: May I ask the right hon. gentleman, if the report is not yet printed, would he at the same time give consideration to tabling copies of the report pending such printing.

Mr. Pearson: I will be glad to give consideration to that suggestion. I know the report has been completed; it was being translated when I last inquired. I will be glad to find out exactly what has happened to the report and when we will be able to obtain it.

ADMINISTRATION OF JUSTICE

STEVEN TRUSCOTT—REQUEST FOR INVESTIGATION

On the orders of the day:

Mr. Eldon M. Woolliams (Bow River): Mr. Speaker, I have a related question. In the absence of the Minister of Justice may I ask whether the Prime Minister now is prepared to give an answer to a question asked by the right hon. Leader of the Opposition with reference to the Truscott case, as to whether the cabinet now has considered a royal commission to look into this matter, or what is the position at the present time?

Right Hon. L. B. Pearson (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, we have not yet received the report from the Solicitor General to which I referred the other day. As soon as this report is received we will give it immediate attention.

[*Later:*]

Mr. Stanley Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Mr. Speaker, may I be permitted to ask a question of the Prime Minister about the matter concerning which the Leader of the Opposition and the Prime Minister had a useful exchange on Friday, and to which reference has already been made today. In view of the wide public interest in the case of Steven Truscott, whom I had the privilege of seeing on Saturday, may I ask the Prime Minister whether he will interest himself personally in this case so there may be an early decision on the request for an inquiry?

Mr. Pearson: Mr. Speaker, I have already done so and I propose to follow the matter up with the Solicitor General, who is making, as I have said, an investigation into this matter. I propose to take a personal interest in the matter, of course, and I am sure every hon. member in the house is very concerned with it.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Right Hon. J. G. Diefenbaker (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, the statement just made by the Prime Minister is welcomed. May I ask him whether anyone is making an examination point by point and paragraph by paragraph of Mrs. LeBourdais' book on the subject, in which she deals with

the trial in great detail and with the weaknesses of the evidence she alleges on the basis of the investigation she has made?

Mr. Pearson: Mr. Speaker, it seems to me that any investigation of this matter along the lines I have suggested would require a very careful examination of that book.

CANADIAN CONSTITUTION

SUGGESTED STUDY BY PARLIAMENTARY COMMITTEE

On the orders of the day:

Mr. Heward Grafftey (Brome-Missisquoi): Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the Prime Minister. I would like to ask whether the government is still investigating the possibility of setting up an all party parliamentary committee to study changes in the Canadian constitution. I would like to ask whether a decision has been reached, and whether we can expect an announcement very soon.

Right Hon. L. B. Pearson (Prime Minister): No decision has yet been made.

[*Later:*]

Mr. Speaker, in answering the question posed to me by the hon. member for Brome-Missisquoi a moment ago I should have added that I was given notice of a question last Thursday by the hon. member for Greenwood regarding this same subject. He asked:

> In the light of the publication of a declaration on Canadian unity signed by 60 prominent French and English speaking Quebeckers urging the necessity for a new constitution, will the Prime Minister give further and urgent considerations to setting up a special committee of this house to study this matter?

I should point out that the so-called Canada committee, referred to in the question, in its declaration, dealt with a number of matters relating to federal-provincial relations and the equality of the two founding groups in Canada. Reports thus far available in the press do not indicate that it called for a new constitution, as the hon. member for Greenwood suggested, but rather for a few specific changes. I have asked for a copy of the full report so that it can be studied. It is one of the many things the government wants to consider before deciding whether to recommend the establishment at this time of a special committee on constitutional matters.

[Mr. Diefenbaker.]

VETERANS AFFAIRS

INQUIRY AS TO GOVERNMENT ACTION RESPECTING HONG KONG VETERANS

On the orders of the day:

Hon. Michael Starr (Ontario): Mr. Speaker, I should like to direct a question to the Minister of Veterans Affairs. In view of the anxiety in respect of the matter, and in view of the tabling of the report concerning Hong Kong veterans, is the minister now in a position to advise what the government intends to do regarding the pensions for these veterans?

Hon. Roger Teillet (Minister of Veterans Affairs): Mr. Speaker, I can report first that it is not necessary to pass legislation in this regard. Second, the Canadian Pension Commission now has decided to implement the various recommendations. The commission plans to proceed with a review, first of all, of all those claims for peptic ulcer which had been previously rejected. The next group to be dealt with will be those who have been rejected because of arteriosclerotic conditions, and these will include both lifetime claims and death claims. The commission then will proceed to review the files of all who are pensioned for avitaminosis, with a view to ascertaining whether increased assessments in these cases are in order. Essentially what the commission is doing is reviewing all the Hong Kong cases in the light of the recommendations and findings in the Richardson report.

Mr. G. S. Chatterton (Esquimalt-Saanich): Mr. Speaker, may I ask a supplementary question. The minister has promised that the Pension Act will be brought up for amendment. Would the review now taking place be repeated if the Pension Act is amended, particularly with regard to the pensions of the veterans?

Mr. Teillet: Mr. Speaker, in this regard I would not be prepared to comment until I have received the report of the inquiry under Mr. Justice Wood who is now examining the procedures, organization and interpretation of the commission. I am informed the committee hopes to conclude its hearings either late this month or early next month. Until that report is at hand I think it would be unwise for me to comment.

Mr. H. W. Herridge (Kootenay West): Mr. Speaker, I have a supplementary question. I presume the standing committee on veterans affairs will have an opportunity to discuss this report when it commences its sittings?

Mr. Teillet: I would hope so, Mr. Speaker.

[*Later:*]

Mr. R. A. Webb (Hastings-Frontenac): Mr. Speaker, I should like to direct a question to the Minister of Veterans Affairs. In the review of the files of the Hong Kong veterans by the pensions commission, would the minister say whether any pensions awarded will be made retroactive?

Mr. Teillet: Mr. Speaker, I am not in a position to answer this question, because it will be a matter for the Canadian Pension Commission to decide.

AGRICULTURE

PORK—REPORTED LARGE IMPORTATIONS BY PROCESSORS

On the orders of the day:

Mr. Eric A. Winkler (Grey-Bruce): Mr. Speaker, I would like to address a question to the Minister of Agriculture. The Canadian Federation of Agriculture is extremely concerned about the tremendous fluctuations in the prices of hogs to producers. Farmers generally are alleging that processors are—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. The question cannot be preceded by a statement. The hon. member should put his question.

Mr. Winkler: I was laying the groundwork for the question.

Mr. Speaker: It cannot be done in the way you commenced to do it.

Mr. Winkler: Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the Minister of Agriculture whether he has information that there are large importations of pork products by processors to depress the domestic market.

Hon. J. J. Greene (Minister of Agriculture): Mr. Speaker, I am aware there has been some importation of pork products. But pork prices generally have been good; but I will certainly investigate the effect of these importations on the general price structure.

Mr. Winkler: Mr. Speaker, I have a brief supplementary question. The minister has indicated that he will look into this matter. I wonder whether he will be so kind as to find out who are the processors who imported this product.

Mr. Greene: I will attempt to do so, Mr. Speaker.

Right Hon. J. G. Diefenbaker (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, in connection with the question regarding the importation of pork, can the minister advise the house whether any investigation has taken place as yet, particularly in view of the fact that the retail price of pork has not gone down despite the drop in the price of dressed carcasses from 45 cents to 32 cents a pound in a couple of weeks?

Mr. Greene: Mr. Speaker, I am not quite sure what the question is, but I will take note of the right hon. gentleman's remarks.

[*Translation*]

REQUEST FOR ANNOUNCEMENT OF DAIRY POLICY

On the orders of the day:

Mr. Clément Vincent (Nicolet-Yamaska): Mr. Speaker, I should like to put a question to the Minister of Agriculture.

Since the new dairy year will start next week could the Minister of Agriculture tell us whether he will announce the new dairy policy this week in the house?

Hon. J. J. Greene (Minister of Agriculture): Soon, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Vincent: Mr. Speaker, I wish to put a supplementary question to the minister.

Could the minister tell us whether a minimum price of $4 per hundredweight for industrial milk can be expected at this time?

Mr. Greene: The policy will soon be announced, Mr. Speaker.

[*English*]

CANADIAN PACIFIC RAILWAY

RECONCILIATION OF COMPANY AND CANADA PENSION PLANS

On the orders of the day:

Mr. H. A. Olson (Medicine Hat): Mr. Speaker, I should like to direct a question to the Minister of Labour, asking him what action if any has been taken in response to the representations from the Canadian Pacific Railway employees unions asking for government assistance in the reconciliation of the Canada pension plan with the Canadian Pacific pension plan.

Hon. J. R. Nicholson (Minister of Labour): A series of steps have been taken, Mr. Speaker, including arrangements for a meeting in Ottawa tomorrow morning between senior officials of the unions of the employees involved and officials of the company.

Inquiries of the Ministry

CROWN ASSETS

HARMON BASE—DISPOSAL OF SURPLUS HEAVY EQUIPMENT

On the orders of the day:

Mr. John Loney (Bruce): Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Minister of Industry. With reference to the question asked on Wednesday last by the hon. member for Gaspé (Mr. Keays), since the minister may now have some information, would the minister inform the house whether the sale of heavy equipment from Harmon air force base is imminent, and how Crown Assets Disposal Corporation propose to sell this equipment?

Hon. C. M. Drury (Minister of Industry): Mr. Speaker, the base is in the process of being closed down by the United States authorities. When this is complete such equipment as is surplus to the United States needs will be sold in the usual way through the government agencies. I would reassure the hon. gentleman and, I hope, the hon. member for Gaspé, that the government agencies in question will ensure that there will not be a depression of prices as a consequence of flooding the market with an excess load.

Mr. Donald MacInnis (Cape Breton South): A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. In answering the question the minister referred to "surplus to the United States needs." Does he not realize, or is it not so, that all equipment on the base would have to remain in Canada and therefore is automatically surplus?

Mr. Drury: I realize that, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Robert Muir (Cape Breton North and Victoria): I rise on a point of order, Mr. Speaker. In view of the question just asked of the minister and the reply given, and the undoubted urgency of this matter, could I not now have a reply to the question I posed regarding the jobs of several thousand steelworkers which are in jeopardy?

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. The hon. member posed a question to which a reply was given. He was continuing with a supplementary question with regard to a matter that had been discussed before, and the way in which the question was put was not acceptable under the rules.

TRANSPORT

ST. LAWRENCE SEAWAY—NEGOTIATIONS RESPECTING INCREASED TOLLS

On the orders of the day:

Mr. H. Russell MacEwan (Pictou): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Transport. I wonder if the minister could tell the house whether meetings will be held at an early date between representatives of the St. Lawrence Seaway authority and their American counterparts; and if so, could he advise us of the date when these meetings will commence with regard to the matter of tolls on the seaway?

Hon. J. W. Pickersgill (Minister of Transport): Mr. Speaker, discussions have been going on for some time, and I would have to refresh my memory as to the stage which they have reached at the moment.

INDIAN AFFAIRS

INQUIRY AS TO INTRODUCTION OF AMENDMENTS TO ACT

On the orders of the day:

Mr. Frank Howard (Skeena): Mr. Speaker, I wish to direct a question to the Minister of Northern Affairs and National Resources and ask when he intends to introduce into the house amendments to the Indian Act.

Hon. Arthur Laing (Minister of Northern Affairs and National Resources): Mr. Speaker, there are a number of amendments that we very much wish to make, and I would hope it would be in 1966.

NORTHERN AFFAIRS

LOANS TO PROSPECTORS FOR RESOURCE DEVELOPMENT

On the orders of the day:

Mr. H. W. Herridge (Kootenay West): Mr. Speaker, I wish to address a question to the always precise Minister of Northern Affairs and National Resources. In order to tranquilize any suspense that has been caused by press releases in respect of the possibility of the government grubstaking prospectors in the Yukon and Northwest Territories, would the minister inform the house whether there is any substance in these reports, and if so when government policy will be announced?

Hon. Arthur Laing (Minister of Northern Affairs and National Resources): Mr. Speaker, I hope the hon. member is not confusing the loan program to assist exploration, which we announced last week, with the grubstaking program for prospectors. This latter program has been in operation in the Northwest Territories and Yukon for many years, and our officials and the recipients are of the opinion that it is a good program. I do not know the details, but I shall be happy to write my hon. friend telling him the number of grubstake grants made and the amounts.

Inquiries of the Ministry

EXPO '67

REFUSAL OF PERMISSION TO RECORD R.C.M.P. BAND

On the orders of the day:

Mr. Joseph Macaluso (Hamilton West): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Secretary of State. Has her department investigated complaints that a Toronto record producer has been refused permission to record the R.C.M.P. band at Expo '67, as a Canadian cultural project, by the American Federation of Musicians head office in New York?

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. This question should be placed on the order paper.

Mr. Macaluso: I will raise the question this evening, Mr. Speaker, at ten p.m.

EXTERNAL AFFAIRS

VIET NAM—INQUIRY AS TO REPORT OF SPECIAL MISSION

On the orders of the day:

Mr. R. N. Thompson (Red Deer): Mr. Speaker, I wish to direct a question to the right hon. Prime Minister. In view of the fact that the government has now received the report of the special mission of Mr. Chester Ronning, and in view of the increased tempo of fighting in Viet Nam, does the Prime Minister have any information he can pass on to the house in this connection?

Right Hon. L. B. Pearson (Prime Minister): No, Mr. Speaker, I have not any information that I can pass on to the house at this particular time.

PUBLIC ACCOUNTS

CONSIDERATION OF REPORTS OF AUDITOR GENERAL

On the orders of the day:

Mr. A. D. Hales (Wellington South): Mr. Speaker, I should like to address the question to the house leader, the Minister of Public Works. In view of the fact that the Auditor General has laid before the house two reports, could the minister give us some idea when these reports will be referred to the public accounts committee in order that it may proceed to study them?

Hon. G. J. McIlraith (Minister of Public Works): I will look into this matter, Mr. Speaker, with a view to having this done in the very near future.

AGRICULTURE

ALBERTA—REQUEST FOR ASSISTANCE IN PEACE RIVER DISTRICT

On the orders of the day:

Mr. G. W. Baldwin (Peace River): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Agriculture the urgency of which is emphasized by the imminent approach of spring, and the fact that the collateral program of the province of Alberta to assist the farmers of northern Alberta will cease at the end of this month. Can the minister at this time give a final and categorical answer to the request for assistance which has been made on behalf of thousands of farmers, so they will know how to conduct themselves and arrange their programs?

Hon. J. J. Greene (Minister of Agriculture): Mr. Speaker, as the hon. member knows, since the time he raised in this house the question of payments supplementary to P.F.A.A. payments for the farmers of the Peace river district, a similar request was made by the farmers of the Bonnyville district. I think this indicates the correctness of the government's decision that we cannot make payments supplementary to P.F.A.A., and to date we have received no requests which would enable us to give aid on any other basis.

Mr. Baldwin: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker, and not an argumentative one. Will the minister not agree that there is this distinction, that the request on behalf of the Bonnyville farmers was not supported by the provincial government?

Mr. Speaker: Order, I suggest to the hon. member that his question is argumentative.

Mr. H. A. Olson (Medicine Hat): A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. For the sake of clarity, would the Minister of Agriculture repeat what he said in regard to a request being made for payments supplementary to P.F.A.A.?

Mr. Greene: What I said was that a request was made for aid which in effect would be supplementary to P.F.A.A. payments.

INDIAN AFFAIRS

SASKATCHEWAN—PRESERVATION OF INDIAN SHRINE

On the orders of the day:

Mr. L. M. Brand (Saskatoon): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Agriculture, who seems to be in a very

talkative mood today. I was wondering whether he could tell the house if the meeting between the P.F.R.A. in Saskatchewan and the group known as the Mistaseni committee to move the plains Cree Indian shrine has reached a conclusion; and can he indicate whether his department will be able to help?

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. I suggest that the hon. member communicate directly with the minister, or put his question on the order paper.

Mr. Brand: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, this is an extremely important matter in view of the fact that there are only days left in which a decision can be reached in this regard. The order paper is of no use; we have had questions on the order paper for months.

Right Hon. J. G. Diefenbaker (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, in connection with the point of order I would say that this is a very important matter. It has to do with an Indian shrine that will be covered with the waters of the Saskatchewan unless action is taken. A question was put on the order paper and there has been no response thereto. There remain but a few days before this shrine, which the Indians have had for hundreds of years, will be covered by the waters of the river and that will be the end of it. I think it is very important, sir, that there should be an answer.

Hon. J. J. Greene (Minister of Agriculture): May I say that this matter is under immediate consideration, and I hope to be able to have an answer for the hon. gentleman and the right hon. gentleman within a very few days.

UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE

BENEFITS TO EMPLOYEES AFFECTED BY TRUCKING STRIKE

On the orders of the day:

Mr. William Dean Howe (Hamilton South): Mr. Speaker, I should like to direct a question to the Minister of Labour arising out of the current strike of the teamsters union. Can the Minister inform the house whether decision has been reached on the eligibility for unemployment insurance benefits of those employees of trucking firms which ceased operation during the strike between teamsters' union local 880 and Consolidated Trucking Limited?

Hon. J. R. Nicholson (Minister of Labour): Mr. Speaker, I know of no change in the position which I announced some weeks ago. In the case of labour disputes, involving either strikes or lockouts, there is no provision for payment of unemployment insurance.

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE

DINNER RECESS FOR THIS DAY AND TOMORROW

On the orders of the day:

Mr. Stanley Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Mr. Speaker, might I ask a question of the house leader in relation to the business for today. In view of the fact that we will be considering a supply motion, which would take precedence over private members' time, I wonder if the house leader would care to ascertain whether the house would take the traditional two hours off between 6 p.m. and 8 p.m., perhaps both today and tomorrow.

Some hon. Members: Carried.

Hon. G. J. McIlraith (Minister of Public Works): Mr. Speaker, since this is the traditional opportunity for the opposition to move want of confidence in the government—

Mr. Churchill: Just an amendment to the motion, not necessarily one of confidence.

Mr. McIlraith: In any event, Mr. Speaker, personally I find the idea very attractive. I think if the opposition is agreeable certainly the government would be willing to take two hours off between 6 and 8 today and tomorrow, because the new rules extend the time for the amendment of the motion that Mr. Speaker leave the chair by two hours on each day. I would be very glad to consider the matter further if the opposition is so disposed.

Right Hon. J. G. Diefenbaker (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, if I may speak to that, the other day we had a two hour adjournment because the ministers could not agree among themselves. This, however, is one occasion when I think there would be general agreement, as far as Her Majesty's loyal opposition are concerned, that a two hour period might well be made available to our members, who have been working very steadily day and night.

Mr. Speaker: Is it so ordered?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Mr. Speaker: Does that order apply for today and tomorrow?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

AIR TRANSPORT

CHANGE IN REGULATIONS RESPECTING AIR CORRIDORS ACROSS ATLANTIC

On the orders of the day:

Mr. Colin Cameron (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Transport. Has the minister been able to examine the protests which have been made against the narrowing of the north Atlantic Air lanes, and is he now in a position to state what is the government's position with regard to the opposition which is coming from the air lines pilots associations?

Hon. J. W. Pickersgill (Minister of Transport): Mr. Speaker, I could make a statement on this subject which is about three paragraphs long, but I think that would be transgressing the rules. I can say very briefly that the view taken by the government is that in no circumstances is any pilot who takes any exception to this rule asked to fly his plane in the narrow corridor. Meanwhile the whole matter is being further studied.

PRIVILEGES AND ELECTIONS

INQUIRY AS TO REPORT OF COMMITTEE

On the orders of the day:

Mr. Frank Howard (Skeena): Mr. Speaker, I should like to direct a question to the hon. member for Northumberland-Miramichi in his capacity as chairman of the privileges and elections committee. I would ask the hon. gentleman what happened to the unanimous report of the committee, which provided that the Canada Elections Act should be referred to the privileges and elections committee?

Mr. G. Roy McWilliam (Northumberland-Miramichi): Mr. Speaker, the point was raised that the privileges and elections committee at its first organizational meeting acted beyond its terms of reference. Subsequently opinions were requested from officials of the house. These opinions have been received, and they will be presented before the committee for further action.

Mr. Howard: A supplementary question. I would ask the hon. member whether it is not a fact that no one in the committee during the time it met raised any objections. I would ask the hon. gentleman who raised these objections.

Mr. Speaker: Order. The hon. member cannot ask a question which suggests its own answer. That is a leading question.

Mr. Howard: I did not think I would get an answer anyway, Mr. Speaker.

SUPPLY

Hon. Mitchell Sharp (Minister of Finance) moved that the house go into committee of supply.

THE INCREASED COST OF LIVING

Right Hon. J. G. Diefenbaker (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, this motion provides the traditional opportunity to bring matters before the house which, in the opinion of those introducing them, are of first importance and deserve the attention of the house. Also, an amendment may be moved and a vote taken on the amendment. There are a large number of matters which could have been taken up. Various suggestions have been made. Had we proceeded earlier last week, as anticipated, with a motion to go into supply, and the terms of reference had been available to us, it would have been possible to bring before the house the totally inadequate and improper nature of those terms of reference in the matter which has been submitted to Mr. Justice Spence.

We in Her Majesty's loyal opposition do not intend to accept the finality of the terms of reference, which in our opinion were not so framed as to place before the judge the allegations which were made in this house and in respect of which the judge is to make inquiries. However, I make it as clear as I can at once that, while we are not moving an amendment, believing that it would not be appropriate to do so, we do not accept the arbitrary nature of the terms of reference which were determined by the government and formulated in an order in council, and then placed before the house without discussion or consideration of the views of the members of this house.

Having made that clear, I want to bring before the house and the country the general economic situation in the nation as a whole. I particularly want to deal with one phase of the economic situation which affects the people of our nation to a greater extent than any other, and I say that on the basis of mail which I receive.

• (3:20 p.m.)

The two subjects in which people are particularly interested, if one's mail is to be any measure of public feeling, are these. One is the alleged barbarities in the slaughter of seals, and the other is the general position of the average Canadian in the face of a rising and accelerating cost of living. In order to

provide a background for what I have to say in this connection, I point out that there are serious economic difficulties facing this country which have not been met by the government.

It is interesting that today, when the Minister of Trade and Commerce (Mr. Winters) spoke at the Canadian Club in the city of Toronto, he dealt with the difficulties that ministers have in arriving at a consensus of agreement regarding the courses to be taken by cabinet when it meets. We had an example of this the other day, showing the disunity that prevails in the cabinet, when ministers openly were in disagreement with one another, when they could not agree as to what certain legislation meant. That was on March 17. Each minister had a different idea of the meaning of the legislation, and the house ended by providing an adjournment so that they might get together to determine for themselves agreement regarding the legislation, which no one seemed to understand in the same way as another.

The Minister of Trade and Commerce said to the persons in the club in the course of his address:

> There will undoubtedly be decisions taken by the government, and supported by me, which will cause some concern to many of my friends. The question inevitably arises as to whether one can serve best by trying to work from within the government, or whether he can be more effective and constructive if he has the freedom to express his private views. Every minister undoubtedly wrestles with this conflict from time to time.

I will make reference to that statement a little later on. It is very obvious that the minister, having had several years experience in private business, realizes that some of the measures of the present government cannot be understood by business or anyone else. He made a form of apology in the city of Toronto to those who were present at his meeting today.

Then he goes on to say, after dealing with the high level of economic activity:

> The high level of economic activity, stimulated by an extraordinarily large capital program, and coupled with shortages of labour and the difficulty of finding sufficient funds to finance all planned undertakings, will impose inflationary pressures.
>
> This will be one of our most pressing problems as the year advances, particularly having regard to the fact that we experienced an adverse external balance on current transactions in 1965 in excess of $1 billion, and that this figure is apt to be higher in 1966. It will be recalled that the corresponding figure in 1964 was less than one-half billion dollars ($433 million).

[Mr. Diefenbaker.]

So the minister goes on. He points out that costs are of importance. Indeed, there are many who are saying today that because of high costs, she is becoming non-competitive in the markets of the world. The minister says that taxes are an important element of costs, and he gives advice—all of which we have endeavoured to give, but our efforts in this regard have fallen on barren soil.

The minister continued to say:

> If we are to avoid too great a disparity between our taxes and those of other countries with whom we compete for manpower, capital and markets, the government must be selective in its spending program and resolute in resisting pressures to spend beyond its means.

These are some of the things that we have been saying. He goes on to say that the reason the government voted against the increase to $100 in old age pension was that it was difficult to find revenues to cover current spending. He says, "We would like to have done so."

It is an interesting speech and it reveals in large measure the effectiveness of the criticism which we levelled at the government. Instead of the political planning promised during the 60 days of decision, proudly paraded as the courageous course to be followed by this government, we have had nothing but forward and retreat, retreat and retreat, from the very beginning of the administration.

Then the Minister of Trade and Commerce dealt with guide lines. I suggest that the Minister of Finance (Mr. Sharp) might study what the Minister of Trade and Commerce had to say in this regard. He goes on:

> There were some misunderstandings in interpretation of the intentions of the guide lines and misapprehensions about their impact on the Canadian economy.

Then he goes on:

> At the recent meeting—Canadian ministers were assured by the United States authorities that the United States Government was not requesting United States corporations to induce their Canadian subsidiaries to act in any ways that differed from their normal business practices as regards the repatriation of earnings, purchasing and sales policies,—

And so on. Then these general words appear again:

> The United States members of the Committee reemphasized the view that United States subsidiaries abroad should behave as good corporate citizens of the country where they are located.

Then he says:

> Special attention and encouragement should be given to help these companies to adhere to the guiding principles of good corporate citizenship.

Sir, until the opposition pressed for action, the attitude of the government on guide lines was that all was well, despite the fact that Canada was being treated in a way that can only be described as that of an economic beagle—b-e-a-g-l-e.

Now we find the minister saying that the balance of payments problem is a serious matter. The deficit with the United States is rising steadily. We have a deficit which is at an all-time high in peacetime. We have prices, and costs rising. We have Canadian exports being priced out of the markets of the world on account of rising costs. The cost of helping the United States meet its balance of payments problem has been met in part by action that falls on the Canadian consumer; by action that falls on Canadian industry, and on the Canadian manufacturer.

Sir, these are things that we have been saying, while the attitude of the government throughout has been that all was well. One has only to look at the last quarterly balance of payments report to see that the current account deficit with the United States in the third quarter of 1965 had increased $137 million or 11½ per cent, over the year before.

You do not see any sign of the government restricting expenditure. They just spend and spend. This government's expenditures are $2 billion higher than ours were at any time. Federal expenditures this year in the main estimates will be $9,318 million. When the supplementary estimates are finally brought in, I am sure that those expenditures will pass the ten billion dollar mark. Last year's expenditures were $8,506 million. If no regard is taken to supplementary estimates that represents an increase of $811 million, or 9½ per cent.

That sir, is the general position. Yet the attitude of the government is that all is well. When every person in Canada that I have spoken to is complaining about the high cost of living, with no action being taken by the government, the government's attitude is that all is well.

One of the most interesting articles that I have read, which puts the matter strongly, is an article written by Richard Needham today, in the *Globe and Mail,* in which he says:

• (3:30 p.m.)

> Take the simple instance of a man who bought a $1,000 Government of Canada bond. This paid him interest last year of $55 from which income tax (at 25 per cent) took $13.75. That's the official tax. The unofficial tax of inflation was more than twice as high. Consumer prices rose by 2.84 per cent in 1965, meaning the bondholder lost $28.40 on his $1,000 investment. His total tax thus came to $42.15, which, subtracted from his $55 interest, left him with earnings of $12.85, or 1.285 per cent on his investment.

Everywhere the inflation signals are flying. The Minister of National Revenue (Mr. Benson) with his usual nonchalance laughs about this.

Mr. Benson: I rise on a question of privilege. I did not laugh about it at all. I simply inquired what happened when hon. gentlemen opposite refinanced the national debt—how much did people lose?

Mr. Diefenbaker: I pointed out the jocularity. There must have been some reason for it.

These are facts which have been pushed aside by the present government until they must, now, face a serious problem. Across this nation, inflation signals are flying. I will read only briefly from press reports and their headings. From the *Financial Post*: "Inflation Fires Heat Up Again". This paper asks "Can growth continue without excessive price increases"? That was in December. Major-General R. H. Keefler, according to the Toronto *Telegram,* in his year end message on December 30, referred to "The upswing which began back in March of 1961". All agree that the upsurge began during the period when we were in office. After speaking of rising labour costs, shortages of skilled labour, price increases and tigher credit, he said:

> If allowed to continue unchecked, all this can add up to an alarming price spiral.

Each and every one of these papers has been warning the government. Almost without exception, newspapers throughout Canada have dealt with this problem. The cost of living index is at an all time high. Everywhere attention is called to the danger of our moving into an inflationary period which cannot be controlled and which might easily backfire into a depression. Here is another heading, "Braking Inflation Sharp's Prime Task". This appeared in the London *Free Press* on January 5. The article says:

> In essence, the minister has called for restraint in wage and price increases and urged that the brakes be applied to over-all spending.

Well, that was good advice to others. But what about the government? It has been

spending as never before. Nine governments across Canada are spending without correlation. Capital expenditures are multiplying in a way which cannot but lead to ever-increasing inflation. Yet we have a government which declines to take any action.

Here is an article by Bruce Hutchison. No one can ever accuse him of admiring anything more than he admires the present government. This is what he says as reported in the Ottawa *Journal* of February 26:

> The risk, of course, is that we shall price our goods out of the world market when we have a special chance to price them in.

So I could continue.

Yet we have a government which has done nothing about this, though no doubt they will pretend that had they had more time they would have brought measures before the house to deal with these things. But nothing appears on the order paper; nothing has been set down there to meet this problem. The other day we had an example of the ill-digested legislation of which I spoke a moment ago. We had to adjourn with nothing done.

When Mr. Gordon went, everybody felt the excuse he had given, that he had offered the government wrong advice, was only a subterfuge intended to cover up the real reason. But there has been no change in policies.

Let us see what *The Economist* has to say about this question, and about what the government has done. I read from *The Economist* of January 1:

> Prices moved up a full 3 per cent last year, against a 2 per cent average for the previous four years . . . . Falling corporate profits, especially in the second half of 1965, could easily trigger further price increases in 1966. Severe shortages of skilled and professional labour take much of the bloom from the employment figures. And the rate of increase in productivity is lagging.

We in Canada have followed the United States. The United States has experienced the greatest expansion in history and, naturally, it affects us. The article goes on to say this about what this government has done.

> Beyond Mr. Pearson's fledgling manpower department, and a request last spring for the Economic Council of Canada to study the feasibility of prices and incomes policy (the council has not yet reported), the government has not moved directly to combat the problems of inflation, lagging productivity, and an adverse balance of payments.

That was on January 1. When the election came, the Prime Minister (Mr. Pearson) went across Canada with profligate hand—here a rink and there a rink; no matter what they asked for, they were promised.

[Mr. Diefenbaker.]

No doubt the minister's answer will be: You will have to wait until the budget. This is something which has been going on for months. It is no excuse to say that a budget will be forthcoming and that all will then be well. Action should have been taken earlier. Already the fires of inflation are burning. Many economists fear it will be difficult to put an end to those fires. The housewife, the wage earner, the war pensioner, the old age pensioner, the retired civil servant and all who live on fixed incomes are today facing tremendous increases in the cost of living. It will go still higher in all parts of Canada as one province after another imposes its own sales tax. The value of the dollar is continuing to shrink. Canada as a nation is spending more, and all its people are spending more. The inflationary trend is moving. It is accelerating with the passing months.

We find the prime lending rate increased today by the Bank of Canada from 4¾ per cent to 5¼ per cent—the highest figure for many years. The small businessman is virtually loaned out because of tight money. What are the figures? I took the trouble to secure those figures so that there might be no question raised as to their accuracy. Let us look at the record. The hon. member for Brome-Missisquoi (Mr. Grafftey) asked the minister a question. He asked what was the cost of living index for the period from January 1, 1965 to December 31, 1965. This was the answer, on the basis of the index in the year 1949 being equal to 100: January, 136.9; February, 137.2; March, 137.3; April, 137.7; May, 138.0; June, 139.0; July, 139.0; August, 139.4; September, 139.1; October, 139.3; November, 140.2; December, 140.8; January, 1966 141.2 and February, 1966, 142.5.

• (3:40 p.m.)

What does all this add up to? So far as the average Canadian is concerned it adds up to unjustifiable food prices. Everywhere across the nation there has been a cascade of increases in food prices, yet the federal government has not declared a war against inflation.

In 1966 food prices are 6 points higher than they were in January 1965, and everywhere people are asking what is going to be done about this matter. The Dominion Bureau of Statistics in its February 1966 report said the food index in February 1966 was 142.5 points as compared with 133.1 points in February 1965. Housing was up 3 points in February 1966, clothing was up 3.8 points, transportation was up 3.7 points, health and personal care were up 4.6 points. These are some of

the things of importance to the average person.

What has the government done? The answer is, nothing. True enough, the authority over prices rests with the provinces, but there is action that the federal government could take, and which it has not taken. We cannot accept the excuse, "If you wait until the budget we will do that which we have not done during the last 15 months."

Let me give a few examples. The Ottawa *Journal* in its issue of Wednesday, March 16, carried advertisements showing the prices of certain foods, and I compare those with the prices which were in effect on March 10, 1965.

During the past few weeks dressed carcasses of pork came down from 45 cents a pound to 32 cents a pound, but nobody knows who gets the advantage. What about the consumer? Has there been any reduction in the price he pays? Let me give some figures at random, and these are not selected to give the proof that there is inflation.

Tomato juice in 1965 was selling at 88 cents for three 48 ounce tins. In 1966 the price is 95 cents. Three 28 ounce cans of tomatoes sold for 88 cents in 1965. Now they are selling at two for 59 cents. In 1965 side bacon cost 69 cents a pound; now it costs 99 cents a pound. Pure pork sausage cost 55 cents a pound in 1965; now it is 65 to 79 cents a pound. Boneless red brand beef roasts, all types, cost 79 cents a pound a year ago; now they cost $1.09 a pound. Steaks were 85 cents a pound, now they are $1.60. Breakfast bacon was 69 cents a pound; now it is 85 cents a pound. Cottage rolls—ham—cost 49 cents a pound in 1965. Today they cost 75 cents a pound. Beef rib roast was 69 cents a pound; now it is 89 cents a pound. Beef rib steak was 79 cents a pound; now it is up to 98 cents a pound. I could give the entire list. Spare ribs cost 52 cents a pound in 1965; now the price is 79 cents a pound. Boneless loin pork roasts were 69 cents a pound in 1965; today the price is 82 cents a pound.

All the way across the board prices are up in one year. Who gets the advantage? The farmer? Not at all. The farmer still continues to receive about the same return for his products.

Mr. Woolliams: Oh, the new Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Greene) will finish that.

Mr. Diefenbaker: No amount of explanation can account for this tremendous increase in food costs, with the farmer not receiving additional amounts.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Diefenbaker: There is a great spread between the price the consumer pays and the amount the farmer receives. Fair and reasonable profits are proper. Consideration must be given to the cost of packaging and the like, but there is no explanation which can be given for this great spread. At the same time, as has been pointed out so frequently by the hon. member for Humboldt-Melfort-Tisdale (Mr. Rapp), the prices of farm machinery are mounting.

The Minister of Agriculture went west on his pilgrimage. Not since La Verendrye went out there did anyone receive equal publicity. He said, "You know, when I get back east there is certainly going to be action. I am warning you—there is going to be action." I can just see him when he met with some of his colleagues in the cabinet and they told him, "You are just a new minister. You have ideas, but we don't work that way."

The minister said he was going to have an investigation into the price of farm machinery. What happened to that?

Mr. Woolliams: Nothing.

Mr. Diefenbaker: Today, with Lincolnesque calm, when he was asked, "What are you going to do about this" he said, "It is under consideration." The minister does not have to wait for the budget. Let us get an investigation under way and find out the facts.

Mr. Grafftey: Another royal commission.

Mr. Diefenbaker: Let us find out who is getting the advantage of this great layer of fat between the price the farmer receives and what the consumer pays, and let us not forget that at the same time the farmer wants to know why his machinery prices are going up, and up, and up. I had great hopes when I read what the Minister of Agriculture said. I thought, well now, we have got a minister; he is going to act. But he was mortified in the presence of the others, and they said no. Then he decided, we can still make the same explanation—"The matter is under active consideration."

Are there combines? Has there been any investigation into this spread? What action has been taken in order to preserve the consumer from these increases? The Minister of Trade and Commerce (Mr. Winters) took

action in connection with copper and copper products to assure that there would not be shipments abroad. But what action has the government as a whole taken? It started the spiral when it put the 11 per cent sales tax on building materials.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Diefenbaker: Get the date of that and you begin to see it roll. The Minister of Trade and Commerce said he did not believe in that tax.

Mr. Woolliams: But he has done nothing about it.

Mr. Diefenbaker: Yes, and when he spoke today in the city of Toronto he said, "After all, don't blame me for anything I did not do, because we in the cabinet cannot do everything we want to do."

What has been done to meet the problem of the fabulous rates charged by some companies on consumer credit? What is being done now? I can only express the hope, so far as the sales tax is concerned, that when the budget comes it will be removed; but if it is, the Minister of Finance (Mr. Sharp) will then be asking the Liberal party sitting opposite to do that which they voted against only a few weeks ago when we produced our resolution.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

• (3:50 p.m.)

Mr. Diefenbaker: It has been said that there must be a sharp reduction in government spending, but just before coming into the house I was given an example of public spending on the B and B Commission, which was to settle all our problems in Canada. Well, it sat $3½ million worth. Let me give some of the figures in connection with that commission. The staff of the commission now has grown to 225, including 35 who receive more than $10,000 a year. Of the 35 $10,000 a year men, 15 are full time employees. The B and B Commission has 193 full time employees and 32 part time workers. That is just an example of the way they go on. There must be some unified action in this country to deal with inflation. With the responsibility in part constitutionally resting on the provinces, we need a government that will act, a government that will bring together the representatives from the provinces, and together make a concerted attack on inflation which today is the thief that is robbing the average Canadian of his savings, and those on fixed revenues from a fair income.

We need action in the field of agriculture. We asked for action on behalf of the dairy farmers. Nothing is done, but the promise is given that some time action will be taken. When we brought about the devaluation of the dollar, the chief criticism by the present Prime Minister was that that would bring about a great increase in the cost of living, and I have his words here. He complained bitterly, but it did not turn out that way. When we were in office we maintained a level which in no way could be described as inflationary, and that continued throughout the entire period of office.

It is time for agreement—and by agreement I mean a liaison—between the federal and provincial governments on the question of priorities. Everybody is spending, spending as never before. There must be a concerted effort, and this can be brought about only when the federal government once more exerts leadership on behalf of this nation, rather than dissipating its energies in gigantic considerations regarding national unity which have produced disunity.

What happened to the automobile agreement? They boasted about that. They said it was their finest hour. You can almost see them in the position of Sir Christopher Wren, when somebody asked where was his monument. You, sir, know the reply: "I do not know; but, if you would see the monument, look about you." This is the monument: $50 million per year by the removal of excise taxes. Who gets the advantage?

An hon. Member: The Liberal party.

Mr. Diefenbaker: Is it the consumer in Canada? Nothing of the kind. You would have thought when they entered into the agreement they would have made arrangements whereby Canadians would be able to have their cars reduced in price. But what a business! These companies export to the United States, are able to compete over there against United States prices, and at the same time Canadians are paying through the nose. Is there any wonder, with a government that will not act, that the cost of living continues to go up and up?

Sir, we tried to bring about a reduction in taxes, but on our motion, which I mentioned a moment ago, in respect of building materials and production machinery, they voted against us. We ask that action in this regard be taken. What about the old age pension? Well, an old age pensioner has written to me in respect of the $75 monthly in the old age

pension, which was started in October, 1963. Since the cost of living and price index has jumped, the $75 monthly now has a purchasing power of $70.20. It has lost $4.80 in the intervening months with the added cost of living.

Now, the government is flying another kite. They voted against the $75 a month, and they have had a lot of criticism over that. When the Minister of National Health and Welfare went west, he said the Senate proposal would provide for a basic guaranteed minimum income at age 65. He said the Senate proposal would prove less burdensome on taxpayers, and the Senate plan he said would correct a major anomaly in the old age pension program—the paying of higher pensions to persons who do not need such assistance.

Then in the next couple of days the Minister of Agriculture made another pilgrimage. He went to the Prime Minister's constituency and he let the people know this had an appeal. Well, everybody wants to see benefits being assured to the older people of our country. But, such a somersault on the part of the government. A few weeks ago when I mentioned $100 a month, they said no. Every last one of them voted against it; and now under the pressure of public opinion and with recognition of the effect that the rising cost of living is having, suddenly they forget who it was who gave consideration to the plight of the old age pensioner.

In addition to that, what about the war pension; what about the retired civil servants who have been denied anything whatever from this government? Five thousand of them receive less than $50 a month in retirement allowance. No assistance is to be given to them. The government goes on with its other programs and spends and spends.

Mr. Sharp: On universities and such things.

Mr. Diefenbaker: All this then adds up to the fact that Canadians today are paying the highest prices in history in peacetime. In wartime there were controlled prices. I recall very well the debate in 1951 at which time the then minister of finance, now Mr. Justice Abbott, was quoted as saying that as a result of the control of prices someone said the saving ran into hundreds of millions of dollars. It is not a question of control of prices; it is action in respect of the prices paid on things the people need, such as food, clothing, shelter and recreation.

I have looked over the taxation records of the other countries in the western world and if we are not the most highly taxed people, I know of no other nation which approaches us: All this, in a matter of three years. What the Canadian people want is action. In order to give them that opportunity I move, seconded by the hon. member for Ontario (Mr. Starr):

That all the words after "that" to the end of the motion be deleted and the following substituted therefor:

"In view of the fact that the cost of living index for the month of February, 1966, reached an all-time high, namely 142.1 points, this House regrets that the government has failed to act effectively to hold down the cost of living and to halt inflation, which is having a serious effect on the economy generally and particularly on all people in receipt of social security payments, on war pensioners, old age pensioners, retired civil servants, those on fixed incomes, and all low income groups."

• (4:00 p.m.)

Hon. Mitchell Sharp (Minister of Finance): Mr. Speaker, I was very much interested in the speech just made by the right hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Diefenbaker) in which he tried at one and the same time to be a responsible leader in this house concerned about certain inflationary tendencies in the economy, about which I and many other people are concerned, and a very strong advocate of very large additions to the expenditures of the government which could not help but have inflationary effects. I understand the position the right hon. gentleman is in, and it must be very difficult for him in the light of the many promises he made during the last election campaign when he went up and down the country promising, if not the sort of things he accused my leader of promising, then others somewhat more expensive.

When the right hon. gentleman began his remarks he made some reference to the general situation, before dealing with the question of the inflationary pressures and the rising cost of living. Since he did not amplify his reference to the general economic situation, this recalled to my mind the sort of conditions which existed in this country when he and his government were in office. I can recall only too well the stagnation of the Canadian economy in those years. Unemployment in those years was the highest in the civilized industrialized world. I know the right hon. gentleman was concerned about this, but his concern was never translated into effective action.

When I listened to the right hon. gentleman talking about our government's finances, I

recalled the state of the finances of Canada in those years and, indeed, the succession of deficits of $750 million annually. When we took office in 1963 this was the first major problem with which we had to cope.

When I listened to the right hon. gentleman talk about the monetary conditions which exist today, I could not help but recall that famous incident in which there was some difference of view between the governor of the Bank of Canada and the government, which the government was not able to deal with effectively because it claimed on the one hand that the Bank of Canada was its own master of monetary policy, while at the same time it felt that somehow this was not really an attitude that was in keeping with the responsibility of the government for policy. The government of that day fell between two stools, and fell as hard as any government I have known.

I think of the mismanagement of the finances of the country in those years and how that government moved from crisis to crisis. I listened to the right hon. gentleman's statement that our criticism of the exchange rate had been based upon the fact of devaluation.

My criticism and the criticism of my leader was not of the devaluation: It was based on the manner of the devaluation. We had an unnecessary exchange crisis brought about by the most disastrous handling of any country's finances that has been seen in the modern world.

I recall the sequence of events only too well; the then minister of finance talking about nudging down the exchange rate; how it was nudged and began to roll, and how, in order to arrest the decline, the government had to stabilize the Canadian dollar. Even after that the exchange crisis was not over because the then minister of agriculture, who was a little unhappy about the decision that had been reached, suggested that the dollar should have been stabilized at 90 cents, not at 92½ cents.

The result was another crisis in relation to confidence in the financial markets of the world. If the right hon. gentleman thinks that this is the kind of financial management to which the country should again be subjected, no one will agree with him, because we do not want a repetition.

Mr. Speaker, in the period of stagnation of the Canadian economy which existed during most of the period when my right hon. friend's government was in office—

[Mr. Sharp.]

Mr. Diefenbaker: And in the United States.

Mr. Sharp: —and in the United States, it was not difficult to hold down the cost of living. It is about the easiest thing in the world to hold down the cost of living when there are vast pools of unused resources that can be brought into production. That is the situation that prevailed during those years. The real problems arise, as they have arisen at the present time, when the country is operating at a high level of activity and when there is a very low rate of unemployment. There is in fact now the lowest rate we have seen for many, many years. Indeed, in some parts of this country there is no unemployment that could effectively be mobilized.

Mr. Speaker, this is the problem we are faced with today. I should like to agree in part with what my right hon. friend has said, that we have reason for concern, but may I put on the record some figures that will help to show the nature of the problem and remove some of the exaggerations that have been injected into this debate by the Leader of the Opposition.

First of all I should like to talk about the rise in prices throughout the world and relate them to the rise in prices in Canada. I do not have to quote from any selected figures. I suggest that we look at the report of the Economic Council of Canada which is to a great extent directed toward this very subject of price trends.

I have here some international comparisons of consumer price changes taken from table 2-5 at page 20 of the second annual report of the Economic Council of Canada. The percentage increase of Canadian consumer prices up to the end of 1965 in Canada was 9 per cent; in the United Kingdom it was 19 per cent; in France it was 20 per cent; in Germany it was 15 per cent; in Italy it was 26 per cent; in Sweden it was 18 per cent, and in Japan it was 35 per cent. The only country where there has been a slightly smaller increase in the cost of living is the United States where, between 1960 and 1965, there was an increase of 7 per cent compared with the 9 per cent increase in Canada. So that, Mr. Speaker, I think is the problem in perspective.

• (4:10 p.m.)

We are not talking here about an increase in the cost of living or in prices that has been pushing us up at such a rapid rate that our competitive position in the world has seriously deteriorated. I should like now to quote

from the second annual review of the Economic Council, where they say at page 17:

> The relatively moderate over-all extent of price increases in Canada over recent years has been quite remarkable considering not only the widespread strengthening of demand forces—both internal and external—but also the upward adjustments in prices and costs which might have been expected to follow the significant decline in the exchange value of the Canadian dollar between 1959 and 1962.

So we are not talking about a bad performance on the part of Canada in the past; we are talking about a remarkably good performance. As I was saying, Mr. Speaker, it is very easy to maintain price stability when there are very many unemployed, as there were when my right hon. friend was in office, when there was no particular increase in investment, when the country was stagnating, worried, concerned, passing from crisis to crisis.

Mr. Diefenbaker: The upturn started in 1961, according to the same report.

Mr. Sharp: Yes. I say to my right hon. friend that what we are now passing through is not only the period of greatest prosperity but the most prolonged, which began shortly before my hon. friend left office and I am sure he thought it would end shortly after we took office, but it has gone on and on and promises to continue much longer.

Now we come to what I think is the serious part of this debate, and that is the problem of the future. I should like to say to the house that I do not take a complacent view of the problem that is faced by the country today. I share, for example, the views expressed by the governor of the Bank of Canada in his report which was published the other day. In his annual report for the year 1965 he said:

> In the present condition of high prosperity, the formulation of public policies intended to influence the total demand for goods and services poses peculiarly challenging problems. On the one hand, it is necessary to avoid a shortfall in total demand, which would result in increased unemployment and unused capacity. On the other hand, it is necessary to be alert to the dangers of excessive demand.

An hon. Member: What page is this?

Mr. Sharp: It is page 4 of the governor's report. He continues:

> The early symptoms in this latter case—

That is the dangers of excessive demand.

> —may not arouse as much public concern. Unfortunately, if the warning signals are ignored and policy does not respond until a large number of unsustainable positions have been created, until costs and prices have risen very sharply and international competitiveness has been impaired, then the problem becomes much more difficult to deal with in a way that will not halt the expansion of the economy.

At the end of the next paragraph, summarizing what has gone on before he says:

> In short, we now run the risk of overloading the economy.

It is for this reason, Mr. Speaker, that I am not complacent about the problems that we face. I am not going to deal at great length with what should be done under these circumstances, because in the budget speech that I hope to make in the near future I will deal with these questions at some length. I should like however to say in reply to the Leader of the Opposition that I trust he will have decided which position in this budget debate he is going to support. I had hoped at the beginning of his remarks that he was going to take a responsible attitude and was going to be concerned with the factors that really are instrumental in causing inflationary pressures. But as I listened to his speech I began to wonder whether he was not some sort of Dr. Jekyll and Mr. Hyde, who trotted out his personality to suit the occasion and could even change it in the midst of his speech.

I believe it is important in the period ahead that there should be a concern about curbing inflationary pressures in the economy. I look upon this as a serious problem. I therefore say, Mr. Speaker, in reply to the motion that has been made, that this government has been following policies that have so far resulted in a remarkable degree of price stability. They have accomplished this even while bringing into use the large numbers of unemployed that were evident in Canada at the beginning of this administration. They have done it in the midst of one of the greatest booms this country has ever seen. I think of the figures of capital investment that I as Minister of Trade and Commerce announced to this house from time to time, increases of 17 per cent and 18 per cent annually in the total investment by governments and business. This is the evidence of the confidence of the people of this country in the future of Canada. They would not have made these investments, they would not be talking about another big wave of capital investment, unless they had confidence in the financial stability of Canada. I suggest that it has been the policies that have been followed

by this government which have led to this great confidence.

I believe we now have a different kind of problem. Our problem now is not to put a brake on the economy; I suggest the problem is to see that we do not press too hard on the accelerator and throw the car off the road. Our problem in the future is going to be to keep the expansion going without inflation, and in this task I hope I have the support of all members of the house.

Mr. Crouse: Mr. Speaker, would the hon. minister permit a question? In his comments this afternoon the Minister of Finance (Mr. Sharp) quoted two authorities. I listened very carefully to his remarks and it seemed to me there was a clash of opinion between the two authorities he quoted. He first quoted the views of the Economic Council of Canada and stated that in the opinion of the Economic Council the economy of Canada is at present underdeveloped. A little later on he quoted the annual report of the governor of the Bank of Canada, and if I heard him correctly he stated that the governor is reported as saying that if we continue at our present rate we run the risk of overloading the economy. My question to the Minister of Finance is: Would he care to tell the house at the present time which of these views he supports?

Mr. Sharp: If I may be permitted to say so, Mr. Speaker, I intend to enlarge my views at great length in the budget speech, and I should not like to anticipate those views at this time.

• (4:20 p.m.)

Mr. T. C. Douglas (Burnaby-Coquitlam): Mr. Speaker, there can be no doubt that one of the problems which is concerning millions of Canadians today is the steady and persistent rise in the cost of living. However, I think in this debate we have to clarify our terms. There have been several references to inflation and the dangers of inflationary pressures. I think we should remember that a rise in consumer prices may be a symptom of inflation, but rising prices do not necessarily mean that we have inflation. Inflation, as I understand it, is when we have an excess of effective demand over potential productivity. I believe I can show later in my remarks that we do not have this situation in Canada, that we have great areas of unmet needs and great undeveloped potential in Canada. Therefore, what we are talking about is not inflation. What we are talking about is the unjustified and unwarranted increase in consumer prices, an increase which is having a ruinous effect upon millions of Canadians.

The last consumer index figure which we have for February of this year is 142.1. This compares with 137.2 for the same month of the previous year and shows an increase of almost five percentage points, or an increase in the cost of living of over 3½ per cent.

We should stop, Mr. Speaker, and think what this means. It means that in February of this year it cost the consumer $103.50 to buy what he could have bought for $100 the previous February. One has only to stop and consider what this means to people on fixed incomes—the old age pensioners, those who have retired on superannuation and those on veterans pensions. All of those on fixed incomes find that the purchasing power of their fixed income is declining year after year. When one looks at this index commodity figure of 142.1 based on 1949, he should stop and realize that this means that it takes $142.10 to buy what $100 would have bought in 1949.

It is said, Mr. Speaker, that when the old Roman emperors ran short of money they used to trim part of the coins so that each coin had a little less gold in it, and in this way they had more money with which to finance their wars. This is exactly what we have done in Canada over the past 17 years. We have allowed the hand of inflation to be put into people's bank accounts, into their pocketbooks and their savings, their life insurance policies, and to take out about 30 cents on the dollar. The purchasing power of $1 in this year of 1966 is about 70 per cent of what the dollar was worth in 1949.

Consider what this means, Mr. Speaker, to a man who has spent years paying for a life insurance policy of $10,000 and who now finds that in purchasing power it is worth only $7,000. Or consider the case of the couple who have purchased an annuity of $100 a month and find it now worth only $70 a month. Or consider people who have saved money assiduously over the years, only to find that a $1,000 bond is now worth only $700.

We used to be taught about the value of thrift. One of the glories of the capitalistic society was that it supposedly taught people to save for the future. As a matter of fact, inflation has destroyed the whole idea of thrift. The people who have been thrifty are the people who have been exploited; in the

last 17 years they have had roughly 30 per cent of their savings taken away from them.

This steady increase in the cost of living —over 3½ per cent in the last twelve months —has hit a wide variety of people. It has hit the people who are least able to protect themselves. I have already mentioned those on fixed incomes. The farmers and fishermen probably have the least economic bargaining power. I find on looking at the figures I have that the farm machinery index, which for December 1964 was 116, rose in December 1965 to 119.8, an increase of about 3½ per cent. Hardware, which the farmers have to buy in large quantities in order to continue their operations, has gone up in that same 12 month period from 116 points to 122 points, an increase of almost 6 per cent.

If the farmer, who has seen his costs of production rising steadily, looks at the index commodity figure for the products which he has to sell in order to live, he finds, according to the Dominion Bureau of Statistics, that the index for farm agricultural products in 1961 was 261.2 and for 1965 it was 261.5. It is significant, Mr. Speaker, that with all the increases in the cost of almost everything we buy, including food, in the past four years the index commodity figure for farm produce has risen less than three tenths of a point. It is virtually the same. There have been some fluctuations during that period, but within the general long-term framework from 1961 to the present the index for farm prices has remained more or less constant. Yet the farmers' costs have been rising steadily, with the result that they are caught in a cost-price squeeze.

The workers find that their wages are not keeping pace with the increased cost of living and increased productivity. It is true that those who are highly organized are able to bargin more effectively, but three quarters of the labour force in Canada is not organized. The latest figures we have for the third quarter of 1965 compared to the third quarter of 1964 show that profits during that period went up by 15.4 per cent, while wages and salaries went up by only 11.3 per cent. That, of course, is not just workers' wages; that includes executives' salaries and salaries of very astronomical amounts. If one were able to take out the executives' salaries and the managerial salaries, the actual increase in wages paid to the manual worker on the job would be very much less. However, even including all salaries with wages, profits have increased much more rapidly in the twelve month period between the third quarter of 1964 and the third quarter of 1965 than have wages.

I was disappointed, Mr. Speaker, that the Minister of Finance (Mr. Sharp) really did not come to grips with this problem at all. He cast some aspersions on the policies of the previous administration and he said there were some inflationary pressures he was thinking about; that he was going to prepare a budget speech and tell us all about it. But I do not think that the people of Canada will consider that good enough. Millions of housewives go to the stores every day, and when they step into the supermarket they see that the things they have to buy have gone up one or two cents since the last time they were there. They know when they go in with $100, that this amount of money will buy considerably less than $100 would buy in that same store 12 months ago. Housewives are concerned about it. They want to know what the government is going to do. So far the government has done nothing.

• (4:30 p.m.)

Also, Mr. Speaker, I want to say this: There is only one thing worse than for the government to do nothing, and that is for the government to do the wrong thing. I hope that the government is not going to do the wrong thing because there has been a growing clamour in financial circles and in financial papers and periodicals asking it to begin to apply anti-inflationary measures. I had a feeling that the Leader of Opposition in his speech several times veered in that direction without really spelling it out. I was afraid that the Minister of Finance himself was hinting that when his budget came down he might be trying to dampen down inflationary pressures.

We in this party want to warn the government that the worst thing to be done now would be to embark upon a general anti-inflationary program. In attempting to reduce the availability of social and industrial capital, to reduce aggregate demand, particularly in low income groups and for those with fixed incomes, the result would be to stop the present economic growth, and create chronic unemployment. It seems to us that it is unrealistic to talk about inflation in a country where, first of all, according to the last figures issued by the Dominion Bureau of

Statistics, there are 356,000 unemployed persons, over 80,000 of whom have been unemployed for more than four months. We are not yet using our full productive capacity. We are certainly not using it so long as we have over 360,000 men and women idle. We are not using our full industrial capacity, nor are we making use of all our vast natural resources.

I do not need to remind the house that in its first annual report the Economic Council told the people of Canada that we must maintain economic growth to the extent that will create 1½ million jobs over the next five years, and anything that will curtail this economic growth can result only in unemployment. The only hope for full employment in Canada is continuing and steady economic growth.

Mr. Sharp: Without inflation.

Mr. Douglas: The minister says without inflation. There will only be inflation if we fail either to make full use of our productive capacity, or come to the point where aggregate demand exceeds our productive potential. Surely the Minister of Finance is not going to argue that Canada has reached its full productive potential?

Therefore, any clamping down of our rate of economic growth could be disastrous. This is what happened in Canada in the 1950's, and this is what happened in Great Britain in the 1950's. Somebody in both countries pushed the panic button, economic growth slowed down, and the result was that deflationary forces were set in motion, resulting in large scale unemployment.

I should like to urge the Minister of Finance to keep in mind that all parts of Canada are not experiencing the same degree of economic growth. Any shotgun approach to this over-all problem will have very unsatisfactory repercussions in some areas. It is all very well to look at one part of Canada and say: "We have almost reached our full potential," when, as in February of this year, unemployment in the Atlantic provinces was still 10.9 per cent, which is more than one worker in every ten out of a job. In the province of Quebec the figure was 6.5 per cent; in the province of British Columbia it was 5.1 per cent.

If the government embarks upon a general shotgun anti-inflationary program of tightening up the money supply, curtailing the amount of credit available for small businessmen and farmers, what will happen in those areas which do not need less money, but need more money? What will happen in areas that need more capital, and more credit, and more purchasing power, and more jobs?

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, our warning to the government is that we are concerned about the rising cost of living, but we want to make it abundantly clear that there must be a distinction between the rising cost of living and any attempt to impose anti-inflationary measures that could have the effect of curtailing the economic expansion upon which we are now embarked.

Some reference was made by the Leader of the Opposition to the cutting of government expenditures. I am not opposed to the cutting of any wasteful expenditures, and there probably are areas in which the government could save money by cutting out some extravagances. But, Mr. Speaker, there are still great areas of unmet needs in our society where, instead of curtailing expenditures, we should be increasing expenditures. Examples I have in mind are old age pensioners; veterans; groups whose increased purchasing power would provide the stimulus to the economy so that we could use our unused and idle capacity.

Mr. Speaker, we in this party have been urging the government for the past three years to give some measure of protection to the Canadian consumer. We live in a pluralistic society, in which various groups are able to band themselves together for their common protection. The manufacturers are well organized, as are the financial institutions, the life insurance companies, the banks and all the other various groups are well organized. They have organs to express their points of view and they have lobbies to present their opinions to the government.

Other groups are not so well protected. Labour is about 25 per cent organized. Those who are organized are able to bargain with some degree of success. However about 75 per cent are not able to bargain, and usually their wages lag behind both the rising cost of living and increased productivity. Farmers, as I have already pointed out, have virtually no bargaining power. Because their product is perishable, they must sell it when it is ready for market. They have no way of withholding their produce from market, and consequently the price which they have received for their produce has always lagged behind the cost of production.

But the most defenceless group in our society are the consumers. They stand naked

to the four winds of heaven. Nobody protects them. They buy most of the things they need in a market where half a dozen large corporations are able to set the prices of the commodities the consumer wants. There may have been a time—I doubt it—when there was sufficient competition in our society that people could shop around, and when this competition provided a measure of protection for the consumer. That is gone. Today the consumer buys in a market which is largely a closed market.

• (4:40 p.m.)

Some ten years ago the chief economic adviser to President Eisenhower said that 62 per cent of the prices in the United States were "administered prices". By that he meant they were prices which were determined, not by the law of supply and demand but by a few corporations in each indusry getting together and agreeing on an administered price. The only element of competition usually lies in service and in the respective advertising gimmicks which individual companies are able to put forth. The price charged to the consumer is something with regard to which the consumer has no protection whatsoever. There is no one to whom he can protest.

Prices are often increased, for no reason at all other than the fact that the companies concerned have decided that because demand is increasing, or for some other reason, the market can be saddled with a further 5 per cent or 10 per cent. We saw a good example of this only last year when the steel industry increased the price of steel by some $5 to $7 a ton depending on the grade. At that time the members of this party protested this increase pointing out that it was excessive and unwarranted. The Prime Minister suggested then that in the previous five years wages in the steel industry had gone up by 26.5 per cent. The fact remains that the productivity in the industry during that five year period had increased at such a rate that the labour content in a ton of steel had actually dropped from $27.57 cents in 1957 to $22.16 in 1963, a fall of $5.36 a ton. In other words the wage content in a ton of steel was $5.36 less in 1963 than it was in 1957. In spite of this, the steel companies raised their prices. Moreover, the profits of the Steel Company of Canada had gone up from $21,158,000 in 1957 to $43,630,000 in 1963.

There was no justification for a price increase either in terms of increased labour costs in a ton of steel or in terms of the profit position of the company. The increase was levied because there was a greater demand for steel—a tremendous need for construction. And the steel company decided that the poor consumer could bear another increase. Of course, this increase has since been reflected in the increased price of farm machinery, hardware and other commodities.

The same thing has happened in the case of newsprint. The same thing has happened in te case of copper. The price of fats has risen despite the fact that the price of hogs has been falling. One of the most glaring examples of what is happening is the recent increase in the price of bread, despite the fact that the price of wheat has dropped by something over 12 cents per bushel, depending on the grade. The price of bread has gone up. Why? There was an investigation into the baking industry carried out by the combines investigation branch a few years ago. Everyone knows what the findings were. Here was a combine to fix prices without any relationship whatever to the cost. Nothing was ever done about it, and the baking industry is still doing the same thing—increasing the price of bread even though the raw material is costing less. So the farmer is getting less for his wheat while the consumer is paying more for his bread and for his flour.

We think the government ought to do something for the consumer and I intend to move an amendment setting forth what we think needs to be done. I move:

> That the amendment be amended by changing the period at the end thereof to a comma, and by adding immediately thereafter the following words: 'and this house further regrets that the government has not established a prices review board to determine the extent to which price increases are unjustified and to take appropriate steps to reduce such prices accordingly.'

In the New Democratic party we have been advocating for several years that the government should set up a special department to concern itself with the protection of the consumer. We have argued that this protection should fall into three categories. First, we need to strengthen the combines investigation legislation and attempt to put some teeth into the act. We should give the combines investigation branch the staff which it needs to enable it to do an effective job in preventing large corporations combining for the purpose of exploiting the public.

Second, we have advocated that a consumers bureau should be established to deal with the question of uniform weights and packaging—to prevent dishonest advertising and

misleading packaging so that when a housewife goes into a supermarket she may know what she is buying and how many ounces she is getting, and not be misled by packages which get larger while the contents year after year grow smaller.

The third point, which is the one we are stressing today, is that a prices review board be set up whose functions would be to look into increased prices in the case of any particular commodity as these increases are drawn to the board's attention. Such a board would be able to examine the books, the profit and loss statements and the cost accounting material of the particular industry concerned in order to find out whether or not increased wage costs and increased costs of raw materials warranted the increase which was being imposed upon the public.

It is true that the Prime Minister has asked the Economic Council of Canada to look into the matter of price increases. This is certainly better than nothing and I am hopeful of the result, when we get the report—we have been waiting for it now for nearly a year.

But I submit, Mr. Speaker, that when we get that report it will be out of date in three or six months. An investigation into the rising price of consumer goods is a continuous process that ought to be going on all the time. We need to have the machinery set up by which at any given time the government can investigate an increase in the price of steel, or of foodstuffs, of copper, of shoes, of hardware, or of farm implements, and which will be able to advise the government as to whether these increases are warranted or whether they are simply the result of unconscionable profiteering on the part of corporations that are taking advantage of the Canadian consuming public.

• (4:50 p.m.)

The tragedy of this rising cost of living, which is having such a ruinous effect upon millions of Canadian families on moderate incomes, is that the government has been doing absolutely nothing about it. It hides behind the constitution, and says from time to time that this is a matter for the provinces.

Nothing could be more ridiculous than to suggest that any single province could regulate the cost of living. How does a small province, which has no steel industry, have any power to regulate the price of steel coming into that province? It would simply be told by the great steel cartel, "You either pay the price or you do without steel."

[Mr. Douglas.]

It is true that there is a divided jurisdiction in the matter of prices, but I must say that the Prime Minister has not used the powers at his disposal. This matter will have to be dealt with in the final analysis by joint legislation. The federal government now has the power to deal with combines and illegal trusts set up for the purpose of exploiting the public. It has the power to investigate prices under a prices review board such as I have suggested and, if it were shown that prices were being increased unjustifiably, the government would then have two courses open to it.

Public opinion would certainly be roused if increases were found unjustifiable, and those who were responsible would be weighed in the balance and found wanting. But if public opinion were not sufficient the federal government, by joint legislation, which I am sure the provinces gladly concur in, could get the necessary power to roll prices back.

In the United States the authorities set guide lines under which they suggested a maximum ceiling to which the cost of living would be allowed to increase. Hon. members will remember that the late President Kennedy, when the steel industry increased its prices beyond what seemed fair and reasonable to his economic council, made them roll the prices back. More recently President Johnson has compelled the copper industry to roll back the price of copper.

Just last week when the Canadian companies increased the price of newsprint by $10 a ton they found that they ran afoul of the United States guide lines and have now announced that instead of a $10 increase in the United States there is going to be only a $5 increase, because the United States government has apparently made it perfectly clear to the newsprint industry that it is not going to allow it to break the guide lines unless it can give good and sufficient reason why it should do so.

I would remind the house that our Economic Council in its first annual review suggested an economic guide line for Canada. It pointed out that all the benefits of our increased productivity would be stolen unless we keep the cost of living from rising more than 2 per cent per year. But in the last 12 months it has gone up more than 3½ per cent. We have already broken through that guide line, and the government has not even indicated it is concerned about the matter.

Today the Minister of Finance spoke in very general terms about what a fine boom we are having, but he did not tell the house or the country what he proposes to do about a 3½ per cent increase in the cost of living between February of this year and February of last year.

Is the government going to do nothing? Is it going to continue to hide behind the divided jurisdiction in the constitution? Our plea to the government is to use the powers it has, powers which it is not using at the present time and, when it has used those powers, if it finds they are not sufficient to cope with the situation, then let it call the provinces together and ask the provinces to join with it in joint action to grapple with what could be the most serious problem facing the Canadian people.

I say to the government the housewives of Canada, the people on small incomes and the people on fixed incomes are looking to this parliament and to this government for some leadership, and they are not getting it. Further delay is courting disaster.

We will continue in the future as we have done in the past to press the government to take some action—not to take shotgun action that will depress the economy, but to take a look selectively at those particular commodities and at those particular industries that are increasing the cost of their commodities to the Canadian consumer without those increases being warranted and justified.

We in this party, Mr. Speaker, feel that the time is long past due for the government to act. We have pleaded with it again and again to do something. So far we have been faced with dilatoriness and inaction. We hope, as a result of discussing this matter today, we will get a statement from the government on what it intends to do, and that it intends to do it very soon. If we do not, then we shall raise this matter again and again, because we believe that on this matter we are speaking for millions of Canadians who are looking to the government to act before it is too late.

• (5:00 p.m.)

[*Translation*]

Mr. Alcide Simard (Lac-Saint-Jean): Mr. Speaker, I should like to make certain comments and offer a few suggestions concerning the Progressive Conservative amendment and the New Democratic subamendment.

Now, I want those comments and suggestions to be in keeping with the philosophy advocated by the Ralliement Créditiste.

Increased Cost of Living

On March 8, when dealing with the estimates of the Department of National Health and Welfare, the hon. member for Nicolet-Yamaska (Mr. Vincent) reminded the government, and especially the Prime Minister (Mr. Pearson), of the promise the latter had made in 1963 to extend student allowances to the age of 21. Further on, he added, as shown on page 2381 of the official report of March 8, 1966:

> It will be remembered that the former Minister of Justice, who now fills a high post in London, said to the house that the right hon. prime minister always kept his promises, and that he was giving himself four years within which to keep his promise to grant students allowances till the age of 21.

The hon. member went on to say:

> If one compares the cost of living percentage points for 1945 with those of today, one sees that family allowances no longer meet the purposes for which they were granted in 1945.

We of the Ralliement Créditiste support wholeheartedly and completely those statements and comments made by the hon. member. I do not believe I could be accused of boasting if I say that we have been the champions and promoters of those claims. As a matter of fact, we have never stopped asking, and we never will, that family allowances be increased in keeping with the rise in the cost of living.

Mr. Speaker, far be it from me to doubt the sincerity of the remarks made by the hon. member for Nicolet-Yamaska, who is an honourable citizen and a good father, but over the five years since his party came into office, what have they actually done to show that they meant what they said about increasing family allowances?

Every day, I get at my office requests asking the government to increase family allowances to $25 a month per child, and that up to 21 years of age. To prove what I am saying, I will read right now two resolutions sent to me by the voters in the northern region of my riding.

Sainte-Monique, Lake St. John.
February 23, 1966.

Mr. Alcide Simard,
Government Buildings,
Ottawa, Ontario.

Dear Sir:

Enclosed herewith are two (2) resolutions passed at the last meeting of our committee.

First: That a request be made to Mr. Réal Caouette and Mr. Alcide Simard to insist strongly, when the Bank Act is considered, on the role that the Bank of Canada must play, namely: financing without interest all works undertaken by public bodies.

Increased Cost of Living

Second: After reading the statement made by the Right Hon. Lester B. Pearson, asking all Canadian citizens to reduce their living expenditures by 25 per cent to further the country's economic recovery, we strongly suggest that it would be logical and more humane to distribute a dividend of $25 per month at least to each Canadian citizen out of the production surplus accumulated each year by Canadians, instead of giving that same surplus to foreign countries as all our governments have done since confederation.

We believe, as a matter of fact, that if each citizen abstains from buying the country's production, that will not help the country's economy but will increase the number of unemployed.

Copy of that second resolution was sent to the Prime Minister of Canada, the Right Hon. Lester B. Pearson.

For most hon. members in this house, it seems utopic that the people who signed the resolution I have just read should ask for the distribution of a dividend of $25 per month at least to each citizen of Canada out of the production surplus accumulated each year by Canadians. Well, it is not so; those people know what they are saying and, most of all, they know what they want. Allow me, Mr. Speaker, to bolster their claims with figures which will certainly test seriously the sincerity of the too numerous promises which are made at election time.

In the 1960, the national production was $36 billion; five years later, that is in 1965, that national production had reached $51 billion and consumption stood at $36 billion only. Consequently, there is a $15 billion surplus between national production and the national consumption. It is out of this surplus that we demand a $25 monthly dividend for every Canadian citizen.

Let us stop asking if there are still poor people in fabulously rich Canada. There lies utopia, the disparity between so much poverty amid such wealth.

Much has been said about the social problems of poverty, misery and economic uncertainty in Canada lately. Heads of families should receive a graduated salary according to the number of dependant children, or adequate family allowances to allow for their increased expenditures, without depriving their families. Officials, gravely discussing poverty, being paid $25,000 a year, are barely qualified to express their views on the problem; the workers should be consulted instead.

As far as those well-fed people who claim that poverty is the result of drink, laziness or lack of ambition, this is sheer hypocrisy, self-righteousness and cowardice.

There may be drunkards, loafers and people easily satisfied among the poor of course,

but they are in minority and most would wish for an easier life for themselves and for their families. Many are sober and hard-working. And drunkenness and idleness have many more practitioners among the rich living off the poor, and often they have climbed not through ambition but through sheer luck, if not through dishonesty and political patronage.

The true causes of poverty, misery and insecurity are low wages, chronic unemployment due to repeated lay-offs, employment difficulties constantly increased, all because of the greed of the big companies and of the incompetence of the government and of well-fed high officials.

I need no other proof than what the Auditor General states in his annual report to the Government for the fiscal year ended March 31, 1965. This report is truly a "plank".

It is in four volumes and includes one thousand pages in all. It holds a wealth of information that we, in the opposition, are going to scrutinize all year round. In it are, potentially, all the scandals and all the blunders of the government; we will only have to find them in this mass of information that only a benedictine would have the patience of reading through. Here are some of the worst and most striking:

A. Freight cars, parked on a track built at a cost of $400,000, are used only as protection against the wind for ferry traffic—

B. The C.B.C. pays half a million dollars for work not performed—

C. National Defence wastes $9 million to develop "Bobcat" vehicles without manufacturing a single usable one—

D. National Defence sinks $7 million in the incoherent venture of bombing computers—

E. A Canadian Arsenals Limited plant, the original cost of which had been $18 million, is sold for $1 million, subject to certain conditions to be complied with by the purchasers—

But the Auditor General seems to doubt that such conditions are equivalent to the slight difference of $7 million, compared with the market value, estimated at $8 million.

F. One judge, in addition to his salary and travelling expenses, gets a living allowance of $100 a day, and performs the major part of his work at home—73 per cent of the Glassco report has not been implemented—Approximate total of unproductive payments reported for the year: 37 cases representing $23 million.

It is urgent that this shameful waste should cease and that the government should take the necessary steps to increase immediately family allowances to $25 per month per child,

up to 21. This would be an effective means of fighting poverty in Canada, which the government has only deplored by word of mouth during the election campaigns.

• (5:10 p.m.)

[*English*]

Mr. H. A. Olson (Medicine Hat): Mr. Speaker, I want to make a few comments respecting the amendment, and the amendment to the amendment, which have been moved this afternoon. Before doing so I want to say one or two words in reference to the opening remarks of the Leader of the Official Opposition (Mr. Diefenbaker).

The right hon. gentleman suggested in opening this debate that in so far as the members of his party are concerned, they would not accept the disposition of the Munsinger case which occupied so much of the time of this house a few days ago. He suggested that they would not accept the terms of reference contained in the order in council, as well as a number of other things. I am not particularly interested in whether or not the Leader of the Official Opposition and his party accept the terms of reference, but I am concerned about what they intend to do with this whole matter at some time in the future.

I think it is their right and privilege to bring this matter back into the House of Commons whenever they choose to do so, because of the provisions in our rules which allow members to raise a question of privilege at any time they feel they have been abused or aggrieved by statements made either inside or outside this house. Having acknowledged that right I hope, if and when they do bring this matter back into the House of Commons, they will introduce it in a procedurally correct way so that there will be a motion before the house and some determination made of the debate and the consequences of that debate.

I must agree with the Leader of the Opposition that referring this whole matter to a judicial inquiry does not settle the alleged question of privilege referred to several days ago, because such an inquiry does not have the right to consider such a question of privilege. That is all I wish to say on that subject, Mr. Speaker.

In dealing with the matters now before the house, namely the amendment and the amendment to the amendment, it would be well for us to bear in mind that the concern expressed in those amendments and felt by hon. members of this house is felt by a large part of the Canadian population, and is similar to the concern which was felt about exactly this same matter in 1957. I have before me a page taken from the *Financial Post* of March 9, 1957. Under the headline "Inflation and Credit: The Great Debate", this article refers to whether there should be an easing or tightening in the credit and money supply, and it states:

> The current debate about tight money is generating more heat among businessmen than any government policy for a long time.

The article then gives some explanations about the kind of arguments which monetary authorities would probably advance in favour of their policies.

At this time we are in a position where we can review in retrospect what happened when Canadians were concerned about inflation and the tightening or easing of money at that time. We can also review the consequences of the actions that were taken. In this regard we should bear in mind the shotgun measures suggested by the hon. member for Burnaby-Coquitlam (Mr. Douglas) to deal with this matter of tight or easy money during an inflationary period, and the undesirable side effects which accompanied those measures and lasted for longer than most of us in this country wanted.

• (5:20 p.m.)

Certainly we do not want a repetition of the consequences that flowed from the action of the government and the Bank of Canada in 1960, 1961 and 1962, because in those years we had the highest level of unemployment in Canada since the end of the second world war. Therefore if the Minister of Finance (Mr. Sharp) and his advisers intend to use exactly the same kind of measures to meet the situation that faces us today, I hope they will also bear in mind the consequences of those measures.

I agree with many of the statements that have been made this afternoon. I agree with the statement that there is a regrettable increase in the cost of living and in certain commodities. There is no question at all in our minds about that. But I believe we also have the responsibility to examine in detail what has been the cause of the situation in which we find ourselves today. One of the most popular reasons given in the last few weeks for the increased cost of living is that the price of food has gone up.

If you look at the latest Dominion Bureau of Statistics report—and this report has been

referred to a number of times today—you will find that from February, 1965, to February, 1966, there was an increase in the consumer price index for all items from 137.2 to 142.1. If you look at the increase for the single item "food" from February, 1965, to February, 1966, you find that it went up from 133.1 to 142.5. Therefore there is no argument but that there has been a greater increase in the single item "food" than any other item included in the consumer price index.

Statements have been made that perhaps the reason for this is that farmers are getting more money for the food they produce; that is, the raw material that goes into the groceries. Before that suggestion is accepted by any member of this house or the Canadian public generally, Mr. Speaker, I think it would be well for us to examine whether there has been an increase in the amount received by the food producers in the country which corresponds with the increase in the consumer price of food.

If you look at the situation in the early 1950's or 1949—that year, by the way, is the basis for the consumer price index, 1949 equalling 100—you will find that many of the major commodities that enter into the category of food, such as beef and pork, commanded for the farmers a price as high as that they receive today. Let us take beef for example. In 1950, 1951 and for part of 1952 the price of beef to the farmer was actually higher than it is today. That is, the price of live steers, or whatever grades they choose to sell beef in the marketplace, was higher in those days than it is in 1966. I shall say a few more words about that later.

In so far as pork is concerned, in those years the price of hogs taken to market by farmers was actually higher than it is today. Yet in the period 1949 to February, 1966, we find that the price of food has risen 42.5 per cent. The point I am trying to make, Mr. Speaker, is that while the price the consumer pays for food has increased some 42 per cent during the last 16 years or so, there has been no increase at all to the farmer in respect of many of the major commodities that enter into the price of food. Let us take wheat for example. The price of wheat was almost as high in those years as it is today, as far as the farmer is concerned. Therefore something has to be examined other than the price level being paid to the farmers for producing food.

I am interested in the subamendment moved by the hon. member for Burnaby-Coquitlam (Mr. Douglas). It says:

"and this house further regrets that the government has not established a Prices Review Board to determine the extent to which price increases are unjustified and to take appropriate steps to reduce such prices accordingly."

I believe that we need a prices review board as the hon. member has suggested, but I also believe that quite apart from setting up any new boards the government has not taken all the action it could have taken under the Combines Investigation Act. I do not think it is necessary to go into a great deal of detailed explanation in this respect, because I believe it is well known that the distribution of food in Canada is gradually but constantly being concentrated in fewer and fewer hands. In other words, the supermarkets which distribute food are not only falling into the hands of fewer and fewer people but we have seen a tremendous increase in so-called "vertical integration" in the distribution of food.

• (5:30 p.m.)

Supermarkets and retail stores that used to buy from wholesale establishments, which in turn made their purchases of the raw materials and even in some cases processed those materials, are gradually disappearing and the whole operation almost from the primary production right through to the distribution to the ultimate consumer is now being carried out by the same corporations and companies. I think there needs to be an investigation in this regard. I think the combines investigation authorities already have sufficient authority, if you want to call it that, to look into these matters, and I believe they should be looked into. A few months ago the price of wheat went down anywhere from 10½ cents to 20 cents a bushel; I think it averaged something like 13 cents a bushel. The hon. member for Burnaby-Coquitlam pointed out that there was no reduction in the price of a loaf of bread or any other bakery product. Yet when the price of wheat has again risen to almost the same level it was about a year and a half ago, then, as I noticed in the paper very recently, one baker suggested the increased cost of flour was the major contributing factor in his over-all cost which gave him justification for increasing the price of his bread. Surely if there is no justifiable cause for lowering the price of consumer goods when the price of wheat goes down, there should not be justification for increasing the

price of bread by the same amount when the price of wheat goes up. Yet this is exactly what is happening in the consumer price scale today, and these are the reasons being advanced for this action.

Let us look at the price of pork for a moment. It is true that the price the farmers receive in the marketplace for pork or hogs has gone up substantially in the last two years. There is no question of that, and I do not disagree with it because I think about two years ago the selling price was below the cost of production. There has been at least a corresponding or perhaps more than a corresponding increase in the price of pork and pork products to the consumer.

During the last few days the price of hogs in the marketplace has gone down. I received a letter this morning from Calgary which advised me that in the marketplace there the price of hogs has gone down from a high of 41 cents per pound three weeks ago to around 30 cents per pound today for the same carcasses. But there has been no corresponding decrease in the price of bacon or pork or any other pork products at the retail level.

Therefore I hope the Minister of Finance (Mr. Sharp) will take cognizance of these price movements to consumers, and that he will look very carefully at the corresponding price movements of the products of the primary producers. I hope he will also have the combines investigation authorities take a look at the movement of prices at the consumer level and at least try to investigate the people involved in the distribution and processing of food to see whether they are engaging in some unconscionable profit-taking along with these price movements.

Looking ahead a little, Mr. Speaker, we are, as many of your members have indicated, concerned about inflation and the increased price of consumer goods, particularly food. However, it seems to me that the problem will be looming again in the future and that it will get worse instead of better, according to some of these other statistics which are available.

For example, in a Dominion Bureau of Statistics report on credit dated March 1966, the following appears. I am not going to read all these figures because this report is a matter of public record and anyone can look it up. But it indicates in relation to finance companies dealing with the financing of consumer goods that there has been a 10.1 per cent increase in the amount of credit outstanding for consumer goods. These figures cover the period December 1964 to December 1965 and are the latest available. The small loans companies show an increase of 13.2 per cent in their outstanding credit, and instalment credit from these small loan companies has gone up 24.1 per cent. This is in one year, Mr. Speaker.

In addition to that, credit outstanding on the books of department stores has gone up 11 per cent. Furniture and appliance stores show an increase of 4 per cent. Fully secured personal loans from chartered banks have gone up 18 per cent, and other loans 21.9 per cent.

This would indicate, Mr. Speaker, that there must be a shortage of effective purchasing power in the country to buy goods and services that we as a nation have produced. Because if it is necessary for the consumers of Canada not only to spend all of their disposable income but also during the course of one year to increase the amount of credit required for their purchases, then they have mortgaged their incomes for the future. Somewhere down the road they are going to need not only their disposable income, if I may use that term, to buy all these goods, but they will also have to pay back some of this consumer credit which has been extended to them by these financial institutions. So, Mr. Speaker, I think we would only be fooling ourselves if we looked at these figures and concluded that the situation is going to get better in the near future.

In so far as the prices review board and increased activity by the combines investigation branch is concerned, I should like the house to know that we in this party believe in free enterprise. But more than that, Mr. Speaker, we believe in free competitive enterprise. I do not believe that you can have free enterprise in the truest sense of the word unless there is competition. Therefore, when we talk of free enterprise the word "competitive" is extremely important, because enterprise is free no more without competition.

I also think there is justification for the federal government to look into the matter of food distribution to determine whether or not there is effective competition in the processing and distribution of food. If there is, and if they can prove that there is, then you would have to transfer some of the responsibility for increased food prices to customer demand. If the customers want food packaged and processed in more expensive and fancier wrappers and they are willing to pay for it, then

that is their privilege. But if, as I suggested, agreements have been arrived at between the fewer and fewer number of people involved in food distribution with regard to some kind of pricing, then such would be a valid case for the combines investigation authorities to look into.

When we are trying to find solutions to these problems, in addition to setting up a prices review board—or whatever is the method used—to look into price differentials, perhaps the government should also look very carefully at its own expenditures. I know there has been some action taken by the government to postpone some of its own building programs because the price of construction has greatly advanced during the past few months, and I think we in this party would, to a degree at least, support that sort of action. I know that the Minister of Finance and the Minister of Public Works are well aware that there has been an unusually rapid increase in the cost of construction during the past few months. We agree with this measure, provided it is done on a selective basis and provided there is not a cut-back in government construction in areas where there really is not a severe employment problem. Where there is still some unemployment, these project should go ahead.

• (5:40 p.m.)

Then, Mr. Speaker, we have also to look at the expansion of all government services. We must also look at areas where government services are a substitute for services previously paid by individuals. Perhaps this area is not so dangerous, so far as affecting inflationary pressures is concerned, but when one looks at the expansion of government spending from, for example, 1956 to 1966, he sees that one of the greatest increases in government spending has been in the matter of public debt charges. The Minister of Finance will be well aware that the estimates in the blue book for 1956 contained an item of $456 million for the total interest charges on the whole national debt, and that this year those charges for the same item are well over $1 billion.

One cannot blame the present Minister of Finance for all that increase, because I suppose the greatest upswing in these charges came about in the now famous conversion loan of 1958 which recalled a lot of bonds that had not matured, which were then reissued for a substantially higher rate of interest.

[Mr. Olson.]

We in this party do not mind the government's meeting its obligations so far as bonds are concerned; but it seems to me unjustifiable to call back several billions of dollars worth of bonds on contracts that had been issued, and then offer a 50 per cent increase in the earning power of those bonds even before they had matured.

I suggest to you, sir, that the government's action respecting its handling of the public debt over the past ten years has been at least one of the major contributing factors to the whole increase in the cost of production and to the cost of living in Canada.

We hope, Mr. Speaker, that the government is not going to proceed with what has been termed a shot-gun solution to this matter of inflation. As has been pointed out, there are areas in this country which are not overextended in the economic field. We hope that the government will use the authority it talked about a while ago with respect to the mobility of workers, to help transfer manpower from certain areas to other areas of greater economic activity, so that workers transferred could be used in those areas of greater employment opportunity.

In the areas where there is a problem, government action will have to be taken to move workers into areas where they may be employed. I think it is fair to say that in Alberta and British Columbia, and perhaps other places, particularly in Toronto and Montreal, there is really not any unemployment at the moment. In fact in some areas there is a very severe labour shortage. In those areas I have mentioned there is a severe shortage of labour in agriculture; there is a severe shortage of labour in most of the professional groups, and in most of the construction occupations. Therefore, when the minister says that he is not going to put the brake on the economy, but that it is necessary to try to find a balance to control inflationary pressures without causing a depression or recession, we agree with him.

In some areas, Mr. Speaker, we do not agree with the minister. We were unable to select any positive steps that the Minister of Finance intended to use, to try to keep inflationary pressures down, and at the same time not put the brake on our whole economy.

In closing, Mr. Speaker, I just wish to re-emphasize that we, in this party, would like the members of this house to know and the general public of Canada to know that this increase in the cost of living has not been

reflected in a corresponding increase of income to the farmers of this country, in producing food over the last five years.

We also want the Minister of Finance to know that we are going to support him if he can come forward with some action that will in fact keep our economy going at a very high level, at the same time take some selective action, if I may put it that way, to hold back in some areas where perhaps there is too much heat with respect to economic activity.

In closing, Mr. Speaker, I want to say to the Leader of the Opposition, when he suggested that we voted against an increase in the pensions, that we keep hearing a repetition of the same charge every time a debate of this nature comes up.

Mr. Monteith: It must hurt.

Mr. Olson: Of course the truth of the matter is that in January we voted on a motion of non-confidence. All members of this house who want to be honest with themselves and to know anything about the rules in this house—

Mr. Grafftey: Oh, no.

Mr. Olson: —know that the wording of the non-confidence motions in the debate on the address in reply to the Speech from the Throne, or of motions amending the motion that the house resolve itself into committees of supply, do not mean anything in terms of what the consequences of supporting these motions would be.

Mr. Grafftey: You protest too much.

Mr. Olson: If the Leader of the Opposition wants to go on trying to keep this from the Canadian people, that is his business.

Mr. Grafftey: Methinks thou doth protest too much.

Mr. Olson: You may think I protest too much, but I think every time some of the members of this house try to deceive the Canadian people, it is the responsibility of those of us who want to be honest—

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Olson: —to repeat and to state the facts and the effects surrounding the consequences of those kinds of motions.

Mr. Muir (Cape Breton North and Victoria): You are showing your halo of blindness. Your wings are spread out.

Mr. Olson: The hon. gentleman over there may not think that it is his responsibility—

Mr. Grafftey: A great speech.

Mr. Olson: —to be frank and honest with the Canadian people. I think this, Mr. Speaker: that some day soon even those hon. gentlemen over there, on my right, may realize that the general electorate in Canada is a little wiser than some hon. members of his party think it is.

Mr. Grafftey: Hear, hear.

Mr. Olson: Over the past few weeks and months the opposition, and then the New Democratic party, moved motions of non-confidence, and then tried to tie other motions in with the subject matter of those motions. The people across the country are not being taken in by that sort of thing any more.

Mr. Knowles: Would the hon. member permit a question?

Mr. Olson: Certainly.

Mr. Knowles: I wonder if the hon. member is aware of the provisions of standing order 56(4)(e), which is a rule which specifically makes it possible for an amendment of this kind to be put, voted on and to be carried, and yet for the government to ask the house to carry on. Does not that type of rule make possible the very thing that we are asking, namely a chance for the house to express its view on a subject without forcing an election?

• (5:50 p.m.)

Mr. Olson: I am very well aware of standing order 56(4)(e). As the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Knowles) points out, he has been in this house a long time. But I wonder how many times this standing order has been used, or interpreted in the way in which he attempts to interpret it? I am not saying it is impossible—

Mr. Knowles: Two or three times in my experience here.

Mr. Olson: Well, it has never happened since I came to this house in 1957.

Mr. Knowles: These have been strange times.

Mr. Olson: I suggest to the hon. member that while he may have a point technically, it has not been the practice of this house to allow an amendment to a motion to go into supply to carry without parliament's being dissolved. This has been the general practice.

Mr. Knowles: Does the hon. member not realize that never in Canadian history has dissolution come about through a defeat on a supply motion? Sorry, there was one occasion—

Mr. Olson: I believe that is not quite right. On February 4, 1963—

Mr. Knowles: I am sorry; only once.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh.

Mr. Knowles: Whereas there have been perhaps a dozen occasions when there was a defeat but not a dissolution.

Mr. Grafftey: How would you vote if the government had a majority?

An hon. Member: A good question.

Mr. Olson: The responsibility for the opposition to assist the government to govern the country would not be so great if they had a majority, and hon. members to my right know that very well.

Now that we have had this little review of the rules and discussed some of the technical possibilities I think we had better return to what is practical. I think this debate is useful. I believe the subject matter raised by the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Diefenbaker) pointing to this inflationary pressure has initiated a very useful discussion and I hope hon. members in all parties in all corners of the house will get on their feet and make positive suggestions to the Minister of Finance, suggestions which they will spell out and which they will support, for dealing with this very serious problem now facing the Canadian people.

Mr. G. H. Aiken (Parry Sound-Muskoka): Without intervening too far in the discussion we have just had on the rules one thing should be noted. The question whether one votes for a motion because of what appears on the surface or because of what lies underneath is an academic one. But I should like to point out to the hon. member who has just resumed his seat that whereas his group supported the government in connection with old age pensions, not so very long ago the Liberal party supported the Social Credit group in connection with debt free money. I think things are just about even, whether the purpose was so obvious or not.

Mr. Thompson: Could I ask the hon. member a question? If we had voted otherwise in that particular instance would it have brought about an increase in old age pensions for the people?

Mr. Aiken: I would think so.

An hon. Member: A dream.

Mr. Aiken: Surely we do not have sham battles in this house. Had the house expressed itself as being in favour of an increase in old age pensions I believe the government would have had either to resign or to increase the pensions. The decision would have been one for the government to take, but the expression of opinion by the house would have been loud and clear; the government would have been obliged to act or to resign.

The most serious problem facing the average Canadian today is the constant increase in the cost of living. This applies whether a person is living on a fixed income or not. Admittedly the effects of inflation are felt more severely by those who are living on fixed incomes, whose hard earned savings dissolve as the cost of living rises. The dollar earned and saved in earlier years as a unit of real value in exchange for the necessities of life now brings less and less. A few years ago, we called such an increase "galloping inflation". That is a horse and buggy term and I think that inflation would in this modern age be better described as "jet propelled." The comparison is a good one, because the recent figures show it to be just that.

When we look at the figures for the cost of living for the month of February over the past ten years we see a dramatic increase. This is a situation which must be dealt with quickly if the economy of the country is not to suffer a serious blow. In February, 1955, the cost of living equalled 116.3; in 1956 it was 116.4; in 1957, it was 120.5; in 1958 it was 123.7; in 1959, it was 125.7; in 1960, it was 127.2; in 1961, it was 128.9; in 1962, it was 129.8 and in 1963 it was 132.00.

This represents a fairly constant and small annual increase of one or two points a year. In 1964, however, it goes up to 134.5 and in 1965, to 137.2—an increase of almost three points. And in 1966 it was 142.1, an increase of almost five points. This is a dramatic and most discouraging increase. As a rule I do not like to make comparisons but I think there is one I should make. In the five years from 1958 to 1963 during which a Conservative government was in power the cost of living increased by 8.3 points. In the three years since the present government took over, from

1963 to 1966, the increase has been 10.2 points, an increase greater in three years than that which took place in the five previous years.

May I call it six o'clock?

[*Translation*]

PROCEEDINGS ON ADJOURNMENT MOTION

SUBJECT MATTER OF QUESTIONS TO BE DEBATED UNDER ADJOURNMENT MOTION

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Rinfret): Order. It is my duty, pursuant to provisional standing order 39A, to inform the house that the questions to be debated at the time of adjournment tonight are as follows: the hon. member for Danforth (Mr. Scott): Housing —Reported shortage of mortgage money; the hon. member for Hamilton West (Mr. Macaluso): Expo '67—Refusal to register R.C.M.P. band.

[*English*]

CAPITAL PUNISHMENT

JOINT SPONSORSHIP OF RESOLUTION— DEBATING SCHEDULE

Hon. G. J. McIlraith (Minister of Public Works): May I have permission to revert to motions in order to deal with some matters of government business for the latter part of the week?

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Rinfret): Does the house give consent to revert to motions so that the minister may proceed with his remarks?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Mr. McIlraith: As hon. members know, the government indicated that it would make available to private members government time for debate on the abolition of capital punishment. There have been some discussions going on between the leader of the house and the house leaders of the other parties, and also some conversations between the leader of the house and those who have put private members' bills on this subject on the order paper.

• (6:00 p.m.)

The result of these discussions is that the four hon. members who had brought forward bills on this subject will today file a resolution jointly signed by them. In order that they can do so, since the practice of the house is that only one person can propose a resolution, we require the concurrence of the house to permit the four names to stand on this resolution.

I would therefore ask:

That, notwithstanding any standing order or any practice of this house, a resolution respecting the death penalty shall be permitted to stand in the joint names of Messrs. Byrne, Nugent, Scott and Stanbury, and to be so described as jointly sponsored in *Votes and Proceedings* and in *Orders of the Day.*

And I would ask that it be made an order of the house.

Motion agreed to.

Mr. McIlraith: Now that I understand the resolution has been filed, Mr. Speaker, I would also move:

That on Wednesday, Thursday and Monday, March 23, 24 and 28, 1966, the order for debate on the resolution standing in the names of Messrs. Byrne, Nugent, Scott and Stanbury respecting the death penalty shall take precedence over all orders of the day, both government orders and private members business, and

That consideration of the said resolution shall be deemed at all times to be the business of private members, and that standing order 31, section (2) shall apply thereto.

Motion agreed to.

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE

Mr. Monteith: May I ask the house leader if it is proposed to take estimates on Friday?

Mr. McIlraith: No, on Friday we shall take government legislation. I shall announce the details later in the week.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Rinfret): Order. Pursuant to special order made this day, this sitting stands suspended until the call of the bells at 8 o'clock p.m. Accordingly I do now leave the chair.

At 6.05 p.m. the sitting was suspended.

SITTING RESUMED

The house resumed at eight o'clock.

SUPPLY

The house resumed consideration of the motion of Mr. Sharp for committee of supply.

THE INCREASED COST OF LIVING

Mr. Aiken: At six o'clock, Mr. Speaker, I was pointing out that the government has absolutely failed to maintain control over the cost of living.

Mr. Vincent: And you were right.

Increased Cost of Living

Mr. Aiken: The effect of this failure is that the benefit from our social welfare legislation, as passed in previous and in recent years, is lost. What is the use of increasing pensions, salaries and welfare benefits if the result is a smaller purchasing power because of inflation and higher taxes?

The spiral of higher living costs, more wages, and higher production costs also affects our selling power abroad. The dollar devaluation, which was a powerful tool in increasing our foreign markets and reducing our imports, now is being offset completely by higher cost of production in Canada, with the result that our power to compete in foreign markets is being eaten away. This is proven very conclusively by our export-import figures.

According to a Dominion Bureau of Statistics release of March 11 this year, commodity imports into Canada in 1965 increased 15.4 per cent or $1,150 million over 1964. Our exports, however, were up only 5.6 per cent or $461 million over 1964. I should mention that this export figure includes the large grain shipments without which our commodity exports would be pathetic. In the result, in 1965 we lost $689 million in our foreign trade in respect of commodities. We must ask ourselves, Mr. Speaker, to what do we attribute this loss?

I submit that inflation undoubtedly has a major part in it. Inflation increases the cost of production and thereby reduces our power to compete in foreign markets. I should like to turn for a moment to the attitude of the government in connection with the problems related to inflation. I think it generally is accepted that spending alone has a great effect on the question of inflation. We can look to the government itself to see what the picture is with regard to its spending while it has been in office. I have taken some figures from two books of estimates which are on record. The first is the book of estimates for the year 1962-1963, the last year in which the former Conservative government was in office; the second is the current estimates for 1966-67 which are the projected spending of the present government.

Total government spending in 1962-63 amounted to $6,276 million. In the current estimates the total is $7,950 million. This is a tremendous increase in spending on the part of the government itself which gives the example to others who are following the lead of the government.

[Mr. Vincent.]

I also picked out a few of the departments in which there have been dramatic increases in spending. I will admit that perhaps there may be differences in circumstances over these few years, but I have taken examples which are most dramatic and which I think at least have equivalent value. The estimates of the Civil Service Commission, for example, in 1962-63 show a figure of $4,815,000; for the coming year they are estimated at $8,087,000. That is a very large increase. As we go away from the wartime era and as the Department of National Defence is making an effort to reduce expenditures, we would also expect that the Department of Defence Production would be cutting back, but we find that while this department in 1962-63 spent almost $19 million, the projected spending for 1966-67 is $26 million. This is another dramatic increase. This does not include the Department of Industry which has the same minister. In 1962-63 there was no department and there was no spending, but for 1966-67 the Department of Industry has estimated expenses of $50,582,000. That is a new department and a new additional expenditure. In 1965-66 the projected estimate for this department was $36 million.

Many of us wonder about these two departments, Defence Production and Industry, Mr. Speaker. Are they really giving value for the tremendous sums of money which are being spent? Many people seriously doubt that value is being received. They have not yet seen, and many people in industry really do not expect to see, the value of this department in relation to its spending. If the question of exports and imports has anything to do with it, the picture is much the reverse, because I am going to show in a minute that our balance in commodities has decreased this year by a large figure, $680 million, over the previous year. Therefore, if the increased spending of $50 million in the Department of Industry has done anything it certainly has not increased our commodity exports.

• (8:10 p.m.)

I also looked at the Post Office expenditures. In 1962-63 they were $192 million; in 1966-67, they are $252 million. Where is the additional expenditure justified? I do not know. There have been increases in postal rates but the deficit seems to be increasing. Is this the result of bad management or an improper attitude toward the whole problem of increased spending and inflation?

The increases in the estimates for the Department of the Secretary of State have

me absolutely baffled. In 1962-63 the expenditures of that department were $5 million. The estimated expenditures for this year are $45 million. I appreciate that a portion of that results from a special statute but there is still an increase in the normal operating expenditures, being the difference between $5 million and $17,500,000.

As I have said, these increases in government spending are indicative of a careless attitude and an absolute lack of concern on the part of this government for the cost of government and the question of inflation generally.

In comparing the spending totals appearing in the estimates for the year 1962-63 with the current spending totals one can see there has been an increase of 25 per cent in that four year period, whereas during the same period the cost of living increased 9.5 per cent. Perhaps to be fair we should only look at the past three year period, from 1963 to 1966, during which the cost of living index has risen from 132 points to 142 points, an increase of ten points with a percentage increase of 9.3. This would indicate that the spending increase is roughly 25 per cent and the cost of living increase is 9.3 per cent. Therefore the government is spending at a rate of increase in excess of the cost of living increase. One can only assume that the government is thereby contributing to the spiralling cost of living rather than slowing it down. The government's spending has increased at a greater rate than even the tremendously increasing cost of living.

We have seen no evidence that the government is concerned about holding prices down. I can remember that in the 1956-57 period, when I was first running for election to this house, one of the most serious problems then being discussed was price increases and the related fact that producers were not getting a fair share of the increase while the consumer was paying more. The cost-price squeeze, as it was referred to then, was a major issue in the election of 1957, certainly so far as the rural areas were concerned. We have not heard very much about this situation in the past few years but it is beginning again to be of importance. Once more the cost-price situation is beginning to squeeze the farmers on one side, who are not getting increased prices, and the consumers on the other side, who must pay more for their goods.

I think some of the causes of this situation are the increased cost of administration, the increased cost of government and the increased cost of production. The cost of processing goods is once again out of control. It is no longer in the position it was for the past number of years during which fair prices were being received by producers while at the same time consumer prices were rising at a slow rate.

Just before the adjournment at six o'clock I pointed out that the cost of living in the past three years had increased ten points compared with an increase of only eight points during the previous five year period when the Conservative government was in power. I think this is something the people of this country should consider. Why is the cost of living becoming so high and why is the government apparently taking no action in this regard?

We are continually told that when the budget comes down we will perhaps be given answers to some of these questions. I hope the government can do something by legislation to alleviate this situation, but legislation is not necessarily the answer. In my view the real problem is related to the attitude taken by the government as exemplified not only through legislation but through administrative and executive action. It is my firm belief that this government has gone ahead with expenditures without making any effort to control the increase in the cost of living and that they have been very careless in this regard. Legislation placed on the statute books will not reverse an attitude displayed by the government.

The public is very quick to grasp such an attitude. The business community and everyone else grasp and understand an attitude on the part of the government which indicates that it is either trying to keep the lid on inflation and keep things under control or that no effort is being made to do this at all. It does not matter what legislation is passed, what the budget indicates or what we are asked to approve in the way of tax measures. These will not remedy the basic problem of this government, which is the result of careless spending and a careless attitude toward general cost increases.

I suggest finally that the answer to our present economic problem does not lie in legislative measures. Nor will it be found in budgetary measures. The answer can only be found if this government turns away from the easy answers and stops doing things on a helter-skelter basis because it feels it might

win approval from one segment or other of the economy.

It is my belief, Mr. Speaker, that this government must set a steady course and maintain it, giving the people of Canada the assurance that they are doing something toward controlling inflation and expenditure, setting an example which others in Canada can follow in maintaining fair increases in the cost of living. We realize that there has been an increase in the cost of living each year for a number of years. The Canada pension plan was based on a presumption that the cost of living would increase. It was assumed that the cost of living would increase at the rate of 2 per cent per annum and that wages would increase at the rate of 3 per cent per annum. On this assumption the Canada pension plan was devised to cover a built-in increase in pensions. That is satisfactory to the extent that it may provide some protection to old age pensioners, but it is indicative of the attitude of this government that this increase is inevitable. Such an attitude can only lead to a belief on the part of the people of the country that excessive spending is the order of the day and that with this government we cannot expect anything more than a continued and continual increase in the cost of living.

• (8:20 p.m.)

Mr. Jack Davis (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Mines and Technical Surveys): Mr. Speaker, the motion before the house deals with inflation. Rising prices are always a problem. They are more of a problem in an economy such as that of Canada at the present time, namely, an economy approaching full employment. A few years ago when the economy was not expanding, when it was relatively stagnant, prices rose, but they rose relatively slowly at a rate of around 1 per cent to 2 per cent a year. In the last two or three years we have seen increases of the order of 2 per cent and latterly 3 per cent. This rate is becoming excessive. The answer is difficult, as I said before. We want, above all, full employment. We want to use all our factories and employ all our manpower. How do we manage prices under these circumstances? This is a burning question not only in countries like Canada but in many countries overseas which throughout most of the post-war period have been struggling with the serious problem of inflation. Their prices have been rising more rapidly than ours.

[Mr. Aiken.]

The question to which we must address ourselves in this house, however, is not so much the identification of the problem, because we admit to rising prices, but the solution of the problem. I contend that a number of steps have already been taken by the government which will help to moderate the rise in prices and I want this evening to advocate one or two others which I think could be pursued with a little more energy by the government in order to contain prices more effectively.

I should like to deal particularly with trade. By that I mean freer trade, because I think through international competition, indeed through competition internationally and domestically, we could help to contain prices.

First, however, I should like to refer to a recent report produced by the Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development in Europe, the O.E.C.D. It is a report on Canada. It was released in December, 1965, and has several interesting things to say which I think might usefully be put on the record. At the very outset it states that in Canada "economic activity has been expanding very rapidly in recent years".

The report says:

> Economic activity has expanded very rapidly in recent years, mainly stimulated by growing exports and gross fixed asset formation. Unemployment has fallen well below 4 per cent and capacity utilization rates have been raised. On the whole the pressure of demand would not seem to be excessive, and the rise in prices, although accelerating somewhat, generally remains moderate—

This is the view of the economists employed by the O.E.C.D. looking at Canada in a sequence of surveys which examined the economies of other countries as well. The O.E.C.D. report goes on to say:

> In Canada, as in the United States, the expansion that began early in 1961 has now lasted for nearly five years, longer than any previous peacetime upturn in economic activity. Following some signs of slowdown in the middle of 1962, the expansion accelerated in 1964 and continued at a high rate in 1965. Indeed, since the middle of 1963—

Incidentally, that is when this administration took office.

> —activity has been expanding rather faster than in the United States and most European member countries.

The report goes on to examine the principal forces for expansion in the country, forces which also tend to increase prices. One is the remarkable increase in new investment by private enterprise. Another is the remarkable increase in exports. In other words,

exports, including exports not only of raw materials but highly manufactured products, together with new investment have been the two major factors tending to increase prices. Several hon. members during the debate today, including the right hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Diefenbaker), and the hon. member for Parry Sound-Muskoka (Mr. Aiken), have castigated the government for excessive expenditure. I should like to read a short paragraph from the O.E.C.D. report dealing with government expenditure. It says:

> Government expenditure on goods and services in real terms has increased less rapidly than real (gross national product)—

In other words, government expenditure has not been growing as rapidly as national production and income. The report goes on to say that the provinces and municipalities account for most of the expansion. Government spending has been growing, though not as rapidly as the economy, and the growth is attributable almost entirely to expanded outlays of the provinces and the municipalities. The report concludes that particular paragraph with these words:

> The increase in federal expenditure has mainly consisted of transfer payments.

Transfer payments are payments out of federal taxation to the provinces for the conduct of business which falls within the constitutional responsibility of the provinces. Therefore I think we see from this report, first, an indication that the Canadian economy is growing very rapidly; second, that prices, while they are increasing are certainly not out of control; third, that our performance relative to other countries is quite good and, fourth, that government outlays, particularly federal government outlays, are not a major cause of inflation in this country.

I wish also to refer briefly to the second annual review of the Economic Council of Canada which discusses the question of prices on page 24. It says:

> In recent years, prices and costs have advanced much less rapidly in the United States and Canada than in overseas industrial countries.

This should be reassuring to us and particularly reassuring to our export industries. There are various solutions which a government can employ to solve the problem of rapidly rising prices, prices rising at a rate of 3 per cent a year or more. One is increased taxation; another is a ceiling on its own expenditures. But other measures have been taken by the present administration and I suggest these have had increasing effect in recent months. These measures taken through the Departments of Industry and Manpower—departments which are concerned with the efficiency of Canada as a producing nation—have had a beneficial and stabilizing effect on prices.

Mr. Aiken: Mr. Speaker, would the hon. member permit a question at this point?

Mr. Davis: I would be very happy to answer any questions at the end of my remarks.

Mr. Aiken: I will hold my question until then.

Mr. Davis: We must emphasize increased productivity. By this I mean increased output through the more efficient use of manpower. Essentially this means through new plants, new processes and new techniques, better utilization of labour, higher capital investment in plant and equipment. This is one of the principal objectives of the Department of Industry. This is one of the main reasons for its formation and I suggest that already in its young life—it is only about two years old—it has done a remarkable job in this respect.

Productivity is one thing. Other things are greater mobility, particularly greater mobility of our people and greater ease of movement of new funds for investment in new industries. These are also important factors which can help to contain cost and price increases. We need a more flexible economy. I believe we need a more open economy. We need a more research-conscious economy. Various measures have been introduced in the last three budgets aimed at increased expenditure on research and development. The main burden of my remarks, however, will have to do with trade.

• (8:30 p.m.)

As I said earlier, I believe that in circumstances where we have relatively full employment we also have the best of all possible circumstances in which to reduce trade barriers, in which to cushion the impact of foreign competition on people who will have to change their jobs and perhaps even change the locality in which they live. Full employment cushions the impact of competition on old plants, plants which will either have to be re-equipped and enter into new lines of production or plants which may have to go out of business entirely. These are the best possible circumstances, with relatively full employment, in which to engage in this process

of reducing tariffs and eliminating protection, particularly the protection of industries which are no longer genuinely competitive in the international sense.

The industrial engineer and the economist talk in terms of factors of production. These are men, materials, machines and money. We certainly have the men. We have people who are not only capable but people who are becoming increasingly more capable in the sense that our educational standards in this country are rising. We have the raw materials in great abundance and in most parts of Canada we have a great abundance of cheap energy. In other words, we have the men and the materials.

It may come as a surprise to some to know that in this country we also have, by and large, the machines. We are a more capital-intensive country, a more highly mechanized country, than even the United States. The recent report of the Economic Council of Canada indicated that on the average we use about 25 per cent more machinery and equipment per person employed in Canada than is the case in the United States. So we are heavily mechanized. We have the men, we have the materials and we have the machines.

What we basically lack in order to attract more money and certainly to improve our competitiveness and get our costs down are markets. We lack markets of adequate size. Often those markets can only be obtained by selling across the international border into adjoining areas of the United States.

The cure, I believe, in one industry after another is to move progressively in the direction of freer trade. Canada is by no means a free trading nation, far from it. We still erect man-made barriers against a wide range of manufactured goods. Our import duties on the average are about 20 per cent. This makes us in the eyes of many of our trading partners even more protectionist than the United States.

True, our tariff wall has been coming down. The fence which earlier generations of Canadians had built around us is not as high as it once was. Not only that, but it is being dismantled in a few important places. One such gateway was opened up last year by the present administration when it signed the Canada-United States, free trade agreement in respect of automobiles and parts. This agreement marks a major step in the right direction. It sets the stage for the uninhibited movement of motor vehicles and parts both ways across the international boundary line.

Canadian manufacturing plants are now free to specialize in the production of goods which they can sell not only at home in Canada but throughout the United States as well. In this way they can get their costs down. Mass production, or the economy of scale as it is sometimes called, is now on our side in respect of the automobile and parts industry. With modern factories and a cheaper Canadian dollar we can compete anywhere.

There has been considerable discussion as to the rise in prices of many categories of consumer goods. In respect of automobiles I suggest that prices over the past year have remained relatively constant. They have risen modestly in the United States. The Canada-U.S. price gap has therefore narrowed in respect of automobiles and parts. We have stabilized at least for the time being the price of automobiles to the average consumer in Canada. This is the sort of action I mean when I suggest that freer trade in respect of broad categories of industrial products will help to contain prices in this country to the benefit not only of the people who are going to produce these goods in increasing quantities but also of consumers right across the nation.

Personally, Mr. Speaker, I would like to see the present agreement expanded in the fullness of time. I should like to see it include repair parts as well. I should like to see—this is an expression of a personal opinion but I am sure that there are many other members in the house who would agree with me—the tariffs progressively removed between Canada and the United States at wholesale and retail levels, so that we eventually have something akin to price parity across the international boundary line in respect of automobiles and parts. This would mean that Canadians, at least in respect of the broad range of products produced by that industry, would be paying prices similar to those in adjoining areas of the United States.

Free trade in automobiles is, I hope, only the beginning of a process which will eventually open up the entire North American market for many of our more highly processed and a good proportion of our highly manufactured goods and services. The products of other industries will then be treated in the same way. Costs will be at a minimum, and prices to consumers will be much lower than would otherwise be the case.

As a westerner I am interested in highly paid jobs as well as lower prices for the consumers. But these too, can be created if our more efficient and larger resource-based industries can also tap expanding markets to the south. Doing away with U.S. tariffs in many instances will allow us to process more of our raw materials. As many hon. members know, the tariff which the United States imposes on our goods increases sharply as the degree of manufacturing increases. In other words, a penalty is imposed on jobs now in the United States; jobs, I suggest, in many industries which would otherwise exist in Canada. By reducing or eliminating tariffs in respect of these semi-processed and more highly manufactured goods we will patriate jobs to Canada. I suggest these jobs will be highly paid and are jobs which otherwise would exist only across the border in the United States.

I believe the products of our forests and our mines can be upgraded in this way. In other words, we will be processing more of our raw materials at home. This will mean more and better paid jobs for a great many Canadians.

I mentioned earlier that I was a westerner. The automobile free trade agreement, as I understand it, at the present time benefits central Canada in two important ways. It is providing many more jobs as well as a ceiling on prices. It is setting some sort of ceiling on prices for all Canada but it is not providing jobs in the rest of Canada. That is why I should like to emphasize and to advocate the opening up of negotiations in respect of the products of our forests and the products of our mines. This will create jobs in outlying areas as well as help contain prices and costs.

• (8:40 p.m.)

What is wrong, for example, with Canada negotiating a free trade agreement in respect of pulp and paper? Newsprint and our cruder market pulps already go into the United States duty free. I would have us extend this duty free treatment to the higher valued papers and paper products, products which are valued at prices two, three and four times that of newsprint and the relatively crude pulps which we ship into the United States. By-products, including most sheet materials and wood-based chemicals, would then be saleable in the U.S.A. Not only would we be making better use of all the resources involved but we would also become manufacturers on a much larger scale. Granted, there will be opposition in some quarters. A few of our manufacturers of fine papers in eastern Canada will be up in arms. Fearing the impact of low cost imports from the United States, they will band together with a view to maintaining the status quo. But we now have an answer which even they can accept. The clue is to be found in the various measures which the government has introduced in order to offset the adverse effects of foreign competition in the automobile industry.

The owners of old and outdated plants are being helped to build new factories and switch to new lines of production. Their workers are also being retrained, in some instances with federal funds, or they are being helped to move elsewhere. Adjustment assistance, using the federal taxpayers' money, is therefore helping to ease the pain of these few unfortunate people whose shoulders would otherwise have to bear the full brunt of foreign competition.

In years gone by there was a broad philosophy expounded frequently and with great energy across this country which was taken up by most of the small "l" liberals, an idea dear to many people in western Canada. They believed that tariffs should be slashed overnight. They believed that they should not only be reduced but wiped out and done away with at once. They believed that this would cause imports to flow freely and that ultimately the standard of living would rise, not simply by increasing wages but by keeping prices at a competitive level. That was the free trade argument. Those people wanted these things to take place instantaneously and overnight.

The traditional Conservative attitude was that of creating industry at home in this country, perhaps by government assistance. Certainly that attitude favoured protection. The idea was to have a hothouse type of growth resulting in industries which eventually would be able to stand on their own feet and which would eventually be able to withstand foreign competition and thus permit the lowering of tariff barriers. These two approaches were diametrically opposed.

Today a more sophisticated approach is taken, one being used I think almost universally in western Europe and to a lesser extent in the United States. It is that of bringing about this transition over a period of years and using government funds where necessary, through research grants, through vocational training, through the retraining of workers and through grants enabling people to move from one source of employment to another, to

cushion the impact of increased foreign competition.

Adjustment assistance in these various forms is vital. It enables the transition to take place in a measured manner and it makes free trade practical politics. It is practical politics because the few who are otherwise going to be seriously hurt can see some daylight. They are helped to change their lines of production or their way of life. They are helped by the rest of the community, by the much greater numbers in the community who through taxpayers funds enable this transition to take place in a more orderly and, I suggest, a much more efficient manner. In other words, through this more sophisticated or perhaps more thoroughly planned approach it is possible to move these people, and to move them with the help of the great majority of the people in the community, to better employment and better opportunities for investment.

In more technical language I should like to make clear that I favour the opening up, an industry at a time, of a North American free trade area. This grand design cannot, of course, be established overnight. Dislocations are bound to occur. In some industries like agriculture protection may be needed for decades to come. But this is not generally true in other areas of resource development. This is why I have chosen forest products as one of the next categories to be negotiated with the United States.

I do not want hon. members to get me wrong. I am not arguing in favour of a North American common market. Canada must never discriminate as between nations. If we alow free entry to United States produced goods we must extend the same treatment to the same group of products coming from other parts of the world. Manufacturers can now bring in their automobiles and parts duty free from the United Kingdom and western Europe. They must be able to do this in respect of all commodities for which we work out free trading arrangements with our neighbours to the south.

A common market differs from a free trade area. It has a uniform fence all around it. Not only that, but the height of the common fence would be determined in Washington. Washington would say what the duty would be on goods coming in from the Commonwealth, for example. It would say whether we were free to sell wheat to Communist China or trucks to Cuba. This, I think you will agree, would be an intolerable arrangement in so far as Canada is concerned. Therefore a common market is out. Only a free trade area, with Canadians making their own policy with regard to goods from overseas countries, can meet our requirements for nationhood.

There is little doubt but that the leading economic thinkers in the world today favour lower tariffs and freer international trade. The development of the European trading blocs and the nature of the initiative taken by President Kennedy under the U.S. trade expansion act, confirms this trend. The implications for Canadian business in general and for those industries manufacturing secondary products in particular are far reaching. Firms which are now largely oriented toward or entirely dependent upon our home market will find themselves faced with new competitive forces. There are two possible courses of action. Either they must reorganize and become more competitive or gradually fade away.

Many of Canada's secondary industries find themselves in this dilemma. Thousands of them make excellent products. But I should like to focus your attention during the remainder of my remarks on those which I think will benefit considerably from free trade. I should like to say a word, for example, about wood products. Our lumber moves with relative ease into the United States and into many markets overseas. Once it is shaped, machined and cut to angles, it bears a considerable tariff. For example, components for furniture going into the United States bear a tariff of 16⅔ per cent. So if we want to make and shape components of wood for sale in the United States we face a problem. We face a tariff which does not exist on the raw material.

The structure of the wood products industry in the United States is changing. Today more than one third of the wood consumed on this continent goes into end products other than housing and industrial construction. It goes into products such as furniture, and into specially shaped packaging materials and so on. These components are made increasingly, at least in the United States, at or near the sawmill. They are cut and planed precisely to shape. They are manufactured in the same sense that automobile parts are manufactured for automobiles, and they are shipped to plants which assemble furniture and other end products. The end manufacturer wants a component in which there is no waste. He wants a component in great numbers, made to standard size, and produced in quantity.

The greater the variety of wood that can be used, the smaller the loss. Losses are reduced. Technology is important. Certainly the economies of mass production are opening up opportunities for further processing of wood at or around the sawmills which are usually at or near the raw materials. This is the type of industry which we ought to be developing in Canada close to the resources, close to nature. We ought to be developing an industry devoted to the shaping of industrial wood components and to the shaping of manufactured components not only for our own home markets in great volume but also for the adjoining markets of the United States. I hope that we will study these opportunities. Being thoroughly knowledgeable as to the nature of the industry we can then negotiate a tolerable agreement with the United States whereby the tariff barrier between our two countries would be removed entirely.

• (8:50 p.m.)

In the wood products industry we have already seen some changes. A new plant was opened recently in southern Ontario to manufacture machined wood components, not just for the Canadian market but for sale in the United States. Its annual output will shortly be worth $5 million; it expects to eventually be worth $10 million. This type of new enterprise differs from the small, highly localized inefficient plants we have had traditionally in the wood products industry. It involves a great deal of investment; it involves the training of many people and it involves the introduction of skills which we do not now possess in this country. But we must move in this direction if we are to become more competitive and set a ceiling on prices.

At this point I should like to say a word about the broader picture and about the Kennedy round of tariff negotiations. The trade expansion act gave the United States administration authority to negotiate with the united states of Europe and reach what could amount to a bilateral agreement between these two major trading blocs. Canada, in some ways, is a spectator on the sidelines. But we all hope that these negotiations will succeed, because tariff reductions as between the European Common Market and the United States will be applied to all other countries and we will find that the barriers involved in shipping our goods to the United States and Europe will be reduced if those negotiations are successful. We must, therefore, wish them well. But we must remember that the two sides are negotiating with respect to goods in which they trade and that most of these are very highly manufactured and hence of a type which we do not necessarily produce in Canada. So the benefits of these negotiations are not likely to be as substantial as some people hope.

We must face the possibility also that the United Kingdom may within the next two or three years become a member of the united states of Europe and find herself behind that common wall so that there will be a tariff barrier between Canada and the United Kingdom similar to that which now exists between Canada and the common market countries.

Mr. Grafftey: The hon. member is off the subject. He has a speech to make and he intends to make it. But what has this got to do with inflation?

Mr. Davis: My point, which may be difficult to understand, is that increased trade and freer trade will lead to greater competition and this in turn will help contain prices at their present levels or even reduce them. Prices have to do with inflation. I think the argument is logical and the broader scene is also important. I say that freer trade will help us contain prices.

We on this side of the house are moving toward freer trade. Through the automobile free trade agreement we have made a tangible and I believe significant first step in the direction of freer trade in many goods and services, freer trade not only with the United States but with all other countries of the world. So we are not discriminating.

Hon. members opposite may have their solutions to this problem. I should like to know where they stand with regard to trade barriers and the possibility of increased competition during this period of high employment in Canada. This is a time of great opportunity. This is a time when we can reduce these tariff barriers. It is not possible to do so when there is high unemployment and the country is passing through a period of stagnation such as existed a few years ago. Now is the opportunity. We must seize it. I believe there is a will to move in this direction. I personally would have us move, an industry at the time, in negotiations with the United States, particularly in connection with forest and mineral products.

I would not gamble everything on the Kennedy round. I would also be prepared for the day when the United Kingdom becomes a

member of the united states of Europe. I hope the United Kingdom can bring the tariff barriers down and act, so to speak, as a friend at court. But I would not want us to enter this new stage in Canada's history unprepared for the changing circumstances in which we find ourselves in the world today.

Mr. Aiken: Would the hon. member now permit my question? The hon. member made a carefully prepared speech on the theory of foreign trade. How does he escape the fact that Canada's adverse balance amounted to $685 million in 1965?

Mr. Davis: I do not want to escape it. It is a fact that a rapidly growing country is also a country which is mechanizing rapidly and when it has an economy like Canada's it is importing a lot of machinery and equipment. It is well known that when this country has grown rapidly it has also, for a time at least, experienced an adverse trade balance. This is a problem and it is not one which can be glossed over.

Hon. Marcel Lambert (Edmonton West): Mr. Speaker, I listened with a good deal of interest to the speech made by the Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Mines and Technical Surveys (Mr. Davis). I would have hoped it might be more apposite to the subject of the debate. In the free flow of debate I like to listen to hon. members and then try to add to what they have said or comment on the points they have made. But if I were to do so in the present case I would find myself completely off the subject because the hon. member for Coast-Capilano has certainly not restricted himself to the theme of our discussion. However, he has been putting forward his ideas and I am wondering whether he is now flying a kite to test the wind so as to see whether further steps can be taken along the lines of thinking he has outlined tonight. I have spoken about this in the past. It has not always been our experience of the Liberals that speeches made by Parliamentary Secretaries in the past expressed strictly their own ideas. I will leave the hon. member's speech as it is because it seems to me to be altogether irrelevant to the subamendment placed before us by the hon. member for Burnaby-Coquitlam (Mr. Douglas) as well as to the amendment put forward by the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Diefenbaker).

To deal with the subamendment, in essence it calls for a prices review board to determine the extent to which price increases are justified and then to take steps to reduce such prices accordingly. I find myself in some difficulty on a number of points with regard to the subamendment. First, I wonder whether the federal government has the constitutional power to set up such a board along lines which would enable it to act effectively? It would appear to me that the undoubted jurisdiction of the provinces in the realm of property and civil rights would demand at least a shared jurisdiction.

Mr. Douglas: That is what I suggested.

Mr. Lambert: Certainly I do not believe we have any War Measures Act in existence upon the basis of which we could set up a prices review board or price control board or stabilization board such as existed in wartime, the provinces having agreed to vacate a particular field for the purpose of the prosecution of a war. But the amendment does not indicate any joint action with the provinces.

• (9:00 p.m.)

Then I have a second point. I find some uncertainty as to how it would work. Would the board have automatic powers of review or would it have to act on complaint about certain price variations in certain industries or with respect to commodities? Would it have an unfettered right to go into all forms of commodities, whether they be raw products, basic materials, or completely finished materials? Then there is the uncertainty as to how it would act. How would it enforce its decisions? Is there punitive sanction behind the authority of such a board?

There is a third point which one must consider also, namely, that in this country we are not particularly prone to accepting freely the principle of price control—and this is price control. When you start unwrapping the wrapping of this little package of a prices review board it comes down essentially to price control. That is all it means. The amendment even stipulates, "to take appropriate steps to reduce such prices accordingly." That is price control, and I do not think Canadians are prepared to accept price control in peacetime.

If one talks about price controls so far as commodities are concerned, there immediately comes into examination the question of the segments that make up the price of a commodity. There are the raw materials. Somewhere along the line they have been produced. There may have been something wrong in the pricing of the original raw

product. Is that price going to be rolled back? An integral part of all commodities is the quantum of labour that goes into them, and there we come up against the real problem of wage control. I am sure the hon. member for Burnaby-Coquitlam, no more than I, does not want to institute a system of wage control or a determination of the wage scales that go into the cost of commodities.

I think the hon. member would immediately say, "We do not want wage controls". We have had to impose wage controls, with difficulty, during wartime. We have seen attempts made at wage controls in Britain in peacetime. More than one British government, more than one chancellor of the exchequer have gotten into real trouble with what they called a pay pause. Even now the present administration in Britain is having problems with its so-called unofficial wage controls. This creates industrial unrest. We have seen across the border in the United States attempts at a sort of unofficial wage control, with a lid being put on wages, which has had some rather drastic results and also some nonsensical ones. Therefore this area of uncertainty, the fact that price control is not acceptable to the Canadian people in peacetime, and the question of the constitutional right of the federal government to enter this field by itself, all give me pause and I personally find considerable difficulty in accepting the subamendment.

Let us look now at the subject of the cost of living. This afternoon the Leader of the Opposition put a number of figures on the record. I may repeat some of them for the purpose of my argument. I think they bear repeating because these are the things we are worried about.

The March 11 return of the Dominion Bureau of Statistics shows that the cost of living has reached the figure of 142.1 points, an increase from 137.2 points in February 1965. In June 1963, which is the median year—I have the Canada Year Book going back to 1913, if not earlier—based on the 1949 index, the cost of living was at 137 points even. In 1962 it was 130.7; in 1961 it was 129.2 and in 1957 it was 121.9. Over the six year period from 1957 to 1963 the total increase was 11.1 points. But from June, 1963 to June 1966, which is only forecasting for a few months, the increase will have reached a total of 10 points. Therefore the increase in the cost of living in the past three years has been double the rate it was in the preceding six years.

I find it rather odd that today both the Minister of Finance (Mr. Sharp) and the Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Mines and Technical Surveys said it is so much easier during a period of what they called economic stagnation or depression to control the cost of living than during any other period. They say nothing happens to it in such a period. Let us look back at the record and see what happened in that context. What of the period from 1951 to 1956?

The cost of living index was at 113.7 in 1951 and it rose to only 118.1 in 1956. But those were the locust years. Those were the great, wonderful years of Liberal administration when everything was going well. The cost of living went up 5 points over a period of six years. Therefore the argument being made by the minister that it is easy during a period of so-called economic stagnation to control the cost of living falls to the ground unless he and his colleagues are prepared to accept that from 1951 to 1956 we were going through economic doldrums, which certainly is not the position they have taken.

I should also like the minister to explain how in a period of one year, from 1950 to 1951, the index jumped almost 11 points. There may have been some historic factor—

Mr. Macdonald (Rosedale): The Korean war.

Mr. Lambert: That was the start of the Korean war, but from 1951 to 1954 we were in the Korean war and if the Parliamentary Secretary to the—is it the Minister of Justice?

Mr. Macdonald (Rosedale): External Affairs. You are as ill informed on that as on most other things.

Mr. Lambert: Well, there have been so many changes taking place over there—musical chairs—but if the hon. member for Parkdale—

Mr. Macdonald (Rosedale): Wrong again.

Mr. Lambert: —for Rosedale (Mr. Macdonald) will look at the figures, he will see that from 1951 to 1956 there was a rise of less than 5 points. As a matter of fact, between 1952 and 1953 the index declined by one point. Therefore I would suggest that the argument put forward by the minister and the parliamentary secretary does not hold water.

Increased Cost of Living

With respect to the figures from 1957 to 1963, there was the factor of the imposition of a 3 per cent sales tax by the province of Ontario in 1962. That had quite an impact because Ontario represents one third of the country so far as population is concerned, and it had an effect on the cost of living index. During the last three years we have had the 11 per cent sales tax imposed by the former minister of finance on building materials and production machinery.

• (9:10 p.m.)

What concerns the country and worries me —and I am sure hon. members opposite also are concerned—is that the government does not seem to be doing anything in respect of the most dramatic increases which hit us personally more than others, and these are in food and in housing. Let us look at food; it has gone up from 133.1 a year ago to 142.5. Housing has gone up from 140.1 to 143.1. Those are high increases. We can go back through the consumer price indices all the way down the years. For instance, in respect of food back in 1957 the index was 118.6 and in 1960 it was 122.2. In 1963 it was 130.

This evening I have been using a lot of statistics but this is the subject matter of the discussion, the movement of prices, and we can measure them only by the various indices. On many occasions this house has had motions before it with regard to the 11 per cent sales tax on building materials and production machinery. Members opposite also have in this year's debate advocated the removal of that tax. It has been the contention not only of members of this house but also of many industries across the country that this has been, shall we say, one of the most potent taxes so far as the cost of living is concerned.

We can see, for instance, what has happened to the index on residential building materials over the years, and I have Dominion Bureau of Statistics records going back to 1955. The index for residential building materials stood at 298.6 in April, 1963. That was at the time of the take-over by this administration. As of December, 1965 it had reached an index figure of 346.1, or an increase of 47.5 in the period of some 32 months. We can see, going month by month through the years 1963, 1964 and 1965, the rather serious escalation every time there was the imposition of a stage of the 11 per cent sales tax.

[Mr. Lambert.]

May I indicate to hon. members that the most dramatic effect was reached in connection with lumber and its products. Lumber stood at 424.2 in April 1, 1963 and in December, 1965 reached 506.8. In other words, lumber in December, 1965 was five times as expensive as it was in the period 1935-39. Let us look at non-residential building materials, the things which go far more into the cost of producing goods and services in this country than do the costs of residential building materials.

True enough, you and I, as potential purchasers of building materials for residences, know what has happened to the price of a house, but from the point of view of being multiplied from time to time I would say that the cost of goods and services flowing from non-residential building materials has a greater effect than that which goes into residences. I should like to say that in April, 1963 the index was at 133.4 and in December of 1965 it had gone to 149.2, or an increase of 15.8. Again, lumber is the one in which there was the greatest increase.

An hon. Member: Would the hon. member permit a question?

Mr. Lambert: If the hon. member will ask the question at the end of my remarks I will do my best to answer him.

The hon. member for Parry Sound-Muskoka (Mr. Aiken), as well as the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Diefenbaker), this afternoon indicated what effect the increase in prices in Canada has had on international trade. If you do not think our international trade position is serious, I am going to refer also to the speech which the Minister of Trade and Commerce (Mr. Winters) delivered this afternoon in Toronto. I think it might be good if we put the whole of his remarks in that connection on the record. Among other things he said:

> The high level of economic activity, stimulated by an extraordinarily large capital program, and coupled with shortages of labour and the difficulty of finding sufficient funds to finance all planned undertakings, will impose inflationary pressures.
>
> This will be one of our most pressing problems as the year advances, particularly having regard to the fact that we experienced an adverse external balance on current transactions in 1965 in excess of $1 billion, and that this figure is apt to be higher in 1966. It will be recalled that the corresponding figure in 1964 was less than one-half billion dollars.

In 1961 we actually had a comfortable surplus on the commodity account but through payments and services and the tourist trade deficiency we certainly did have a

deficit in our external balance on the over all. However, it was not as bad as it was in 1957 when the deficit of the external balance on the whole, I remember, was something over $1,400 million and a good portion of that in those days was represented by a deficit in the commodity account.

It is all very well for the Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Mines and Technical Surveys to say about producing goods that this government encourages by certain incentives the production of goods, but unless you are going to consume them yourself—and in this way you are selling in the domestic market—or unless these goods are sold in the external market there is no point in producing them, because there is nothing to be gained by producing goods merely to put them in warehouses to be stockpiled. This unfortunately is the position we may be driving ourselves to unless government, management and labour get together much more seriously than they have done in the past and with a much greater degree of concentration and co-operation than there has been in the past to see that we remain competitive in the international market. Otherwise Canada's industries one by one, particularly a number of the more sensitive export market industries, will wither on the vine. This is as clear as it is that the sun will rise tomorrow, because the government can go through all sorts of exercises and can provide all sorts of incentives for employment and the production of goods but unless those goods are sold the exercises will have been futile. Therefore, anything which goes to increase the cost of goods makes our position that much less competitive.

• (9:20 p.m.)

This can be seen in relation to our wholesale price index and a number of other indices relating to commodity markets here in Canada. In the past three years we have been getting into a dangerous position. The only thing that has saved us in respect of a number of sectors of our economy has been a corresponding inflation in other countries.

We of the opposition suggest it is dangerous to have inflation in Canada, but it is widely reported in the United States at this time that the number one problem there does not relate to the war in Viet Nam but relates to the threat of inflation. We know from past experience how closely Canada's economy is related to the economy of the United States and how quickly it reflects major inflationary trends there. That is quite easy to understand. In 1958-59, when Canada did experience some form of economic recession, it was a reflection of the pattern set by the United States economy. In fact, it was not as severe in Canada as it was in the United States, but we know there was a relationship.

At this time we are experiencing the same sort of thing here in Canada in regard to inflation. What does this declining position in the trade picture do for us in Canada? I suggest it causes an economic slowdown. We cannot rely on one-shot, fortuitous, trading events such as the wheat deals with the Soviet Union to save our economic position. In 1963 there was a very serious threat to the value of the Canadian dollar and it was only as a result of the announced Soviet wheat deal that the pressure was removed. Were it not for that deal I am sure the situation would have been worse than that which occurred in May and June of 1962.

At this time we can read statements appearing every day in financial columns to the effect that there is some talk of pressure for devaluating the dollar because of Canada's continued deficit in international accounts. The minister has denied that there is any talk of this kind, as it is to be expected he would, but we know that pressures can build up. It may be that the United States financial community would not allow devaluation to take place because of the high stakes they have in Canada. Devaluation would be too costly and they could not allow it to happen. But this is part and parcel of the consequences of the policies advocated by the Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Mines and Technical Surveys.

For the last few minutes I have been talking about how closely our economy is tied to the economy of the United States. The hon. member for Coast-Capilano has tried to tie it even more closely so far as international trade is concerned.

Continuing inflation will create a drive for higher wages, and that is readily understood. This will create industrial unrest and dislocate economic production. As a matter of fact, it may lead to a ruinous year for some of our major industries. My colleague, the hon. member for Parry Sound-Muskoka, spoke about the negative effects of inflation on persons of fixed incomes and pensions. What is the point of arranging a pension for your retirement years if the value is going to disappear unless, of course, you are not going

to live to see it disappear? We know what has happened to people who have arranged private pensions either through government annuities or private pension schemes. We have all witnessed the continued pressure upon older citizens on old age security, pensioners and others living on the benefits of insurance programs because of a decrease in their value.

I am sure that many hon. members here have arranged insurance programs for their families and realize that the value of those schemes in the past year has dropped by 4 per cent. I do not know what the net result of the year's fiscal operations will be but if the Minister of Finance is able to come reasonably close to a decrease in the deficit forecast by his predecessor, that will to a great extent be the result of the hidden effects of inflation. Taxes based on prices such as sales tax bring in higher government revenue without any increase so far as the national product is concerned, but this is a false picture. There is an over-inflation of government revenue. I recommend that hon. members refer to the Canadian Tax Foundation observations in this regard.

The present 9 per cent level of expansion of the gross national product must reflect more this year than in the past the effects of inflation. What can we do about this situation? I do not like wage controls or price controls because I think they breed more problems than they solve. Last August the government announced a program of stretching out or cutting back on some of its expenditures. It is too bad they were not able to consult with the provinces in this regard. All of the provincial budgets this year, without exception, forecast greater expenditures on roads and building. The budget of the province of Alberta this year reflects expenditures of $682 million and that province has a population of only 1,500,000.

Mr. Douglas: That is more than the budget of Canada in 1936.

Mr. Lambert: A good deal of this money will be spent on education and other non-capital programs but a great deal of it will be spent on the capital expenditure side. The province of Alberta is no different in this regard from any other province. The provinces of Saskatchewan and British Columbia are in the same boat. That is why I feel there has been a sort of policy of drift or unwitting non-recognition of certain factors by the present administration. On the federal level it is turning more and more of the tax dollars over to the provinces and the Minister of Finance is handcuffed in that he cannot take steps as effectively as he could a few years ago in order to combat inflation. That is one of the consequences I have pointed out.

The federal government says it is going to apply a policy of self-denial because it feels there is some inflationary pressure. However, the provinces are free to act as they wish and they are following a course in the opposite direction. The net result is that there is no relaxation of pressure so far as building materials, labour and machinery are concerned. We are in just as bad shape in 1966 in this regard as we were in 1965. I do not think this picture is going to get better but rather it will get worse.

• (9:30 p.m.)

I still believe that the federal government and the provinces should have a conference in which they would agree on priorities of expenditure in the fields of education, health and welfare, and that we nationally must tailor our operations at the public level according to our resources in production, instead of going ahead helter-skelter and creating artificial pressures as we are now doing. I maintain that not only should those priorities be established and we should eliminate as much as possible the pressures on our resources through this, shall we say uncoordinated approach, but we should eliminate the 11 per cent sales tax on building materials and production machinery. To my mind this was a hair-shirt fashioned by the former Minister of Finance. It has had a tremendous effect in creating inflationary pressure.

Mr. Walker: Where are you going to get the equivalent revenue from? Would you get it from the sales tax?

Mr. Lambert: With regard to the revenues, what did the Minister of Finance do? He turned around and spent them right away.

Mr. Walker: Where are you going to get them from?

Mr. Lambert: I maintain that we must have increased immigration and not necessarily immigration of those at the skilled levels equivalent to grade 10 and so on. I refer to our need of immigrants such as those who have come into this country under sponsorship and who very often have had very limited education and could not speak English or French. The great many immigrants who have come into this country since the

end of world war I and world war II have not been less productive Canadians because of these limitations. I would say that perhaps it has given them an additional spur and they have been that much more industrious. I certainly cannot agree with the report presented to us the other day which recommended that we should have less sponsored immigration. I would say we must have more and we must obtain it from these untapped sources of manpower. We must get people, bring them here and if we have to train them, for goodness sake let us get down to the job of training them in the way we want. This will give us not only an additional domestic labour market but will help in many ways. I believe this is one positive step we can advocate and this house should join in recommending it to the governments.

The house has been very tolerant with me as usual, Mr. Speaker, in allowing me to speak beyond my time. I would commend some of these points to the attention of the ministry. I do not think the ministry has been doing enough with regard to the control of inflation and for that reason I enlist the support of all members of the house in supporting the amendment that is before us.

Mr. Lind: Mr. Speaker, could I ask the hon. member a question?

Mr. Lambert: Yes.

Mr. Lind: I should like to ask the hon. member whether the large increase in the cost of building homes has been related to the cost of building materials, the cost of construction or the cost of land over the last eight years? Second, I understood the hon. member to say that lumber costs had risen five times from the period 1935-39 to the present time and I should like to ask whether wholesale lumber prices today, even with the 13 per cent increase in freight rates and the 11 per cent sales tax, are any greater than they were in the years 1958 and 1959.

Mr. Lambert: With the indulgence of the house I will endeavour to answer those questions. As to the first question, Mr. Speaker, what I am pointing out is an index of certain building materials and components. Certainly the price of land has gone up, but I was not talking about the over-all cost of a house. I was pointing out the increased cost of certain building materials.

Mr. Lind: I understood that the hon. member referred to the cost of a home.

Mr. Lambert: I referred to the cost of a home simply to show that a home now costs more, as we know, because of the measures that have been taken. If the hon. member wishes to obtain catalogue No. 62002, which is a price index published by the Dominion Bureau of Statistics, he will have all the statistics he wants, if he likes statistics, and these figures will perhaps give him an answer to the question he has put to me.

Mr. Lind: The hon. member did not answer my question about lumber costs having risen five times from the period 1935-39 to the present time.

Mr. Lambert: In 1958 the index for lumber was 409.8.

Mr. Winkler: Mr. Speaker, I think a fair question to ask—

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order. The time allotted to the hon. member for Edmonton West has expired. The hon. member for Vancouver-Kingsway.

Mrs. Grace MacInnis (Vancouver-Kingsway): Mr. Speaker, I rise to support the amendment put forward by my leader, the hon. member for Burnaby-Coquitlam (Mr. Douglas), which regrets that in view of the rising cost of living, the government has not established a prices review board to determine the extent to which price increases are justified and to take appropriate steps to reduce such prices accordingly.

At the outset I should like to draw to the attention of the hon. member for Edmonton West (Mr. Lambert), who has just spoken, that in his remarks he may have overlooked several points which were made by my leader. I notice that the hon. member for Edmonton West views the subamendment with misgiving on three counts. The first was that a large share of the control of prices is provincial in scope while our subamendment proposes that the federal government should set up a prices review board.

I would point out to the hon. member for Edmonton West that our leader was very careful to point exactly to the fact that the federal government would of necessity have to take the provincial governments into consultation in setting up this board and specifying the work it should do. The federal government would be giving leadership in this field as it has in many others where jurisdiction is divided, because no province can possibly hope to cope with the question of prices within its own borders.

The second point of the hon. member had to do with the fact that prices had been controlled in wartime and that the only time we had exercised any control over prices or attempted to deal with them was in a war situation. This is true. But for many, many thousands of people across this country the present situation is very serious indeed, and the government has given lip service at least to this situation by speaking of the necessity of waging a war on poverty. I have not seen any indications of the war yet but they are talking about it. Evidently they consider the situation that many thousands of people face today to be very serious.

I would point out that the fact that we have made some attempt to deal with prices in wartime and that conditions have changed might make it quite possible to institute some kind of measures to deal with prices in a way in which we were not able to deal with them a few years ago. Conditions have changed and today the Canadian people are very anxious to see the steady rise in the cost of living stopped.

• (9:40 p.m.)

The third point which the hon. member for Edmonton West made was that he believes the Canadian people do not want control over prices. The hon. member referred to the fact that price controls would entail wage controls. I am suggesting that before any trade union can get an increase in wages today it has to go through an elaborate process of collective bargaining and a great deal of red tape.

Mr. Douglas: In order to justify it.

Mrs. MacInnis (Vancouver-Kingsway): Yes, to justify it. On the other hand, in the matter of prices there is no such machinery whatever. The way prices are raised is that the manufacturer just decides he is going to raise them and the next thing any of us know about it is when we walk into a store and find a few cents or dollars added to the prices of what we want to buy.

If we consider it a good and necessary thing to make trade unions go through a whole lot of machinery to justify wage increases before they get them, I suggest that the consumers of this country have now reached the point where they are prepared to make the same demand on the manufacturers and processors in the country. They want to see a board created before which these manufacturers will have to appear and justify the increases they are proposing to make on items which are necessary for the households of this country. I think that the creation of this board would be completely justified.

A great many other questions were raised by the hon. member for Edmonton West concerning how the board would function, its machinery, and so on. I listened very carefully this afternoon but I would point out that I did not hear any concrete proposal made by anyone in his party which would provide the mechanism for dealing with the question of the rising cost of living unless, of course, it was removal of the sales tax. There was no proposal whatever with regard to a program to hold down the cost of living. They just blamed the government for their inaction, and quite rightly.

In my view this party has made a proposal which would provide such a mechanism in an attempt to hold down the cost of living. We propose the idea of establishing a review board before which manufacturers would have to justify increases in their consumer prices. I have yet to hear from any other group in the house any alternative suggestion. In these days when we are hoping to do things in a responsible way I think the least people who are criticizing can do is to offer an alternative method or suggest some type of action.

Mr. Webb: We suggested that the farmers be given a fair share of the price.

Mrs. MacInnis (Vancouver-Kingsway): That does not provide a mechanism to my way of thinking. I think more than generalities should be advanced: some sort of concrete proposal should be made.

From the hon. member for Coast-Capilano (Mr. Davis), the Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Mines and Technical Surveys, we had a very elaborate speech about various factors of production, the need for expanding our economy, the need for mobility of manpower, the need for training and research, the need for greater trade and so on. As a speech it was perfectly all right but I do not think it went anywhere near the subject we have in mind.

The people of this country are asking for bread and they are being given the stone of government treatises. This has happened over and over again since this house opened its session. I do not think the government is prepared to grapple with the problem of rising prices. I think the government is fobbing us off with elaborate talk of trade, productivity and of all these other things

without once going near the end product of our economic system. They ought to see to it that the people of the country are enabled to provide for themselves collectively a moderate and good standard of living by their own efforts. The government should be the agent which does the planning by which this is achieved.

It just does not make sense to me to talk of an expanding economy when at the same time there is increasing distress for large sections of our people. An expanding economy with at the same time increasing distress for large sections of the community can only mean one thing. It means that too few people are getting too much of the benefits of the expanding economy and too many people are not getting enough. I do not see any other explanation. People can use all the economic jargon they like, but I do not think we can escape that conclusion.

In a period of expanding productivity and prosperity such as the present, when vast sections of our people are insecure and not so large sections are in real misery, there can be only one conclusion drawn, namely that all this affluence is not being distributed as it should. In my view the job which this government has badly neglected to do in this country is not so much related to productivity but to seeing that the results of our productivity are distributed across the country in a fair and equitable way and, particularly, that the sections of the country which need it the most are given a fair share and a moderate standard of living such as can be provided out of our resources, our machinery and our technical knowledge.

The question of steadily rising prices is one of the greatest problems to come before parliament this session. I think that tackling the problem has been far too long delayed. I have received mail, as have no doubt many other members, not only from people in my own constituency but from people clear across Canada. I have received letters from people who are desperate and keep asking what we here in Ottawa are doing. They tell us that we have good salaries and earn far more than any of them, and they ask why we cannot understand. They ask us: If, indeed, you are not too far removed from us, why can you not understand what our problems are regarding food, clothing and shelter, all the things which go to make life worth while and which we never get around to having because all our work, thought and care have to go into getting enough to eat and to wear and to educate our children? That is the sort of mail I receive, and I am sure the rest of the members of the house receive similar mail too.

I am going to suggest that it will not be very long before we will have to pay attention to this problem. There have been pickets of one kind or another and lobbies of one kind or another before, but I firmly expect that if we keep on turning the deaf ear and the blind eye it will not be very long before Mr. and Mrs. Consumer will come to Ottawa and picket in front of the Peace Tower. They will tell us that they are sick and tired of hearing us all moaning about the cost of living but doing nothing about it. I think it is time we grappled with the problem. When I say "we" I mean the government, which has the ultimate responsibility for coming to grips with the question and finding policies to meet the situation.

It is no good for the government to tell us, as we have been told over and over again, that they must wait for the Economic Council to make its report at the end of the year before they can find out what kind of measures they will take. That is one answer we have been given.

Another answer I was given when I asked a question on the orders of the day was that the government feels its present economic and other policies are enough to ensure that the cost of living will not keep rising. Today we were told by the Minister of Finance (Mr. Sharp): "Just wait till I bring the budget down and perhaps you will find something there to deal with cost of living". I want to suggest that this is not good enough for the people of this country today.

What are the plain facts? The cost of living has gone up 3½ per cent over the last 12 months. The February price index, the latest one we have, shows that prices are up on nearly everything—clothing, housing, household utilities of all kinds. The most alarming increase has been in the price of food. When you come down to food, Mr. Speaker, you get down to rock bottom. You get down to the only item which is regarded as flexible for budgetary purposes, because the other items carry a fixed cost and have to be met.

• (9:50 p.m.)

The foods which are particularly affected are listed in the February index, as they were in the January index, and comprise butter and other fats, meat, fish and poultry and vegetables. They are the foods which are

absolutely essential for building healthy bodies and creating strong nerves and healthy minds. The women of this country have been propagandized by the government for so long now that they know these are the foods necessary to create good bodies, strong nerves and healthy minds. Now they are no longer able to buy those things and they cannot understand why the government they have elected, and the members they have elected to this house do not see to it that they are able to buy the foods that their families and husbands need to maintain good health.

I say that it is alarming to see food prices steadily going up. Food price increases hit us all but they do not hit us all evenly. You cannot look at people too much as if they are statistics in columns in a book. People are not statistics in books; they are all individuals and each one of their cases is different. Pressures on different people do not hit them the same way. The price rise in an item which merely irritates a person earning $10,000 a year may be a very serious thing for the worker with a family who earns perhaps $50 a week, and it may be catastrophic to a veteran or to somebody on an old age pension or some other kind of fixed income.

We do not realize that these rises in the price of foods are as serious as they are. Price rises strike at the very well-being of Canadian families. They particularly attack families in low and fixed income groups. I do not care, Mr. Speaker, how much we have in the way of automobiles, pulp and paper and all the other great things of our economy if we cannot find ways and means of feeding our families across this country. If we are not feeding them, we are not doing our job as members of parliament.

All these other things we have are simply wasted and useless unless the people of this country can have access to the foods they need. I think of thousands of families, not necessarily families in British Columbia but self-respecting families everywhere, most of them paying their own way, who are finding it harder and harder to make their pay cheques go around to buy the things they as families need to make a modern standard of living possible. They have every right to a modern standard of living.

I think of a young couple newly married who are trying very hard to set aside a little bit for the family they hope to raise, who are buying furniture on time, as are other people. Far from getting ahead, they are finding that the rising cost of living is robbing them even of the little they have been able to put aside; the rising cost of living is destroying the plans they have been making. They find that their future is dwindling and shrivelling like something being burned up in a fire. They are filled with despair because while they are doing everything they can in the right way the rising cost of living is depriving them of the fruits of their labour.

I think of Mr. and Mrs. M. and their five children. Mrs. M. knows all about the things that children need to have. She is a good, faithful and intelligent woman. She knows the need for a balanced diet and she cannot get it for her children any more. I have seen this woman in my own riding and others like her in other parts of British Columbia going into stores to shop, hoping to pick up those things which they bought the previous week and trying to buy perhaps one or two little treats for the family but finding that the price has risen two or three cents on this product, perhaps five cents on something else and a few cents on something else. I have seen these women come out sad and feeling very apprehensive about what is going to happen the next time they go shopping.

Things are made much worse when one realizes that these women cannot buy the food needed for the health of their children. I am not talking only of British Columbia. Here is a letter from a woman in London, Ontario:

> In this area over the last three months there has been an increase in milk, bread, butter, meat, fruit, vegetables, newspapers and bus transportation and not long before—hydro, water and telephone rates. It is pathetic to see our older citizens walk long distances in cold weather because they can no longer afford transportation.

Here is a letter from New Brunswick:

> The (Federal) Government granted a ten dollar a month raise in the old age pension some time ago and all of us got our rent raised $10 a month immediately so you can see that raise did not go far . . . Now the Provincial government is raising the sales tax to 6% from 3% on April 1st.

That is why our leader proposed that Ottawa should take the lead in calling the provincial governments together to consider how to establish a price review board. The provincial governments are levying their own taxes and those taxes are attacking the same family budget that high prices are attacking and lessening the value of the same family dollar.

Therefore we have to make a concerted attack on this sort of thing and this is the only place from which a concerted, well

directed attack can come. All across the country millions of families are waiting to see what the government is going to do.

Here is a letter from a mother of a family in Newfoundland who has a sick husband:

> Prices are preposterous and it's time someone did something about them. My sick husband needs a special diet, our son needs a high protein body-building diet, our other children also need body-building foods. Needless to say there is never enough to provide us with all this.

I want to say that all across Canada tonight these families are watching and waiting hopefully to see what if anything this government is going to do. They do not figure that a government that was just elected last fall has lost steam and they believe it still wants to do something. These people still hope that something is going to come out of Ottawa. However, they are not going to continue to believe that. They are not going to maintain that faith if there is no relief on the horizon.

What is the government doing about the rise in cost of living? This afternoon we heard the Minister of Finance say that now we are in a period of prosperity which is remarkable not only for being one of the greatest but also one of the most prolonged. That is simply not true for thousands of people in Canada today. They are living in insecurity and poverty and they need help badly.

What is the sense of having a society that is part affluent and part poor? In fact, those of us who are affluent will not long keep our affluence if we are going to permit poverty to exist. I say that instead of chasing all over Europe and the rest of the world looking for markets it is time we looked at the home market with a view to building up that market here in this country. Mr. Speaker, may I call it ten o'clock.

PROCEEDINGS ON ADJOURNMENT MOTION

A motion to adjourn the house under provisional standing order 39A deemed to have been moved.

EXPO '67—REFUSAL OF PERMISSION TO RECORD R.C.M.P. BAND

Mr. Joseph Macaluso (Hamilton West): Mr. Speaker, may I point out that this matter which I raised last Thursday and today is a very serious one that really affects the interests of Canadians. I think it is depressing that an international union with headquarters in New York should dictate whether or not a recording should be made of the Royal Canadian Mounted Police band at Expo '67, a band that is paid for by the taxpayers of this country.

Because the R.C.M.P. band members do not belong to a union Canadians are not going to be allowed to buy recordings of a tattoo by that band at Expo '67. This is a cultural project. It seems to me a very discriminatory practice that the American Federation of Musicians would not allow a Toronto recording producer, or for that matter any recording producer, to make records of the tattoo which is going to be presented by the Royal Canadian Mounted Police band. It is all the more discriminatory when such permission has been granted by this union to the U.S. army, air force, navy and marine corps bands whose members are also non-union and when their performances have also been cultural projects. But when the purpose of the R.C.M.P. tattoo is also cultural and a part of Canada's centennial celebration this union will not allow the R.C.M.P. band to make recordings.

• (10:00 p.m.)

I do not wish to speak at great length on this matter, but I think this is a ridiculous situation. The R.C.M.P. band is supposed to be one of the finest in our country and I think it is incumbent upon the Secretary of State (Miss LaMarsh) and the Minister of Labour (Mr. Nicholson), whom I see in the house, to intervene in all possible ways so as to obtain permission from the union for the recording to be made. If all these approaches fail I suggest that the government provide facilities through the C.B.C. or the National Film Board or any other crown agency to have recordings made of this band.

As one who has at times acted on behalf of international unions I think this is a disgraceful situation. It is completely discriminatory to allow United States bands to be recorded but not a Canadian band. This band has not even been allowed to perform at the Canadian National Exhibition because of this discriminatory practice and I suggest that the Secretary of State make every intervention possible and adopt every means open to the government to persuade the union to give its permission to have this performance recorded or else to allow crown agency facilities to be used for this worth-while project.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Albert Béchard (Parliamentary Secretary to Secretary of State): Mr. Speaker,

the question put by the member for Hamilton West (Mr. Macaluso) and drawn once again to the attention of the Secretary of State (Miss LaMarsh) and of the house today, refers to a matter of great concern and interest to the hon. member and seems obviously to result from a report in the Toronto *Daily Star* of March 11, 1966, written by Mr. Douglas Hughes. The latter expresses the grievances of a company called Arc & Sound Limited, of Toronto, and reported by its promotional manager, Mr. Ken S. Warriner.

Incidentally, I do intend to disprove categorically that part of the item of the Toronto *Daily Star* to the effect that the report promised by the Prime Minister in his secretary's letter dated November 30, 1965, in reply to that of Mr. Warriner, dated November 17, 1965, had not yet been provided on March 11, 1966. I reviewed the file fully and a report was submitted to Mr. Warriner explaining the whole matter to him on February 1 and 16, 1966.

[*English*]

Mr. Macaluso: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, I am not concerned with an article in the Toronto *Star* of which I have no knowledge. I am concerned only with what action is to be taken with respect to recordings of this particular band. I am not concerned about the producer named by the Parliamentary Secretary but about what action is to be taken.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Béchard: Mr. Speaker, the answer to the suggestion of the hon. member for Hamilton West to the effect that there is discrimination—and it is the question put to the Secretary of State, by the Vice President of the American Federation of Musicians in refusing the request by Arc Sound Limited—is easily given.

The house and the hon. member should know that all agreements entered into by the musicians' union and the recording companies, provide that companies may not record any musician who is not a member of the union, in this case the American Federation of Musicians.

Now the R.C.M.P. band are not members of the union and, consequently, there is no cause to cry foul play and discrimination.

Furthermore, since the hon. member and Mr. Warriner seem to insist upon what they call the ridicule of a Canadian band being dominated by a foreign labour organization, I may add that a similar proviso could be included in the regulations of a Canadian union and this company or any other would not have the right to record the R.C.M.P. band.

Mr. Warriner claims it would cost $40,000 in musicians' fees and suggests that the Prime Minister (Mr. Pearson) find the funds to meet this obligation. Having presented his case to the Minister of National Defence (Mr. Hellyer), he was told that it would not be advisable to take this amount from public funds to record the music of a military band for purely commercial purposes. The same reply was given by the Department of Justice who has jurisdiction over the R.C.M.P., and by the Centennial Commission.

However, the R.C.M.P. has no objection to having the music of its band recorded for commercial purposes, but since this would be a competitive engagement, the recording company would have to obtain permission from the American Federation of Musicians and provide the funds or find an acceptable sponsor.

[*English*]

Mr. Macaluso: I wonder whether the Parliamentary Secretary would allow me to ask a question?

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order.

Motion agreed to and the house adjourned at 10.09 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS

Tuesday, March 22, 1966

The house met at 2.30 p.m.

FINANCE

TABLING OF LETTERS RESPECTING SECURITY PURCHASES

Hon. Mitchell Sharp (Minister of Finance): On Friday last the hon. member for Middlesex West asked whether I would table copies of the letters which I had addressed to financial institutions in connection with the purchase of off-shore securities. I have pleasure now, with the consent of the house, in tabling copies in English and in French.

Mr. Speaker: Does the minister have leave to table the documents in question?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Mr. Douglas: Would it be possible to have this material printed either as an appendix to *Hansard* or in *Votes and Proceedings*?

Mr. Speaker: Is it the wish of the house that the document in question be published as an appendix to *Hansard*?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

[*Editor's note: For text of document referred to above, see appendix.*]

THE BUDGET

ANNOUNCEMENT OF PRESENTATION ON TUESDAY, MARCH 29

On the orders of the day:

Hon. J. Waldo Monteith (Perth): I should like to address a question to the Minister of Finance. Is the minister in a position to tell the house the date of the budget?

Hon. Mitchell Sharp (Minister of Finance): Yes, Mr. Speaker. I will be presenting the budget on Tuesday, March 29, at 8 p.m.

EXTERNAL AFFAIRS

VIET NAM—INTERVIEW WITH DELEGATION FROM VOICE OF WOMEN

On the orders of the day:

Mr. T. C. Douglas (Burnaby-Coquitlam): Mr. Speaker, I believe the Secretary of State for External Affairs this morning met a delegation from the Voice of Women. I want to ask the minister if he is able to accede to their request and make a forthright and forcible appeal for a cessation of the bombing of Viet Nam.

Hon. Paul Martin (Secretary of State for External Affairs): I outlined to the delegation which came to see me this morning what Canada was seeking to do by way of developing a further role for the International Control Commission. I also mentioned the efforts which were being undertaken by representatives of Canada in discussions with the government of North Viet Nam and the government of South Viet Nam. I pointed out that I felt, in view of these operations, that they would not expect me to comment specifically on some of the questions they put, including the one to which my hon. friend directs my attention. They seemed to accept the suggestion I made as the wise course in the circumstances.

Mr. Douglas: As a supplementary question may I ask the minister, is he prepared to give the house any statement with reference to the request that Canada take steps to prevent the export of equipment which can be used by either side in the war, particularly with reference to helicopter parts, Caribou planes and any other material which could be used for military purposes?

Mr. Martin (Essex East): Mr. Speaker, I do not believe there was any particular comment on that question. The fact is that there are no direct military exports from Canada to Viet Nam.

Mr. Douglas: As a further supplementary question, may I simply ask the minister whether his attention has been drawn to page 2 of the brief presented to him this morning.

Mr. Martin (Essex East): It would not be necessary to draw it to my attention, Mr. Speaker, because I read it with great care.

Right Hon. J. G. Diefenbaker (Leader of the Opposition): As a supplementary question, Mr. Speaker, would the minister say whether the interpretation that some of them gave to his answer to the request that Canada should recognize communist China, was well founded?

Inquiries of the Ministry

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Kootenay West.

Mr. H. W. Herridge (Kootenay West): Mr. Speaker, it is most interesting and unusual that I am able to bail out the Prime Minister, but I want to direct a question to the Secretary of State for External Affairs. While we know the government has the most peaceful intentions and wishes to do the right thing in respect to the war in Viet Nam, did the minister inform these ladies that basically the government of Canada supports the policies of the United States in this war?

Mr. Martin (Essex East): Mr. Speaker, I indicated to these ladies what we were doing, and they appreciated this. In fact in their brief they commended the government for the efforts it is making to bring about negotiations to end the conflict in Viet Nam.

BROADCASTING

REPORTED STATEMENT BY TRANSPORT MINISTER RESPECTING FOWLER REPORT

On the orders of the day:

Mr. R. N. Thompson (Red Deer): Mr. Speaker, I wish to direct a question to the Secretary of State. Would the hon. lady inform us whether the remarks made yesterday by the Minister of Transport, to the effect that there was no need for a broadcasting czar, mean that the government is intending to bypass the Fowler report?

Hon. Judy V. LaMarsh (Secretary of State): Mr. Speaker, I am not only not sure what my colleague means; I am also not sure what he is reported as having said, and I have not had an opportunity to ascertain from him what he actually did say.

[*Translation*]

NATIONAL DEFENCE

INVESTIGATION INTO CRASHES OF CF-104 PLANES

On the orders of the day:

Mr. Gérard Laprise (Chapleau): Mr. Speaker, I should like to put a question to the Minister of National Defence.

Is the minister investigating the causes of the crash of several CF-104 Canadian aircraft, some of them in Germany, recently?

[*English*]

Hon. Paul Hellyer (Minister of National Defence): Yes, Mr. Speaker. Each accident is individually investigated to determine the causes, so far as they can be determined.

[Mr. Diefenbaker.]

Mr. Andrew Brewin (Greenwood): As a supplementary question, would the minister say whether this is not the 36th or 38th of these Starfighters that have had trouble of this sort, and whether this individual case will be investigated in the light of the long series of accidents.

Mr. Hellyer: Each case is investigated, Mr. Speaker. This is a single engine airplane and when there is a flame-out, when the engine fails for any reason, it is almost always a write-off because of the very high wing loading. This is one of the problems you have with aircraft of that design.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Gilles Grégoire (Lapointe): A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker.

Could the minister tell us whether some of the inquiries into accidents in which the CF-104 was involved are now completed?

Could the minister tell us also if he has received the reports of such inquiries?

[*English*]

Mr. Hellyer: Oh, yes. In almost every case a report has been received and the causes are numerous, but in most cases the problem has been due to having only one engine on which to rely, with no auxiliary source of power when anything goes wrong affecting the engine.

TRADE

MAINLAND CHINA—CONSTRUCTION OF STEEL MILL BY WEST GERMANY

On the orders of the day:

Hon. George Hees (Northumberland): Mr. Speaker, I wish to direct a question to the Secretary of State for External Affairs. Does the Canadian government share the concern of the United States government, as expressed by Secretary of State Rusk, regarding the building of a $150 million steel mill in mainland China by West Germany?

Hon. Paul Martin (Secretary of State for External Affairs): Mr. Speaker, my hon. friend was kind enough to give me notice of his intention to ask this question. In reply I may say there is no internationally accepted prohibition on the sale of a steel mill to communist China. I think the question primarily is one for the countries which are involved.

Mr. Hees: Mr. Speaker, I have a supplementary question. Would the Secretary of State for External Affairs now answer the simple question, does the Canadian government intend to recognize the government of mainland China?

[*Translation*]

POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT

MONTREAL—DISPOSITION OF MONEY FOUND IN MAIL

On the orders of the day:

Mr. Clément Vincent (Nicolet-Yamaska): Mr. Speaker, I should like to direct to the Postmaster General a question concerning the envelope containing 58 $1,000 bills which was found in the Montreal post office.

Has the Postmaster General any indications on where the envelope came from?

Hon. Jean-Pierre Côté (Postmaster General): None, Mr. Speaker.

[*English*]

Mr. Speaker: I cannot see how this matter can be considered of such urgency that it should be asked at this time. I suggest the hon. member place it on the order paper.

Mr. Raynald Guay (Lévis): Mr. Speaker, I wish to put a question to the Postmaster General.

Could he inform the house whether the 58 $1,000 notes received at the Montreal post office are counterfeit or genuine?

Mr. Côté (Longueuil): They are genuine, Mr. Speaker.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Gilles Grégoire (Lapointe): Mr. Speaker, I should like to put a supplementary question to that of the hon. member for Lévis.

Since I have often received letters addressed "To whom it may concern", does the Postmaster General consider the possibility of forwarding to me the letter sent to the Montreal post office recently?

[*English*]

DAYLIGHT SAVING

SUGGESTED ESTABLISHMENT ON NATION-WIDE BASIS

On the orders of the day:

Mr. Lloyd R. Crouse (Queens-Lunenburg): Mr. Speaker, I should like to address a question to the Prime Minister. Yesterday being the first day of spring, many of our provincial governments now will be thinking of establishing daylight saving time. In order to establish uniform timetables for the railroads, bus companies, air lines, and radio and television networks, has the Prime Minister given any thought to establishing nation-wide daylight saving time by setting specific dates for the changeover from standard to daylight saving time and back again?

Right Hon. L. B. Pearson (Prime Minister): No, Mr. Speaker. I confess I have not given this any thought, but naturally I will now.

Inquiries of the Ministry

EXTERNAL AFFAIRS

RHODESIA—STATEMENT AS TO EXTENT OF EMBARGO

On the orders of the day:

Right Hon. L. B. Pearson (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, perhaps at this time I could deal with a question asked yesterday by the Leader of the Opposition concerning the effectiveness of oil sanctions against Rhodesia. To supplement what I said yesterday, I would confirm that while there have been a number of press reports about shipments of oil into Rhodesia, some referring to shipments from South Africa and others to shipments from the Portuguese territory of Mozambique, these reports refer, in addition to gasoline, to other petroleum products such as kerosene.

While there have been many reports of this kind, it appears that some of them are exaggerated. For obvious reasons it is difficult to arrive at an exact estimate of the quantities of gasoline now entering Rhodesia, but the reports the government has received indicate that the quantity reaching Rhodesia from outside is only part of the daily consumption, even under the stringent rationing now in effect. Despite the shipments of gasoline into Rhodesia the stocks of gasoline in that country, I am informed, are diminishing.

The hon. gentleman also asked about the amount of oil delivered to Zambia by the R.C.A.F. Up to March 21 the amount has been 3,475 tons of oil.

Right Hon. J. G. Diefenbaker (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, I do not know whether the question I have in mind will be regarded by the Prime Minister as improper; however, the question simply is this. On the basis of the latest information what are the expectations now in respect of the breakdown of the Smith administration by reason of the imposition of sanctions, particularly in connection with oil?

Mr. Pearson: Mr. Speaker, there is a commonwealth committee in London which is following the application of the sanctions. I believe it is to meet very shortly, and we will get a report on the effectiveness of the sanctions as we have been able to determine that effectiveness. All I would like to say at this moment is that the sanctions are being effective, but their full effect is perhaps going to take longer to see than we had thought to be the case when we met in Nigeria a couple of months ago.

[*Translation*]

SHIPPING

ST. LAWRENCE RIVER—STEPS TO PREVENT FLOODING

On the orders of the day:

Mr. Jean-Paul Matte (Champlain): Mr. Speaker, I wish to put a question to the Minister of Transport.

Could the minister tell the house if security measures have been taken to prevent floods along the St. Lawrence river?

[*English*]

Hon. J. W. Pickersgill (Minister of Transport): Mr. Speaker, every step that is appropriate for the Department of Transport to take is being taken in this matter.

[*Translation*]

Hon. Théogène Ricard (St. Hyacinthe-Bagot): Mr. Speaker, I should like to put a supplementary question to the Minister of Transport.

Has a request been made directly by the government of the province of Quebec to that effect?

[*English*]

Mr. Pickersgill: Not to my knowledge, sir.

ADMINISTRATION OF JUSTICE

STEVEN TRUSCOTT—REQUEST FOR INVESTIGATION

On the orders of the day:

Mr. Andrew Brewin (Greenwood): Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the Solicitor General. Will he in the course of checking on the Truscott case take a look at correspondence between the Department of Justice and the Truscott family, and take steps to ensure that no pressure is applied to persuade Steven Truscott to admit to the commission of a crime of which he has consistently claimed to be innocent?

Hon. L. T. Pennell (Solicitor General): Mr. Speaker, pursuant to my instructions the book in question is being carefully studied by the department, as well as the transcript of the evidence taken in the case which amounts to 2,284 pages. All the records of the department are being looked at, and certain correspondence which has been referred to by the hon. member will also be studied. I shall not be in a position to make any statement until that study has been completed.

Mr. Brewin: I have a supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Will the minister take a particular look at the letter from the executive assistant to the Minister of Justice dated November 12, 1965?

Mr. Pennell: I have made note of the hon. member's question, and I shall do so.

Mr. H. A. Olson (Medicine Hat): I have a supplementary question I should like to direct to the Solicitor General. Is he aware that the commissioner of penitentiaries has prevented any more members of parliament from visiting Steven Truscott, and does he concur in this decision to prevent such visits?

Mr. Pennell: Mr. Speaker, it has been traditional to permit members of parliament to visit penitentiaries and meet with inmates. I am advised, however, that the commissioner of penitentiaries discussed the matter of further visits with the father of Steven Truscott, who agreed that at this time it would probably be better not to allow any further visits except by the immediate family and a solicitor.

[*Translation*]

AGRICULTURE

MILK—REQUEST FOR ANNOUNCEMENT OF MINIMUM PRICE

On the orders of the day:

Mr. Gilles Grégoire (Lapointe): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Agriculture.

Could the minister tell us when he will announce the new policy on the price of milk and if he expects to increase the minimum price of milk to $4.00 per hundredweight in the near future?

Mr. Speaker: Order. It seems to me that this question was asked in identical terms yesterday, at which time the minister answered.

[*English*]

PORK—REPORTED LARGE IMPORTATIONS BY PROCESSORS

On the orders of the day:

Mr. Eric A. Winkler (Grey-Bruce): Mr. Speaker, I should like to ask the Minister of Agriculture whether he is now in a position to answer the question I posed yesterday.

Hon. J. J. Greene (Minister of Agriculture): Mr. Speaker, with regard to the question raised yesterday by the hon. member and the right hon. Leader of the Opposition, the situation is as follows. Imports of pork into Canada from January 1 to March 8 were 7,548,043 pounds. Exports of pork out of

Canada from January 1 to March 12 were 9,134,730 pounds. I think this is consonant with the normal pattern, as this is a North American market and imports and exports are normally fairly well balanced. From 1960 to 1965 imports into Canada totalled 44 million pounds annually and exports were 45.7 million pounds.

I might point out to the hon. member that the average price for grade A hogs at Toronto for February was 43.19 cents per pound, which was the highest on record. For the week ending March 19 it was 34.46 cents per pound. This drop occurred mainly for two reasons: first, hog marketings have increased from an average weekly total of 129,700 in February to 144,300 in the week ending March 19. There has been a parallel marketing situation in the United States.

It should be noted that the above price declines were from record high levels, and that present prices are still well above those of a year ago. On March 20, 1965 the price of grade A hogs at Toronto was 28 cents per pound, compared to 34.46 cents for the week ending March 19 this year. The national cumulative weighted average price for grade A hogs—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. The question is deemed to have been answered.

[*Later:*]

Mr. Winkler: Mr. Speaker, because you did not allow the completion of the answer by the Minister of Agriculture, I should like to give notice that at ten o'clock tonight I am going to debate this matter with the Minister of Trade and Commerce.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

CANADIAN CONSTITUTION

CHANGES IN AMENDMENT FORMULA SUGGESTED BY QUEBEC GOVERNMENT

On the orders of the day:

Hon. E. D. Fulton (Kamloops): Mr. Speaker, on March 4 on the orders of the day, in answer to a question from me the Prime Minister said that before any further consideration could be given to resuming negotiations on the matter of an amending formula for the constitution he felt it would be only proper to ask the government of Quebec to indicate the nature of the changes that it now thinks should be made. I asked whether the Prime Minister would make that inquiry and he said he would be glad to do so. May I ask the right hon. gentleman whether he has made the inquiry yet, and if so what answer he has received, if any?

Right Hon. L. B. Pearson (Prime Minister): Yes, Mr. Speaker, I have made the inquiry. I would prefer, if my hon. friend would agree—and I apologize for not having replied before—to make sure that I have the exact information as it came from Quebec city.

[*Translation*]

ADMINISTRATION OF JUSTICE

REQUEST FOR A ROYAL COMMISSION

On the orders of the day:

Mr. Maurice Allard (Sherbrooke): Mr. Speaker, I wish to direct a question to the Prime Minister.

Has the cabinet reached a decision respecting a royal commission to inquire into organized crime and did the Prime Minister get in touch with the provinces so as to obtain their consent?

[*English*]

Right Hon. L. B. Pearson (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, I cannot add anything to what I have already said on this matter. I hope to be in a position to make a statement about it shortly.

[*Translation*]

CANADIAN BROADCASTING CORPORATION

REPORTED SPEECH RESPECTING MONTREAL HEADQUARTERS BUILDING

On the orders of the day:

Hon. Théogène Ricard (Saint-Hyacinthe-Bagot): Mr. Speaker, I should like to ask the Prime Minister whether the hon. member for Saint-Jacques (Mr. Rinfret) was speaking on behalf of the government when he said, according to a release published in *Le Devoir* of March 22:

> —that the cabinet is now considering the funds to be appropriated for the building and will set the date shortly for the start of—
>
> —the C.B.C. building in Montreal.

[*English*]

Right Hon. L. B. Pearson (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, I shall have to look into the exact report in question and discuss it with my colleagues. Perhaps I shall be able to make a statement on this important matter very shortly.

Inquiries of the Ministry

[*Translation*]

NATIONAL SECURITY

REPORTED ADMITTANCE TO CANADA OF VIET CONG SYMPATHIZER

On the orders of the day:

Mr. Gérard Laprise (Chapleau): Mr. Speaker, I should like to direct a question to the right honourable Prime Minister.

Is the Prime Minister aware of the recent entry into Canada of a certain Ronald P. Ramsey and could he tell the house whether this person is a security risk for the country?

Mr. Speaker: Order. This question could be put on the order paper.

[*English*]

EMERGENCY MEASURES ORGANIZATION

MANITOBA—TALKS ON FLOOD ASSISTANCE

On the orders of the day:

Mr. L. R. Sherman (Winnipeg South): Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Minister of Industry. Can the minister advise the house whether the director general of the Emergency Measures Organization has yet reported to him on the substance of his flood cost talks in Winnipeg last week with the Premier of Manitoba?

Hon. C. M. Drury (Minister of Industry): Mr. Speaker, the director general of the Emergency Measures Organization was out in Winnipeg, Manitoba, to discuss what might be done in respect of possible future floods. I would not describe them as flood cost talks. It was with a view to the Emergency Measures Organization providing assistance that might be useful and necessary. He has not yet reported to me on the outcome of these talks.

INDUSTRY

DOSCO—REPORTED INTENTION TO REMOVE EQUIPMENT FROM SYDNEY PLANT

On the orders of the day:

Hon. C. M. Drury (Minister of Industry): Mr. Speaker, I should like to reply to a question yesterday by the hon. member for Cape Breton South, who asked whether the government was aware of Dosco's intention to remove production equipment from their wire and nail mill at the Sydney steel plant, and if so had the government received a request for aid or did it intend to give aid to this area.

[Mr. Pearson.]

The government has not received any request for aid, nor is it likely that one will be received in respect of this. I understand that the question involves the movement of two production machines, both controlled by one man, from Sydney to Etobicoke. The effect of this move will be to increase the sales of drawn wire by Dosco, resulting in a greater output of steel at Sydney and a net increase in employment of from nine to 12 man years.

[*Later:*]

Mr. Robert Muir (Cape Breton North and Victoria): I should like to ask the Minister of Industry if he has any knowledge of a reported request by Premier Stanfield for an investigation into the steel operations at Sydney.

Mr. Drury: No, I have no knowledge of a reported request for an investigation by Premier Stanfield.

UNITED NATIONS

INQUIRY AS TO PAYMENT OF ARREARS BY DEFAULTING NATIONS

On the orders of the day:

Mr. H. Russell MacEwan (Pictou): I should like to ask the Secretary of State for External Affairs if he has hopes that the various nations in arrears in their contributions to the United Nations will agree on a certain formula to alleviate the unnatural strain which is now on that organization. I understand there have been United Press reports to the effect that as the result of a meeting an agreement will be made, especially with France and the U.S.S.R., to pay these arrears.

Hon. Paul Martin (Secretary of State for External Affairs): As my hon. friend knows, Canada is a member of a committee that is engaged in the examination of the financial operations of the United Nations. As the result of a meeting that took place a few days ago a suggestion has arisen that one might expect substantial payments to be made by certain defaulting countries. I sincerely hope that this will be the case.

INDIAN AFFAIRS

CLAIMS COMMISSION—REPRESENTATIONS FROM BRITISH COLUMBIA

On the orders of the day:

Mr. T. S. Barnett (Comox-Alberni): I have a question for the minister of northern affairs arising from a reference on C.B.C. radio

news this morning to the Indian lands commission which will deal with claims arising from the Indian lands question in British Columbia. Has the minister appointed such a commission or does he intend to appoint such a commission apart from any commission or court that might be set up under the Indian claims legislation to which reference has been made in the house?

Hon. Arthur Laing (Minister of Northern Affairs and National Resources): In reply to the hon. member I might say I had a visit some time ago from Mr. Guy Williams, who is president of the native brotherhood. He asked that we delay the introduction of the legislation on Indian claims until a meeting was held with the native people of British Columbia on the so-called British Columbia lands question.

As my hon. friend knows, they are claiming that the aboriginal rights in British Columbia were never extinguished. They wanted to discuss it on that basis. I told him I would wait for some time until such a meeting was held. According to the press that meeting was held yesterday, and Mr. Williams has been in communication with my office today. He has informed us he intends to come to Ottawa next week. I have nothing to say beyond that.

FISHERIES

SEAL HUNTING—CONFERENCE TO CONSIDER AMENDMENT OF REGULATIONS

On the orders of the day:

Mr. Robert McCleave (Halifax): I should like to ask the Minister of Fisheries whether he has received a request from the Ontario Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals that a conference be held almost immediately to consider further amendments to the seal hunting regulations. Will the hon. gentleman consider convening such a meeting?

Hon. H. J. Robichaud (Minister of Fisheries): I wish to refer the hon. member to the statement I made in this house a few days ago, in which he will find a full answer.

CANADIAN CENTENNIAL

STATEMENT AS TO ORGANIZATION OF YOUTH PARLIAMENT

On the orders of the day:

Mr. J. M. Forrestall (Halifax): I should like to ask the Secretary of State if she might now be in a position to answer a question directed to her parliamentary secretary on Friday last with regard to the centennial youth parliament.

Hon. Judy V. LaMarsh (Secretary of State): Yes, Mr. Speaker. On Friday the hon. member for Saskatoon asked, in my absence, whether I had received any proposals for a centennial youth parliament other than those submitted by Mr. William Fair. The answer is yes, additional proposals in regard to this project have been put forward also by the staff of the centennial commission itself.

As for the member's suggestion that a parliamentary committee be set up to assist in consideration of this project, I think all I can tell the house at this stage is that the government is now considering how best to proceed with this matter.

CANADIAN BROADCASTING CORPORATION

APPEARANCE ON PROGRAM OF REPORTED VIET CONG SYMPATHIZER

On the orders of the day:

Hon. Judy V. LaMarsh (Secretary of State): I should like to answer a question which was directed to me on Friday by the hon. member for Edmonton West with regard to the appearance on the C.B.C. of Mr. Ronald B. Ramsey. I have checked into this matter with the officers of the corporation and am informed that Mr. Ramsey was in Toronto last week to record an interview for use on the well known program "This Hour Has Seven Days". As is customary in such cases, the C.B.C. paid Mr. Ramsey's travel expenses plus the normal honorarium of $150. The interview in question is to be shown at a later date as part of a program segment on Viet Nam which will include other points of view than those expressed by Mr. Ramsey.

TRADE

REQUEST FOR INTRODUCTION OF NATIONAL CO-OPERATIVE LEGISLATION

On the orders of the day:

Hon. Judy V. LaMarsh (Secretary of State): Mr. Speaker, on Wednesday last the hon. member for Burnaby-Coquitlam asked me a further question in regard to the work of the committee studying possible introduction of national co-operative legislation. I wish to inform the hon. member that the committee already has received a number of briefs and

informal representations from interested parties, and use has been made of these in the preliminary work to which I referred in my previous answer.

The committee feels, however, that its work has not yet progressed to the stage where it would be advisable or profitable to hold conferences or discussions with co-operative organizations. I can assure the hon. member that his representations in this regard will be kept in mind and that the government, for its part, will not introduce legislation without having given all interested parties adequate opportunity to put forward their views.

[*Translation*]

NATIONAL DEFENCE

NEGOTIATIONS WITH U.S. RESPECTING ANTI-MISSILE BASES

On the orders of the day:

Mr. Réal Caouette (Villeneuve): Mr. Speaker, I should like to direct a question to the Minister of National Defence.

Is Canada now negotiating with the United States to instal anti-missile bases on Canadian territory either at North Bay or at La Macaza?

[*English*]

Hon. Paul Hellyer (Minister of National Defence): No, Mr. Speaker.

[*Translation*]

NATO—POSSIBLE TRANSFER OF CANADIAN FORCES

On the orders of the day:

Mr. Gérard Latulippe (Compton-Frontenac): Mr. Speaker, I should like to put a question to the Minister of National Defence.

Does the minister intend to withdraw our armed forces from France? If so, is it his intention to bring them back to Canada or elsewhere in the western hemisphere?

[*English*]

Hon. Paul Hellyer (Minister of National Defence): Mr. Speaker, as my hon. friend the Secretary of State for External Affairs has told the house, this whole question is under consideration by the government at the present time.

Mr. H. W. Herridge (Kootenay West): A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Can I ask the minister if there is a possibility of the New Democratic party's program being fulfilled in this respect?

[Miss LaMarsh.]

Mr. Hellyer: I would think not. I am not sure what that program is, but I would think the answer is no.

EDUCATION

STUDENT MEANS SURVEY—FURTHER FEDERAL ASSISTANCE

On the orders of the day:

Mr. John Loney (Bruce): I should like to ask the Minister of Finance if he is now able to reply to the question I raised last Thursday concerning further financial assistance to the Canadian student means survey.

Hon. Mitchell Sharp (Minister of Finance): I regret that I am not yet in a position to answer the question. I am having inquiries made.

AGRICULTURE

INQUIRY AS TO APPLICATION OF CREAM SUBSIDY

On the orders of the day:

Mr. Jack McIntosh (Swift Current-Maple Creek): I should like to direct a question to the Minister of Agriculture, but before I ask the question I may say that a short answer of yes or no will be sufficient. Under the present government dairy policy, are all producers who ship cream entitled to a subsidy, or is there a gallonage figure set below which producers are not entitled to payments?

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member may get a yes or no answer on the order paper.

FINANCE

INQUIRY AS TO GOVERNMENT STEPS TO CONTROL BALANCE OF PAYMENTS

On the orders of the day:

Mr. David Lewis (York South): I should like to address a question to the Minister of Finance. In view of the statement made yesterday by the Minister of Trade and Commerce that foreign affiliated companies will have to make an all out endeavour if we are to hold our external payments gap to manageable proportions, will the minister inform the house what steps he proposes to take to achieve that desirable end?

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. It seems to me that this is the type of question which cannot be asked at this time.

[*Translation*]

QUEBEC—PURCHASE OF TELEPHONE COMPANY BY U.S. INTERESTS

On the orders of the day:

Mr. Gilles Grégoire (Lapointe): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Finance.

Can the minister tell the house whether the purchase of the Quebec Telephone Company by American interests is in violation of the guidelines laid down by the American Treasury Department?

[*English*]

Hon. Mitchell Sharp (Minister of Finance): Mr. Speaker, this is a question that would have to be directed to the United States government. It does not constitute an offence in Canada.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Grégoire: Mr. Speaker, I have a supplementary question for the Minister of Finance.

Could the Minister inquire from his American counterpart whether this is in violation of the guidelines issued recently?

Mr. Speaker: Order.

IMMIGRATION

HONG KONG—SHORTAGE OF EXAMINING OFFICERS

On the orders of the day:

Hon. Jean Marchand (Minister of Citizenship and Immigration): Mr. Speaker, on March 15 the hon. member for Edmonton West (Mr. Lambert) asked me if the department intended to correct the situation which existed in our Hong Kong immigration office because of a shortage of personnel. I checked and found that a Canadian agent had been added to the Hong Kong office as well as a native agent. At present it does not take any longer to accept or refuse applications at the Hong Kong office than at any European immigration office.

Last year 2,664 applications were examined at Hong Kong, compared with 4,352 this year. Therefore, there is no shortage of personnel there.

[*English*]

THE CANADIAN ECONOMY

NEWFOUNDLAND—INVESTIGATION INTO FOOD AND DRUG PRICES

On the orders of the day:

Mr. Max Saltsman (Waterloo South): Mr. Speaker, I should like to direct a question to the Prime Minister. My question arises from a report in this week's *Financial Post* to the effect that a royal commission has been appointed by the government of Newfoundland to investigate food and drug prices in that province.

My question is this. Has this matter been drawn to the attention of the Prime Minister? Also, since the rise in the cost of living is a problem facing all Canadians, has the government offered to assist the province of Newfoundland in its investigation? If so, what assistance is the government prepared to offer?

Right Hon. L. B. Pearson (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, I should have to look into this question. Perhaps if my hon. friend would put it on the order paper he could get a more complete and exhaustive reply.

EXPO '67

AVAILABILITY OF RECORDING FACILITIES FOR R.C.M.P. BAND

On the orders of the day:

Mr. Joseph Macaluso (Hamilton West): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Trade and Commerce. I should like to ask the minister if his department would approach Expo '67 officials to make recording facilities available to the R.C.M.P. band at Expo '67 so that records may be made available to the Canadian public as a cultural contribution to Canada's centennial year.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. It seems to me that the hon. member asked this question yesterday. I understand it was answered last night. This is substantially the same question, and it cannot be asked now.

Mr. Macaluso: But with respect, Mr. Speaker, this question was not answered properly last night.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Macaluso: Could it be debated at ten o'clock, Mr. Speaker?

TRANSPORT

HEARING OF APPEAL AGAINST ABANDONMENT OF C.P.R. SERVICE

On the orders of the day:

Mr. H. A. Olson (Medicine Hat): Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask a question of the

Minister of Transport or of the Minister without Portfolio, who I understand is interested in these matters. Has a date been set for a hearing of the petitioners in their appeal respecting the judgment of the Board of Transport Commissioners having to do with the Canadian Pacific train the Dominion?

Hon. J. W. Pickersgill (Minister of Transport): No, sir. One of the reasons no date has been set is that one of the parties to the appeal has not yet submitted the brief that that party undertook to submit. It was felt that all the briefs should be received before hearing the appeal. Perhaps the hon. gentleman could do something to facilitate the provision of the brief in question.

Mr. Olson: A supplementary question, Mr Speaker. I understand that a meeting will be held tomorrow morning with some of the mayors from western Canada. Will the cancellation of the Dominion be the specific subject matter of that meeting, or will other things be involved?

Mr. Pickersgill: I understood, sir, both from the correspondence with the mayor of Moose Jaw and the confirmation given by the hon. member for Moose Jaw-Lake Centre (Mr. Pascoe) in their talks with the government, the mayors were going to talk about passenger service generally, and not specifically about the Dominion.

HOUSING

REPORTED SHORTAGE OF MORTGAGE MONEY

On the orders of the day:

Mr. Reid Scott (Danforth): Mr. Speaker, I should like to direct a question to the Minister of Labour in his capacity as minister of housing. I have given him notice of this question.

In view of continuing fears being expressed by officials of the housing industry in Canada that the shortage of mortgage money is creating the danger of a critical stoppage in construction, has the government reached a decision with regard to re-entering the direct lending field for speculative housing? If so, what is the nature—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

Mr. Scott (Danforth): —of such decision?

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. This question was asked by the hon. member precisely in the same terms, and it was ruled out of order.

[Mr. Olson.]

[*Translation*]

MINES AND TECHNICAL SURVEYS

NORTHWESTERN QUEBEC—ASSISTANCE TO GOLD MINES

On the orders of the day:

Mr. Réal Caouette (Villeneuve): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Mines and Technical Surveys.

Has the minister communicated over the week-end with Quebec officials of the Department of Mines to examine closely the situation facing the gold mines of Northwestern Quebec?

Hon. Jean-Luc Pepin (Minister of Mines and Technical Surveys): I shall be making this telephone call in a few seconds, Mr. Speaker.

[*English*]

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE

INQUIRY AS TO EASTER RECESS

On the orders of the day:

Mr. Harold E. Winch (Vancouver East): Mr. Speaker, I desire to direct a question to the Prime Minister, not because I anticipate any holiday at Easter but in view of the fact that if there is to be a holiday, hon. members from western Canada must have many days' notice in order to get transportation. I would ask the Prime Minister what is in mind for Easter.

Right Hon. L. B. Pearson (Prime Minister): I think my hon. friend's interest will be shared by other hon. members of the house. His is quite a reasonable request. We ought to let the house know as quickly as possible what plans there are for what is often considered to be an Easter holiday.

Mr. Winch: I am sorry, Mr. Speaker, but I must ask a supplementary question. What has been said does not answer the problems of members from western Canada. Could we have information very shortly with reference to the holiday, so we can make our reservations?

Hon. G. J. McIlraith (Minister of Public Works): Perhaps I could help the hon. member by telling him that I think he would be quite safe in making his reservation for the Wednesday night immediately preceding Good Friday.

Mr. Winch: And returning when?

Mr. McIlraith: I cannot give any information at the moment about that, but I hope to be able to do so soon.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

SUPPLY

The house resumed, from Monday, March 21, consideration of the motion of Mr. Sharp for committee of supply, and the amendment thereto of Mr. Diefenbaker, and the amendment to the amendment of Mr. Douglas.

THE INCREASED COST OF LIVING

Mrs. Grace MacInnis (Vancouver-Kingsway): Mr. Speaker, when the house adjourned last night I was asking the question which literally millions of Canadians are asking more and more urgently every day. I asked, what is the government going to do about the rising cost of living? Everyone wants to know, and everyone needs to know. We must have action to bring the cost of living into line with the incomes of the people in this country.

• (3:20 p.m.)

The government may not like the idea of a prices review board as suggested by the leader of this party. Very well, let members opposite suggest and implement their own machinery for keeping prices within the range of Canadian family incomes. This is what must be done. What worries me, as it does a great many others in this house, is that so far there seems to be no realization on the other side of the house that inflation is now a major problem. It has been brushed aside. But this cannot be done any longer without there being serious consequences for Canada.

I touched last night at some length on the grave consequences to family health, well-being and human dignity across this country. But there are other consequences we must take into account. If the government persists in pretending that measures concerned with trade and other aspects of the economy will of themselves suffice to deal with the cost of living, hon. gentlemen opposite are in for a rude shock.

If this process of inflation is allowed to go on much longer, this steady rise in the cost of living month by month, and if the cost of food in particular continues to increase, every organized group in this country, including professional organizations, trade unions, and even pensioner groups to the extent that they can do so, will be bound to engage in an ever fiercer struggle to protect their living standards. This is inevitable. What will happen will be that the stronger ones will get their incomes increased while the weaker will be pushed down still further into insecurity and misery.

As surely as the sun will rise tomorrow, we in parliament will have to find more and more money to boost pensions and allowances for those whose purchasing power has been driven down and who have no effective means of raising their own incomes. I think this process is a stupid thing and vicious thing. There is no end to it. The time has come when the government should face the fact that incomes in this country must bear a sensible relation to the cost of living.

We say that the problem of holding the cost of living steady, or at least the cost of household essentials, is one which must be faced. We have suggested one way in which a start could be made. There are other ways in which action could be taken. But the important thing is action. We are deluding ourselves if we believe that steps taken to deal with big industries in this country will lead eventually to benefits trickling down to those in low income groups. This has nothing to do with reality.

I urge the government now, before it is too late, to deal as a matter of urgency with the cost of living as it relates to the incomes of ordinary Canadian families. It is one of the most important problems that we face this session.

Mr. Heward Grafftey (Brome-Missisquoi): Mr. Speaker, before I proceed with my remarks this afternoon I should like to express agreement with much of what the hon. lady has just said. It has always been my contention and the contention of members of this party that most Canadians do want to better their lot in freedom in the economic sense. Many of the hon. lady's remarks reminded me of the fact that we cannot talk about political freedom unless at the same time we concern ourselves with economic freedom.

In years gone by, though perhaps we never admitted it, inflation during relatively good times was something we learned to live with. It might be remembered that in past years most modern governments in the western world considered inflation as something which was inevitable, something which confronted most governments, especially, as I say, in good times. However, I suggest that today modern governments fully realize that the question of inflation, the question of an excessive rise in the cost of living, is one which must be dealt with. Otherwise, serious difficulties arise at home and the prestige of our country is seriously handicapped abroad.

Increased Cost of Living

If confidence is lost in the nation's money, if confidence is lost in the Canadian dollar, much harm is done at home and our prestige abroad is greatly impaired. I am sure the Minister of Finance (Mr. Sharp) and the government of the day will agree with this proposition.

At the outset of my remarks, Mr. Speaker, let me frankly admit that a solution to the problem of rising costs or excessive inflation in a Canadian context is not easy. In many ways we have no real precedents, no historical tools to serve us. Yet this is no excuse for a government to do nothing. A solution to the problem of inflation, a solution to the problem of rising costs, will need imagination, determination and a firm hand.

For this reason I, together with most members of the house, I feel sure, was appalled by the speech which the Minister of Finance made yesterday. What were we told of the government's plan to face a situation which the Minister of Trade and Commerce (Mr. Winters) himself described in Toronto as a serious one? The speech of the minister and the speeches of his supporters up to now have convinced me that the government of the day has no real plans to face the problem of rising costs.

Yesterday afternoon, after my leader had spoken, the minister was apparently satisfied to indulge in some unseemly partisan bickering. He gave us a historical survey of the sins of a past administration. Never for a moment did he doff his partisan blinkers. I ask the house, did the minister speak of one concrete plan which the government is adopting to fight inflation and rising costs? Did he talk about one single achievement which the government has to its credit since it came to power a few years ago in terms of facing this problem? All our members who heard the minister yesterday and all who have heard from supporters of the government since must answer, no. I would say that while the minister may have great administrative skills, while he may have been a technocrat of merit suitable to a bygone era in the '50's, both he and his government lack the drive and the imagination needed to face this problem in the '60's.

• (3:30 p.m.)

I do not intend to waste the time of the house with a long historial survey or a long historical treatise. But in 1957 when our party came to power—and I am not laying blame on the government or on this side of the house—we had to deal with a very serious problem, namely, the problem of unemployment. And in a partisan way I am not going to suggest for one single moment that we completely and entirely solved the problem. It was a difficult problem to solve, but I do say that the imaginative government of that day at least addressed itself to the problem of unemployment.

[Mr. Grafftey.]

I well remember that when I came into this house in 1958 members of the opposition front bench, including the now Minister of Transport (Mr. Pickersgill) and the now Secretary of State for External Affairs (Mr. Martin), legitimately day after day berated the government of that time on the questions of unemployment and employment. We addressed ourselves to that problem and I say to the members of the government, you must address yourselves to the problem of rising costs and inflation. Partisan surveys like the one given yesterday by the Minister of Finance will not be an answer to this problem and will neither be satisfactory to the members of this house nor to the people of Canada.

How did we address ourselves to the problem of unemployment in 1957 and 1958? Our approach in part included winter works, improvement of our national placement service office facilities, increased export sales abroad, the building of technical and vocational schools, and winter "Do It Now" campaigns. These are just a few of the things we initiated which I believe helped in part, but not entirely, to solve the problem of the day. Instead of engaging in partisan attacks on my leader and on our past record I say to the minister and his government, do not wait for the budget, a budget encompassing tax plans. I hope that before the vote is taken this evening a member of the government or one of the government supporters will stand up and tell us at least one concrete plan they have developed in order to face up to this situation, because up to now we have heard nothing.

I say again to the government that we had to face up to the problem of unemployment and I tell the members of the government that they must face up to the problem of rising costs and inflation.

Mr. Sharp: May I ask the hon. member a question?

Mr. Grafftey: Yes.

Mr. Sharp: Could he give us the figures to indicate the success of the efforts made by his government to combat unemployment?

Mr. Grafftey: I do not seriously believe the minister wants me to give him statistical information of this nature while I am in full flight.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh.

Mr. Sharp: Mr. Speaker, I apologize to the hon. gentleman.

Mr. Grafftey: Yesterday the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Diefenbaker) made some positive suggestions on how we might tackle the problem of rising costs and inflation. I intend, sir, in my brief remarks this afternoon to make some more. When the Leader of the Opposition criticized the government for spending—I think I am paraphrasing his remarks correctly—I do not think he was necessarily criticizing the quantity of the government's expenditures. What he was criticizing primarily was waste, duplication and lack of co-ordination in its spending and the lack of planning priorities with the provinces.

I think we all agree in this house that modern governments must and should spend money if the public sector of the economy is going to keep up with the private sector. We who are responsible for the public sector of the economy must play our part. We must spend more on research. We must spend more on hospitals, on education, urban development and redevelopment, housing and rehousing plans, parks, playgrounds, vocational schools, etc.

Again I say the Leader of the Opposition was not criticizing expenditures for legitimate and logical welfare measures, for education and the like. What we are criticizing is waste, duplication, lack of co-ordination and the lack of planning priorities with provincial authorities.

The hon. member for Vancouver-Kingsway (Mrs. MacInnis) and my hon. colleague, the member for Edmonton West (Mr. Lambert), have most ably established already the fact that in 1965 inflation and the rising cost of living constituted a serious problem and continue to be a serious problem today. If we base the index on 1949 as 100, we can see that the average yearly rise amounted to about two points, but between January, 1965 and December, 1965 the index went from 136.9 to 140.8, almost double the average. Who then could contend that inflation is not a serious problem, that rising costs are not a serious problem, and who could contend that we in this house are expecting too much when we ask the government, before the vote is taken this evening, to tell us at least one or two of its concrete plans in this regard?

I say that this government lacks the determination, the will, the direction and the imagination to deal with this problem in the '60's. The government front bench is filled with experienced technocrats who were perhaps able to conduct the nation's affairs in the '50's, but again I say they lack the imagination to grapple realistically with this problem in the '60's. Sir, unless something drastic happens between now and this evening we can but say and believe that the government has no plans in this regard.

Who in Canada, and I join hands with many members of the N.D.P. who have already spoken in this regard, are primarily affected by a rising cost of living? The answer is simple—the poor, the deprived and the destitute. The hon. lady from Vancouver-Kingsway and my colleague from Edmonton West ably pointed out the fact that when rising costs strike, when inflation strikes, foodstuffs, clothing and housing are affected, and it is the poor, the destitute and the deprived who get it in the neck every time.

Can we sit by, indulging in idle partisan talk and bickering while this situation faces us? I say no, Mr. Speaker. Good times rarely affect the poor, the deprived and the destitute. Prosperity and good times rarely affect them, but I submit that bad times and the remedies usually brought forward to correct them invariably do affect the poor, the destitute and the deprived.

Take as an example, sir, the old classical way of combating inflation and rising prices, a method I do not advocate in its entirety for future application. What happened in the past when governments occasionally moved in the classical sense to combat rising prices and inflation? It was said that government spending had to be cut, and interest rates rose in order to freeze credit. Who got it in the neck every time? It was the poor, the destitute and the deprived. They are watching this parliament, they are looking to this parliament for action and concrete plans and measures. They are not looking to this parliament for partisan historical surveys and bickering.

• (3:40 p.m.)

We want this government to face up to its responsibilities as we tried to face up to our responsibilities, not always successfully, in respect of unemployment. It is these people living on fixed or shrinking incomes who are largely affected by the problem of inflation

and rising costs; it is the old people of the nation who are so affected. That is the reason my leader and my party have suggested time and time again that instead of talking, discussing and having commission after commission we should raise the old age pension immediately right across the board as we have suggested, because if we wait for a commission to report and on its findings the people who deserve to have a fair share of our national income will be dead before the government acts.

What about poverty in this country? These things have been put on the record before, sir, but I suggest they should be put on the record again because it is the people in conditions of poverty who are affected. Mass poverty is one thing in the African and Asian countries; it is yet another thing in Canada where we have the second highest standard of economic living in the world. Far too many Canadians are not truly sharing in our nation's prosperity today.

Right here at home we have done a poor job in pushing back the frontiers of poverty and want. I submit that individual and national excellence will be a meaningless concept if millions of Canadians continue to subsist on barely minimal standards and conditions. We shall have to put an end to poverty amidst plenty at home, or what will our answer be to communism abroad? The leader of the New Democratic Party and many members of my party have continually put the following statistics on the record of parliament. The Ontario Federation of Labour tells us that in Canada today we can consider that families of four people with net annual incomes of under $2,000 are living in destitution. Who would not admit that? Further, families of four with net annual incomes of under $3,000 are living in poverty. Who would not admit that? Also, families of four people with net annual incomes of under $4,000 a year are living in deprivation.

With these statistics in mind I submit that over 30 per cent of the population of Canada is living in either poverty, deprivation or destitution, and these are the people primarily affected by inflation and rising costs. I think I have shared the experience of many members. Many of the people who daily come into my office in my constituency are the silent, voiceless poor. These are the people who never come under the aegis of private or public welfare help, and it is to the problems of these people that we must direct ourselves in this debate. Invariably these people never have been in an unemployment insurance office. They would not know what an unemployment insurance book or an unemployment insurance stamp looks like.

What does a prosperous Canada mean to so many people living in poverty? As I said before, let us not have the effrontery in this House of Commons to quote statistics to them. The hon. lady last night well said what effrontery it is to people who are living in poverty amongst plenty to have Dominion Bureau of Statistics figures continually quoted to them. These people are individuals. In fact, very often an ever-increasing gross national product locks more people into grinding poverty.

Today our rising gross national product means that many Canadians are becoming richer while more than 4 million are becoming poorer. Four fifths of us earn salaries or have incomes tied to rising production while the other one-fifth pays for the higher prices with shrinking incomes. I think that this in part is the crux of our debate of yesterday and today; in other words, as a free country we are going to have to put a halt to the type of poverty we have at home if we are going to have a meaningful image in the face of communism abroad.

We have already stated that probably we are not going to solve this problem with the old negative, classical approach to rising prices and inflation. I am not saying we should not to a certain extent consider government spending programs and interest rates when we are approaching the problem of rising prices and inflation, but I should like to discuss some positive measures which I think the government should entertain immediately.

If any government, no matter of what political stripe, is really going to tackle the problem of inflation and rising prices it must encourage the notion of what I consider to be individual and national excellence. Admittedly this very often involves increasing expenditures. First of all, I believe we are going to have to increase our expenditures on basic research in Canada. For every dollar which the Canadian government up to the present time has given per scientist in Canada the United Kingdom has given five and the United States government ten to fifteen.

I should like to hark back to some remarks made in this house the other evening by the Minister of Trade and Commerce. I think, sir, that with specialization and selectivity we

must emphasize the quality of our ventures rather than the bigness of our enterprises. This is a very difficult subject to discuss, but living next to a country which has the highest standard of economic living in the world we are very often working in areas of activity in which we have no business to be.

I think the dictates of reality in the modern world mean that living next to the United States we must enter into various areas of economic activity, but still I wish to emphasize the fact that in the past we have entered into areas in which we have no business to be. As a parliament I think we should keynote the fact that we should encourage individual and national excellence and should underline specialization and selectivity and the quality of our ventures.

We must encourage people to emigrate to our shores and join with us in nation building.

The government must do more than it has up until now to sell more of our products abroad.

We must encourage the idea of an ownership democracy. What do we mean by an ownership democracy? It simply means that by a system of self-liquidating government guaranteed loans we help people to help themselves. This will mean more good farmers on good farms; it will mean more independent businessmen owning their own businesses; it will mean more Canadian families owning their own homes. This is the reason we advocate a tax rebate for home building and construction, and this is the reason we advocate the abolition of the 11 per cent tax on building and production machinery.

• (3:50 p.m.)

It means more than that. It means that as a nation we must encourage foreign capital to come to Canada to help us in the process of nation building. At the same time, we must encourage more Canadians to participate in investment in Canadian enterprises. We as Conservatives believe that democracy is well served when as many people as possible have an ownership stake in their country.

What about the problem of excessive interest rates? We in this party, as well as every member of this house who has stayed close to his constituents, recognize that it is very often the poor, destitute and deprived who are not only affected by rising costs and inflation but are the people who are gored by excessive interest rates. That is why in confronting this problem our party has discussed and put forward the idea of a consumers loan act.

We recognize that many home owners must make legitimate and valid expenditures for household goods and effects. I believe, as do many of the members of my party, that we must do something for these people because they should be able to obtain government guaranteed loans for these legitimate expenses. As other members have said, we must put real teeth into our monopoly and price-fixing legislation.

What about our farmers, Mr. Speaker? While we find poverty in the decaying centres of our large cities and metropolitan areas, where do we find poverty in our rural areas? We find it spread indiscriminately throughout the countryside and in our rural villages and towns. At the present time we have 500,000 rural Canadian families with a net annual income of under $2,000. The farmer is the man who gets it in the neck when governments do not deal with inflation and rising costs. The farmer is caught today, while the government does nothing, in an intolerable cost-price squeeze. Today he pays much more for his grain and machinery than he did ten years ago but he gets approximately the same amount for his produce.

What is the government doing about this problem? Are they going to say a single thing about it before the debate terminates this evening? Time and time again we have put forward a positive program for the farmers. Amongst other things we feel there should be a program of crop insurance for all farmers in both the east and the west. Farmers must receive a realistic average price of $4 per hundred pounds for milk. The government must make a much greater effort to sell our agricultural products abroad, and we must establish as soon as possible an eastern feed grain agency so the farmer can pay less and have a more realistic price for his grain and feed. We must spur on ARDA legislation if the farmer is not going to be caught continually in a cost-price squeeze. This situation indicates the typical failure of the present administration in its ability to put good legislation into effect and into practice.

The present Minister of Forestry (Mr. Sauvé) and future minister of forestry and rural affairs, I assume, has constantly refused to consult the people who are meant to be affected by the ARDA legislation. I condemn the minister in simple terms because he believes that pure public planning will provide all the answers. The Minister of Forestry

in his failure to get the ARDA legislation off the ground lacks the support of what I call the third group in modern society, those non-public and non-private bodies or associations whose support is needed in order to translate legislation into meaningful results.

My last general topic is the following. I think most of us sitting in all sections of the house realize today that we make no progress in a federal or national sense, in an economic, social or political way, unless the government does everything possible to strengthen confederation and strengthen federal-provincial relations. It has already been stated that a government that cannot strengthen federal-provincial relations cannot deal with various problems such as inflation and the cost of living because time and time again members who have addressed themselves to this debate yesterday and today have recognized that only a high degree of federal-provincial co-operation will even begin to tackle the problems of inflation and rising costs.

We realize this, Mr. Speaker, because the provinces have a large part to play in controlling prices. What has happened since this government has come to power? Why have they been unable to get co-operation from the provinces and face the problems of inflation and rising costs? What happened to the program put forward by the first minister of finance of this government? His whole domestic and economic program failed and foundered on the rocks simply because this government consistently refused to consult the provincial authorities, especially in conjoining jurisdictions. What is the situation now, a few years and a few months later? Nobody in the government and on the treasury benches at this time will define or lead the federal cause. The pendulum has swung to the other extreme while a rudderless federal government drifts and flounders.

What must be done immediately? Let us not wait for more commissions and more hearings and that kind of activity on the part of the government. We are in a minority situation and we are here to co-operate. Just because some good ideas emanate from our side of the house, do not shoot them down automatically ipso facto. Let us put our nation first and make this minority parliament work.

As has been suggested time and time again on both sides of the house and by provincial premiers in a bipartisan spirit putting the country before party, if we are going to strengthen federal-provincial relations and really meet problems such as inflation and rising costs we are going to have to plan spending priorities in the economic and social fields with the provinces. Our leader mentioned this yesterday. When is the government going to take the proper initiative in this regard?

Second, the government is going to have to provide leadership in improving permanent consultative machinery between Ottawa and the provinces. The type of machinery we have in the Privy Council office of the Prime Minister is a beginning but it is not good enough. Permanent consultative machinery must be improved as between Ottawa and the provinces.

What is my third suggestion? Our party believes that we must have a great conference with the provinces in order to give Canada a modern constitution suited to modern times. I do not know whether I am speaking for my party in this regard but as an individual member I personally believe that the B.N.A. Act as it now stands cannot confront present problems, be they inflationary or associated with high costs of living, between Ottawa and the provinces. We must have a modern constitution suited to modern times and I suggest that an all-party parliamentary constitutional committee should be established as soon as possible to meet with similar bodies of all provinces. Following that we should have a great national conference with the provinces in order to devise a constitution suited to modern times.

I do not think I am being a dreamer when I say we must be realistic and should not expect miracles overnight. Some feel the B.N.A. Act is flexible enough for current needs while others feel it needs greater or lesser amendments. Still others feel that we need an entirely new constitution. The point is, sir, that these various points of view should be brought to the conference table as soon as possible because every day we delay, every day we wait, is a lost day.

• (4:00 p.m.)

Together with many members of all parties in the house I suggest that we should celebrate our centennial with agreement on a modern constitution suited to modern times. Only when this is done in a modern nation like Canada can all levels of government truly tackle problems such as inflation and the rising cost of living. But this government's record in the field of federal-provincial relations is appalling; it is terrible. Any

time my leader has made a suggestion for strengthening this country and bringing groups together, has the government once answered those suggestions with concrete counter-proposals? No. They say he is anti-Quebec and that is the only answer they have ever thrown at us. I suggest to hon. members opposite that we should pump the partisanship out of this discussion and get down to the business of concrete discussion.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Grafftey: Canadians in every section of this country, be they French speaking or English speaking, do not want to see partisanship injected into this debate. I know that one of the great problems facing Canada and this parliament is something that we find very difficult to deal with. Sometimes it is dangerous to talk about it. The government receives a great percentage of its support from the province of Quebec. The major party in opposition receives a great deal of its support from western Canada. What is going on in Canada right now? While Quebec is going through a type of quiet revolution, people in the western part of our country who are largely represented by this party speak with a new, outlooking, dynamic point of view relating to Canadianism. To my mind the strength and the glory of Canada are what we see in Quebec and out west. Instead of bickering and arguing, let us join hands across the floor of this house and all over Canada. Let us not plunge this debate into a partisan discussion. I would suggest that if we all made this resolution our nation would be a better place in which to live.

What has happened since this debate took place, since the right hon. Leader of the Opposition proposed the amendment to the supply motion? We in the opposition have shown the serious situation relating to rising prices and inflation. We and members of other parties have told the house which Canadians are largely affected and hurt by this situation. These are the poor, the destitute and the deprived. We have, in our opinion, listed a few positive measures which we feel must be enacted in order to confront the problem of inflation and rising prices. We have contended that the government has done nothing and during this debate has not put forward a single concrete, positive measure in order to combat the serious situation. For this reason, Mr. Speaker, I now call for the support of all hon. members in every corner of this house in voting for the amendment put forward yesterday by the right hon. Leader of the Opposition.

Hon. E. J. Benson (Minister of National Revenue): Mr. Speaker, I have been listening patiently for two days to hon. members opposite and waiting for suggestions to come forward to deal with the problem of the cost of living. I have not heard a single suggestion from the other side of the house to deal with this immediate problem except that put forward by the New Democratic Party. Of course the government is concerned with the cost of living. People are naturally concerned with the cost of living. Living costs have been moving up faster than they did during the term of office of the former government. As a matter of fact, the cost of living index has never moved up very fast during periods when Conservative governments were in power because inevitably these have been periods of high unemployment in Canada. A great percentage of the labour force was not employed and the cost of living did not go up. I will deal with the figures of unemployment later.

Mr. Ricard: That was because you did nothing up to 1956.

Mr. Benson: In order to put this matter in perspective we must recognize the fact that the cost of living increases in Canada over the years since this government came into office have been the second lowest of any western industrialized nation. The only country which has had slightly lower increases in the cost of living is the United States of America. France, Britain, Sweden, Spain and Italy have all had greater increases in the cost of living than we in this country.

My primary reason for entering this debate was to deal briefly with some propositions put forward by the right hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Diefenbaker) in his speech yesterday when he introduced the motion now before the house, a speech which to my mind was amazing in that it was directly contradictory in what it said and was not very factual. First of all, of course, I missed in this sort of financial debate the humour of the late George Nowlan in the kind of speech which he would have made. Second, when I left the house last evening I felt there was something else missing and after thinking a while I decided that the right hon. gentleman's speech really lacked the perception of the former member of the right hon. gentleman's cabinet who is popularly known as the

Senator from Bay Street. Indeed, it did not even have the perception which one would expect from the member representing St. James Street.

I wondered where the hon. Senator was and found that he had gone fishing. I think the big difficulty with the speech of the right hon. Leader of the Opposition yesterday was that he and the Senator did not arrange their fishing trips at the same time.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh.

Mr. Ricard: This is constructive isn't it?

Mr. Benson: What did the right hon. Leader of the Opposition say in his speech? He started off by saying that he would like to move a motion to change the terms of reference with which Mr. Justice Spencer—

Some hon. Members: Mr. Justice Spencer?

Mr. Benson: —has to comply but that it was too late to do so now.

Mr. Vincent: It is Mr. Justice Spence.

Mr. Benson: The right hon. Leader of the Opposition had that opportunity last Monday, a week ago, when we asked him to introduce such a motion and he refused to do so.

Mr. Diefenbaker: That is not so.

Mr. Benson: Instead he used up the whole day in debate.

Mr. Diefenbaker: That is not so.

Mr. Benson: It is so. Next, the right hon. Leader of the Opposition went on to quote from a very eminent source, the Minister of Trade and Commerce (Mr. Winters) who had made a speech in Toronto. In that speech the minister said:

> —the government must be selective in its spending program and resolute in resisting pressures to spend beyond its means.

Those are fine words and I agree with them wholeheartedly. But then the Leader of the Opposition said:

> These are some of the things that we have been saying.

I have been in the house since this government was formed and I tried last night to think of one occasion when hon. gentlemen opposite said that we should reduce expenditures. We have only recently finished discussing the estimates for 1965-66, and the only thing they suggested reducing was the salary of the Minister of Justice (Mr. Cardin), knowing full well it could not be reduced no matter what kind of motion they put forward.

Mr. Ricard: Who said that? It was not us. It did not come from us; it came from your friends the Socialists.

Mr. Vincent: He is all mixed up. He spoke about Mr. Justice Spencer.

Mr. Benson: I should like to know what expenditures the right hon. gentleman suggests we should reduce. I have been waiting for suggestions in this regard. He said that the solution of the problem, and this was the only solution he put forward, was to reduce government expenditures. Therefore I have been wondering what expenditures we should reduce. We are waiting for suggestions from that side of the house as to the type of expenditures that should be reduced. I shall point out a few errors in the figures used by the right hon. gentleman.

Last night I looked at the estimates for the year 1966-67, estimates which I had the honour of tabling in this house, which amount in total to $7,950,459,478, not $9,318 million as stated by the right hon. gentleman at page 2943 of *Hansard*. I looked at the main expenditures included in these estimates and one of the highest, of course, is national defence. What has happened to national defence expenditures since this government took office? They have been almost frozen. If you take a look at national defence expenditures over the period that this government has been in office, you will find that they have not increased; we have the same level of expenditures except for the increased cost of the same goods and materials included.

• (4:10 p.m.)

The next item at which I looked was national health and welfare. The right hon. gentleman opposite said during the course of his speech that we should increase the old age pension to $100 per month. Does he think that we should cut down the family allowance payments or the payments to the blind and disabled? Does he think we should cut down our hospital grants? Does he think, for example, we should take the $3 million out of the final supplementary estimates which we put in for additional medical research? I should like the other side to offer concrete suggestions where the government can cut down on its expenditures.

Another point the hon. gentleman made was that there was going to be a very high balance of payments deficit this year. I agree that there is going to be a high balance of payments deficit on current account. However, I think the statement should be placed

in perspective. I am referring to the current account. In 1957 the deficit was $1,455 million; in 1958, $1,131 million; in 1959, $1,504 million; in 1960, $1,243 million and in 1961, $982 million. Those high years were when there was high unemployment in Canada. Then, in 1962 the deficit was $874 million; in 1963, $557 million and in 1964, $453 million.

Why is the balance of payments deficit going up this year? One of the reasons is that Canada is engaged in the largest industrial expansion in its history. In order to carry out this expansion a great deal of machinery is being imported into this country. I think if hon. gentlemen opposite will take the time to analyse the increased deficit in current account trade with the United States this year, they will find a very large portion of it is made up of the cost of machinery imported into this country. These imports are creating factories and jobs for the people of Canada.

I should like to point out one or two other slight errors in the speech made by the hon. gentleman. Yesterday he said that Canadians were the most highly taxed persons in the world. Perhaps he would like me to quote his exact words. He said, "If we are not the most highly taxed people, I know of no other nation which approaches us". Well, I should like to refer him to page 443 of *Hansard* for April 26, 1965 where he will find a comparison of income tax rates in Canada with those of the United States.

He will find that the total taxes for single persons with an income of up to $50,000 are lower in Canada at all levels than they are in the State of New York in the United States. For married couples with two children with an income of up to $15,000 the taxes in Canada are lower than they are in the United States. I should like to ask the hon. gentleman to prove the statement he made.

Yesterday the right hon. gentleman spoke of the automotive trade pact, at which time he made another slight error. He said that this monument of $50 million per year resulted from the removal of the excise tax. I should like to inform the right hon. gentleman that the excise tax was not involved at all; it was customs duties.

Mr. Ricard: Oh, what an argument.

Mr. Benson: I should like to point out that I believe the Minister of Industry (Mr. Drury) indicated in this house that the reduction in automobile prices last year was more than the amount of the tax involved. The whole argument put forward by the right hon. gentleman yesterday was that we should curtail government spending and at the same time we could cut taxes. In particular, he suggested the elimination of the 11 per cent sales tax.

He suggested at the same time that we should increase the old age pension and pour more money into the economy. He said the economy was operating at a high level. Thanks to the efforts made by this government, it is operating at a high level. However, he wants to pour more money into the economy in order to get rid of inflation.

Mr. Diefenbaker: Is this a preview of the budget?

Mr. Benson: This is not a preview of the budget. I was going to mention that the proper time to deal with the matter of inflation and with other economic matters is during the speech by the Minister of Finance (Mr. Sharp) next Tuesday night during the presentation of the budget.

What is the economic situation in Canada at the present time? Unemployment at 3.9 per cent in 1965, was at the lowest level since 1957. I was very interested in the remarks made by the hon. member for Brome-Missisquoi (Mr. Grafftey) about the effort that was put forward by his government in order to decrease unemployment. I should like to point out what the results of that effort were. In 1958 unemployment was 7 per cent, in 1959, 6 per cent, in 1960, 7 per cent, in 1961, 7.1 per cent and in 1962, 5.9 per cent. Then we come to the terrible Liberal years about which hon. members have been complaining. In 1963 it was 5.5 per cent, in 1964, 4.7 per cent and in 1965, 3.9 per cent.

Mr. Coates: I should like to ask the minister where he gets the figure for the unemployment rate as 3.9 per cent of the labour force? The statistics I have indicate that the unemployment figure for all Canada as of February 19 stands at 4 per cent, with 65,000 of those unemployed located in the Atlantic region.

Mr. Benson: I am using a weighted average throughout the years in all the figures I have given, including the years in which the right hon. gentleman opposite was in charge of the government.

What has happened to the gross national product in Canada over the past several years? In 1958 it increased 3.1 per cent, in 1959, 6.1 per cent, in 1960, 3.9 per cent, in 1961, 3.3 per cent, in 1962, 8.2 per cent, in

1963, 6.5 per cent, in 1964, 8.9 per cent, and the estimate for 1965 is 9.5 per cent.

How many people are employed in this country? In 1958 there were 5,706,000 people employed while in 1965 there were 6,862,000 people employed, an improvement of 1,156,000 during that time. Comparing 1962 with 1965 we find that there were 637,000 additional jobs created in those three years. All of us recall the wonderful years when the gentlemen opposite were in power, the years when our deficits ran from $609.3 million in 1958-59—

Mr. Diefenbaker: Have you got information for us on the United States?

Mr. Benson: —to $513.1 million in 1959-60.

Mr. Diefenbaker: Are you responsible for the improvement in the United States too?

• (4:20 p.m.)

Mr. Benson: We are only responsible for Canadian figures. In 1959-60 there was a $513 million deficit. In 1960-61 it was $340 million, in 1961-62 it was $691.6 million and in 1962-63 it was $791 million. In the first full year when this government was in power the deficit was $38 million. The Minister of Finance has stated that the deficit will be low in the current fiscal year as well.

Mr. Grafftey: What has all this to do with inflation?

Mr. Benson: When this government came into power unemployment was high in Canada. The aims of the government, and I think these would have been the aims of any government, were, first and foremost, full employment in this country.

Mr. Grafftey: Hear, hear.

Mr. Benson: Second, we wanted a rapid rate of economic growth. Third, we wanted reasonable stability of prices. Fourth, we wanted a viable balance of payments and, finally, an equitable distribution of rising income. These are aims that are accepted in a modern state. The trick is not to accomplish any one of these aims alone but to achieve all of them at the same time and to do it consistently.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Benson: This government has made every effort to do just that. I could go into the means employed in order to achieve the economic aims but hon. members have heard them all before. I might mention a few such as the policies taken by the previous minister of finance by way of special depreciation allowances in order to encourage capital expenditures, the special inducements in designated areas, the establishment of the municipal development and loan fund, the establishment of the Atlantic development fund; the $500 house building bonus, the provisions for assistance in the fields of vocational and technical training, the provision of guaranteed loans to students, and so on.

I think that the economic accomplishments that have occurred in Canada since 1963 have been creditable.

Mr. Diefenbaker: Other than the cost of living.

Mr. Benson: The cost of living has increased by the second smallest amount of any western civilized nation.

Mr. Diefenbaker: Oh, oh.

Mr. Benson: I should like now to deal briefly with the proposition put forward by the New Democratic party to set up what they call a prices review board. I do not think that in this country people would accept a prices review board unless along with this went a wages review board. I for one would not want to see a wages review board in Canada and I do not think the members of the New Democractic party would either.

You cannot control prices in a country unles you control wages. If you want to go to the ultimate control of prices and wages, then you have to do the sort of thing that was done in wartime when there were wage and price controls in Canada. I do not think this is acceptable to the Canadian people and it certainly is not acceptable to this government. Furthermore, I do not think it would be acceptable to hon. members opposite. Instead, we must use economic means and the financial proposals in our budget to try to contain all aspects of the economy so that we can move forward with high employment and a real increase in our gross national product with relative price stability.

What has this government done in the field of prices? Reference has been made to the Economic Council of Canada which, incidentally, was created by this government for the purpose of finding the best means to carry out the objectives in the long run which I have put to you as the economic objectives of the government. The reference to the Economic Council was that it was to study factors affecting price determination and the interrelationship of movements in prices,

costs, levels of productivity and income and, second, to report on the representations respecting sustained economic growth and the achievement of high levels of employment, trade, and rising standards of living and, third, to review the policies and experiences of other countries in this field and their relevance to Canada.

In a speech delivered on March 21 Dr. John J. Deutsch, chairman of the Economic Council of Canada, had this to say when making reference to the particular aspects I have mentioned:

> The government has asked the Economic Council to undertake a comprehensive study of the basic relationships between prices, costs, incomes and stable economic growth. The government has also asked the council to review the policies and experiences of other countries, and their relevance for Canada. The council now has under way a major research program to assist us in our study of these important matters. The fact that a basic study of this nature has not previously been undertaken in this country poses serious problems both as to the availability of information and a body of analysis. The serious lack of information makes it impossible to get quick results which could serve any useful purpose. These problems are likely to be with us for a long time and therefore it is important that the council's conclusions and advice should be soundly based. We hope to be able to report on these issues later this year.

Before this matter was ever brought up in the House of Commons, other than by way of questions, the government took this step to have the relationship between costs, prices and wages looked into by the Economic Council of Canada. We are presently awaiting the report of the Economic Council. Indeed, as I recall it, the Minister of Finance was worrying about price increases before the chairman of the Economic Council actually made a statement on this very problem after submitting his second report.

I believe that the record of this government in the economic field has been good. I do not think that the rise in prices to date has been as serious as it might have been if the economy had not moved forward evenly pricewise and wagewise.

I am the first to admit that prices are too high. Prices are always too high for people. Increases in prices bear hard on people on fixed incomes. However, I do not think that there is any easy or fast solution to this problem. I think that we must take steps as a government, through budgets which are presented by the Minister of Finance of this government, to combat undue increases in prices while at the same time making sure that this country moves forward with full employment and with increasing productivity and a better standard of living for all Canadians.

Mr. Robert C. Coates (Cumberland): Mr. Speaker, the Minister of National Revenue made the kind of contribution to this debate that one has come to expect of him. He heads a department that comes closer to producing the dictatorial bureaucracy all Canadians fear and which all Canadians find is becoming more predominant in government today. This is the same minister who could not get out of the house fast enough to lable the Conservative party as being anti-Quebec last week but who was not willing to make the same kind of statement in this house when the irresponsible statements of the Minister of Justice were being debated. The minister put a great number of statements on record.

Mr. Benson: Would the hon. gentleman permit a question? I did not hear him when he said something about some minister labelling the Conservative party as anti-Quebec. Was he by any chance referring to me? If he was, that is just not a fact, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Coates: The minister's statements about the leader of my party are certainly not factual. In that I will agree with him. Otherwise I will not comment further.

• (4:30 p.m.)

The minister took time to put a great number of facts on the record about what a great and wonderful job the government has done since assuming office, which has been instrumental in producing a buoyancy in the economic welfare of this nation second to none that it has ever experienced. One would think that when they took office on April 8, 1963, unemployment was at a desperate level, the economy was at a desperate level and Canada was in the throes of a recession. In actual fact Canada had been in a boom period ever since 1961 and everyone knew it. Every economist referred to it. Members opposite talk about the cost of living showing the second lowest increase in the free world. I will put some facts on record to indicate that when we were in office the increase in cost of living was not the second lowest in the free world but the lowest.

No government ever assumed office in better times than did the present one. The recession which plagued our government ever since we assumed office following the St. Laurent administration had been conquered and the economy was showing the progress

which took us into the boom period in 1961. Employment was on the rise. Half a million more people were at work in 1962 than in 1957. Labour income was up by 25 per cent, farm cash income by 19.3 per cent, exports by 30.8 per cent, social justice payments by 79 per cent and payments to provinces by 124 per cent.

What of the cost of living during that period? Canada was the world leader in price stability. No less an authority than the late President Kennedy praised our efforts in the following statement on January 22, 1963:

> With the single exception of Canada, the United States last year had the best record of price stability in all the industrialized world.

In September, 1962, the magazine, *Canadian Business,* stated:

> A 12-nation comparison of retail price increases over the 12 months shows that Canada has been the most successful in keeping down the cost of living. The Canadian increase was just under 1 per cent. The United States was only a shade more. Biggest increases were in France, Holland and the United Kingdom where the cost of living rose by over 5 per cent. In Germany and Sweden it rose by 4 per cent.

What of economic growth? The Minister of National Revenue tries to tell us there was none in Canada between 1957 and 1963. This is the story they tried to tell the Canadian people in 1962 and 1963 and again in 1965. What was enonomic growth like in Canada? When this government assumed office, the *Economist* said—the minister can dispute what the *Enonomist* says if he likes—that Canada had outstripped every nation in the world in the rate of economic growth in 1962 with an increase of 8 per cent. While we increased social justice payments by an unprecedented 79 percent we maintained the cost of living in our nation as no other free nation of the world.

This is what we should be getting today from the government, and if we had a government today that is what we would be getting. But we are left without a government; we are left with a rudderless mess. When we assumed office in 1957 we in Canada were buying $713 million more than we were selling, but these deficits were eliminated and replaced by surpluses in 1961 and 1962. Where are we going today? There is no doubt that with the unprecedented increases in the cost of living from month to month we shall soon price ourselves out of the export market, placing ourselves as a result in another Liberal recession, the same situation as in 1957 when we took office.

[Mr. Coates.]

No government could have anticipated a greater legacy from a defeated administration than that headed by the present Prime Minister (Mr. Pearson). They knew the facts in the election campaigns of 1962 and 1963 but chose to dupe the electorate with Madison Avenue techniques to overshadow and undermine the successes of the administration of the present Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Diefenbaker). There is no doubt about this today in the minds of the electorate. No government came to office with more fanfare. None has ever remained in the state of constant chaos which has been our misfortune since April 8, 1963. Canadians have now come to realize the inbred ineptitude that plagues the present administration. But even with its stumbling and stupidity there are areas of this nation which continue to prosper. There is no direction, no goal, unless it be to survive from one crisis to the next with an absolute absence of leadership.

We were criticized during our years in office for the establishment of royal commissions to secure background and recommendations on such matters of national importance as banking, taxation, health and transportation. Today the royal commission has been replaced by the inquiry and the subjects of these inquiries leave much to be desired in the minds of most Canadians. What of the royal commission reports now available to the government from those commissions which we established? They sit gathering dust because this government's ineptitude is so complete it cannot guide the ordinary business of this country to its natural conclusion, legislative action.

Today we find the taxpayer being plunged ever deeper in debt. The government is preventing private enterprise from expanding in a desired manner because of its wish to spend and spend and spend in a time of boom, or near boom when it should be withdrawing from the economy to the benefit of private enterprise. The Minister of National Revenue asked the Leader of the Opposition to state what items should be cut from the list of those upon which the government intends to spend money. Well, it is about time this administration started to do some governing itself and ceased to call on the Leader of the Opposition to give direction.

I say it would be much better for everybody in Canada if the Leader of the Opposition were sitting where the Prime Minister is now so that we could be getting the direction we need in order to go forward in a

healthy way. Take my area of Canada, the Atlantic region, where 20 per cent of the unemployment in this nation is found. The Minister of National Revenue would almost lead us to believe that these people are not in existence. I say to him that there are 365,000 people in Canada who are unemployed today. That figure is not from the Martin bureau of statistics; it is from the Dominion Bureau of Statistics. No responsible minister in a responsible government would stand up in the House of Commons and brag about the fact that 365,000 people are unemployed. Yet the minister endeavoured to do so by his failure to mention how many people are unemployed in Canada today. Instead, he gave us statistics, and unreliable statistics at that. He said that 3.9 per cent of the labour force were unemployed. Yet the February issue of The Labour Force says that 5 per cent are unemployed. I do not know what to believe.

An hon. Member: I do.

Mr. Coates: I think we will rely on the Dominion Bureau of Statistics rather than on the Minister of National Revenue, though he is a chartered accountant and all the rest of it. Out of those 365,000 I might point out that 65,000 are located in the Atlantic provinces where the unemployment rate is not 3.9 per cent but well over 10 per cent. What is the government doing to reduce this rate or even bring it close to the national average?

• (4:40 p.m.)

An hon. Member: Waiting for suggestions.

Mr. Coates: Well, it would not make much difference if we made them. Today in the House of Commons when we are debating matters of national importance affecting all Canadians we find only two cabinet ministers present out of a total of 26 or 27. I am not sure how many there are because they have so many new departments and are shifting around all the time. But only one thirteenth of the cabinet is present to listen to the suggestions that are being put forward. The Minister of Finance (Mr. Sharp) does not even find it possible to come here when we are debating a subject for which he is responsible.

The 65,000 unemployed in the Atlantic provinces are told that we cannot progress at a faster rate because tight money is in the nation's best interests. The Minister of Finance is unwilling or unable to cope with the special problems of our region. We are the first to feel the effects of a recession and the last to overcome those effects; yet we are told to sit back and whittle on a block of wood until the rest of the nation overcomes the dangers of the boom period it is now enjoying.

I say to the Minister of Finance that we see no indications of boom in our part of Canada. We see no danger of over-expansion. We see only misery and suffering if special attention is not forthcoming to recognize our special needs in so far as tight money is concerned.

Where is the special attention, so evident during the Diefenbaker years, to our special problems? We are not interested in being grateful to anyone, as the Prime Minister (Mr. Pearson) feels we should be, for we do not look upon Ottawa as if we were a beggar but as an area of Canada determined to progress on the basis of sound economic planning that demands recognition from the central authority of our legitimate grievances. Certainly the present rate of unemployment and the tight money policy are not compatible in our area and immediate action should be forthcoming to assist in eliminating both.

What of the cost of living? We earn less and work longer for what we earn in the Atlantic provinces. We have a larger number of pensioners per capita than any other area of Canada. Nowhere is the spiralling cost of living, so evident in our nation today, more crippling than in the Atlantic area. The Minister of Trade and Commerce (Mr. Winters), a fellow Nova Scotian, has stated that the government would have liked to increase old age security payments but could not find the revenue. My, that is really touching. It can find $100 million for the C.B.C. every year but it cannot find $100 million to increase old age pensions. What a joke is this statement by the minister. What a miserable joke to perpetrate on those who in many instances are not able to subsist on their present pension cheques. What an irresponsible joke for a government that stands by and watches the cost of living index spiral upwards and by its inaction is taking food out of the mouths of those who need it most.

This is the government we have in Canada today. It is a government so involved with its own inability to govern that it has no time for the problems facing the people. If more ministers would sit in the house when debates are going on they would know more about what is happening in the nation. If they sit in their ivory towers they will never know what is happening to the people of

Canada; yet that is what we see each and every day in this house.

Government ministers are so divided within their ranks that it is impossible to produce a consensus on any given subject. This is what we are told we must live with because the electorate cannot face the thought of another election. Surely, sir, the time will soon arrive when the government will have proven beyond the shadow of any doubt that it is incapable of providing the leadership this nation, approaching its 100th birthday, must have if we are to move forward with national policies that will produce the kind of nation we are capable of being on this North American continent.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Réal Caouette (Villeneuve): Mr. Speaker, the motion and the amendments we are now discussing clearly indicate that the cost of living is rising constantly in Canada.

This state of affairs did not come about in the last few days, or the last two or three weeks. In fact, the cost of living has been rising constantly since the end of the war in 1945. Now, the amendment moved by the Conservatives states: In view of the fact that the cost of living index for the month of February, 1966, reached an all-time high, namely, 142.1 points, this house regrets that the government has failed to act effectively to hold down the cost of living and halt inflation which is having a serious effect on the economy generally and particularly on all people in receipt of social security payments, on war pensioners, old age pensioners, those on fixed incomes, and all low-income groups.

• (4:50 p.m.)

The situtation was the same, Mr. Speaker, when the Conservatives were in power and they did nothing either in this regard to alter the situation which existed from 1957 to 1962. Why? Surely not because some Conservative ministers did not sincerely want to change the situation. And today, if nothing is being done, it is not that the ministers are not willing to halt inflation and the rise in the cost of living. The ministers today cannot, like those of yesterday could not, I think, halt inflation and hold down the cost of living.

As long as our financial system remains the same, a system which prevails in the public administration of Canadian affairs on the federal, provincial, municipal and school levels, we shall never halt inflation or hold down the cost of living. The system itself produces inflation. Money created by a private system

commands that money or credit shall end up larger than when created. Such a system involves the germs and the factors of inflation and rise in the cost of living.

The Conservatives, as well as the Liberals, do not want to realize that it is so. Yes, they realize it, but they do not want to say so in the face of the public. The only organization in Canada which is presently prosperous is the financial organization. The financial sharks and leaches benefit from the situation the year round and constantly. The people pay the piper. The people must pay the bills presented by the financiers.

The other organization enjoying some prosperity is the Canadian parliament, because it has the means to practise vandalism, to rob workers, farmers, all the social classes, professionals, manufacturers and small businessmen. It increases taxes or levies new taxes. In fact, Mr. Speaker, since the end of the war, have we not seen fantastic increases in taxes and new taxes in Canada: federal taxes, increase in the income tax, provincial taxes, taxes here and there, school taxes which were increased recently, municipal taxes, all sorts of new taxes, which promote inflation and prevent holding down the cost of living.

Recently, in the Hull area, was there not a strike by teachers? They were striking against the school board, against themselves in fact. They got an increase in salary but the next day, the school tax was increased by 50 cents per $100. When will this increase in taxes end? Taxes contribute to inflation and to the rise in the cost of living.

The amendment moved by the New Democratic party says this:

[*English*]

and this House further regrets that the Government has not established a Prices Review Board to determine the extent to which price increases are unjustified and to take appropriate steps to reduce such prices accordingly.

[*Translation*]

That means, in plain French, that members of the New Democratic party are in favour of the establishment of a price control commission, such as we had during the war in 1942, 1943 and 1944.

Mr. Speaker, price control means control of wages and production, control of consumption and of the individual. That is why when the vote is taken tonight, we shall vote against the inconsistencies of the New Democratic or Canadian socialist party.

Mr. Speaker, they certainly advocate an incentive to the black market. When the C.C.F. or N.D.P. says that during the war, we benefited from the price control board I say —and I know it personally—that there was a black market in Canada at that time. One could get goods with the small coupons of the government that did not take into consideration the needs of the human being and the population in general. Moreover, thanks to those buying stamps, those small coupons, we could get on the black market, provided we paid more, any kind of goods we wished. That is the policy the members of the New Democratic party would like to introduce at present in Canada. Mr. Speaker, that does not work with the Canadian people and the members of the New Democratic party know it.

An hon. Member: The old C.C.F. party is looking for it.

[*English*]

Mr. Winch: Not in Quebec.

Mr. Caouette: No, not in Quebec, nor in any other place. They have changed their program about 15 times in 10 years. They do not know where they are going.

Mr. Boulanger: They have changed their program.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Caouette: Mr. Speaker, as long as our present system will be respected, adulated and even idolized by some people, it will be impossible to hold down the cost of living and to check inflation. When salaries are increased, the higher salaries raise the cost price of goods. I am in the automobile business and I have mechanics working for me. If I pay them $2.25 an hour and charge a customer $4.00 an hour for labour, in short, if I must raise the salary of my employees by 50 cents an hour, naturally, I shall have to charge 50 or perhaps 75 cents an hour more to the customer or consumer who requires the services of my establishment. This is quite understandable.

A business or anything else is run that way. Salaries are included in the cost price of goods. When salaries are increased by 25 to 50 cents an hour and if the retail price of an item goes up by 60 or 65 cents, then the people do not have more purchasing power, but there is inflation, indeed.

What is the cause of this inflation? The system which always requires the industrialist, the businessman, the employer to make decisions or raise salaries and, by the same token, increase his production costs.

Mr. Speaker, it is exactly like a cat running after its tail. It runs in circles all the time. A price increase results in a salary increase, and so on. We have been going around in circles like this for almost 25 years, since the end of the war.

Mr. Speaker, I was listening a while ago to the Minister of National Revenue (Mr. Benson) saying that the Conservatives had made no suggestions, and that is a fact. It is all very well to say: cut the expenses. Why did they not cut the expenses when they were in power? And the present government offers no suggestions either. They attack each other, one claiming the other did no better when in power and the other saying: When we were in power, we tried to do better than you. Finally neither one does any better than the other. They are both in the same bag.

The New Democratic party suggests price control. This will still change nothing. It is a poultice on a wooden leg. That is their solution.

The Créditistes, on the other hand, propose to increase the workers' and the Canadian people's incomes without letting this increase be absorbed into the cost of products, without increasing the salaries included in the operating costs.

The Créditistes propose an increase in purchasing power that would not be absorbed into the cost of the goods. Then we have a true increase in purchasing power. By what means? We are suggesting a new way of doing it: compensated consumer discount, so that the consumer can secure an increased purchasing power through a discount at the store where he buys his goods.

The second method, or second proposition: the distribution of a national dividend to every Canadian citizen. Not a dividend based on the moon, no. Not a dividend based on nothing, as the Minister of Citizenship and Immigration (Mr. Marchand) was pleased to claim on television, no. But a dividend based on the actual production in Canada.

Everyone admits that this year the gross national production will be worth over $50 billion and everyone knows, at the same time, that our national income, for the same period, will reach approximately $37 billion. There is a discrepancy between the total production made by Canadians and the income earned by Canadians. There is a discrepancy of $13 billion. Thirteen billion dollars to enable

Canadian citizens to buy the existing products, and that amount does not exist. I see that my hon. friend from Matapédia-Matane (Mr. Tremblay) is shaking his head. All the same, it is true that there is a discrepancy of $13 billion between the production and the purchasing power, the people's income.

If you take into account the speed with which money changes hands, supposing that it stands at 2.4 per cent, then you can say that with $6.5 billion you could balance the purchasing power with the real production in Canada.

But it must be done and no action is taken. Instead of cutting into the system, they are trying to cut into the individuals, the contractors, the industrialists, everywhere, all the social classes, instead of cutting into the financial circles which are responsible for the present situation in Canada. They cut into the citizens, the people who are building Canada instead of those who are destroying it.

When the Créditistes talk about a national dividend, they are shocked. A national dividend distributed by the provinces, Great Britain, Jamaica, in short everywhere in the world, that is all right. But the distribution of a national dividend to the Canadian people, who are building Canada, that cannot be done.

• (5:00 p.m.)

[*English*]

Mr. Bigg: Sheer nonsense.

Mr. Caouette: Like my hon. friend at the other end on this side, he looks just like nonsense.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Speaker, what are the solutions advocated by the Conservatives, and particularly by the hon. member who just said that is nonsense? Make concrete proposals and we will support them wholeheartedly. We are not narrow-minded like you. Our minds are open to new ideas, but come to us with something new, not always with the same old stories, the same old excuses: there is no money, nothing can be done because no credit is available. Canadians are asked not to invest in the United States because the United States no longer wants to invest in Canada.

The discount rate of the Bank of Canada is increased. How? Do you think that increasing the discount rate of the Bank of Canada will fight inflation in the country, when people have to pay more in interest? Do you believe that we are going to fight, slow down or halt the rising cost of living with the increase in the discount rate of the Bank of Canada? The Créditistes suggest the immediate establishment of a national credit commission, made up of experts—I would not even see any objection to the hon. member for Matapédia-Matane being appointed to a position on that commision—study the facts, the true data on the Canadian economy and prepare something which could balance the economy of our nation.

Mr. Speaker, we suggest the creation of a national credit commission which shall make sure, at all times, that the Canadian people will have a purchasing power large enough to buy the Canadian production, that such production will serve the consumers.

Here you will say to me: What about our imports and exports? This changes nothing in the problem, for we are seeking, through all possible means, to export as much as we import—which is quite natural—so that we can have, as much as possible, favourable balances of payments.

Now, this changes absolutely nothing to the solution advocated by the Créditistes, which is that the Canadian public should always have enough purchasing power to buy the products made by the Canadian people, including products exchanged with other countries of the world. Everything is included in that national production.

Mr. Speaker, although the dividend solution is not accepted, nothing keeps the Créditistes from continuing to explain the logic of that solution to the nation as a whole.

Some day members of parliament who will not look at the true solutions to the present economic problems will be replaced by others who will consider such in depth. There is no other way, because at this time, we are getting deeper and deeper into taxes and unpayable debts.

The other day, my colleague from Lapointe (Mr. Grégoire) said that the federal government could never pay off its national debt. And that is true. Our municipalities will never be able to pay off their debts. Neither will the provinces, except Alberta and British Columbia; but the other provinces do not follow their example. School boards and individuals are in the same situation.

This system is basically wrong. Take for example the Central Mortgage and Housing Corporation, which assists in the construction of houses. As you know, there is at present

an 11 per cent tax on building materials, which further raises the price of houses.

I shall take my own case as an example.

In 1963, as we sit all year long, I buy a little house in Hull, not through Central Mortgage and Housing Corporation but through the Mutual Life Insurance Company. The contract stipulates monthly payments of $88. That is in 1963. When municipal and school taxes are added, my monthly bill is $114 instead of $88. That is for the monthly payment on the house plus the taxes. After three years, my monthly payments are now $132. According to the statement of account for the past year which I received last week, I paid $1,534 to the Mutural Life Insurance Company, including $810 in interest, $510 in taxes and $200 and some odd dollars on the capital. That was for last year.

Mr. Boulanger: Would the caisse populaire not have done better?

Mr. Caouette: My hon. friend from Mercier (Mr. Boulanger) asks me whether the caisse populaire would not have done better. Mr. Speaker, a member of Parliament may perhaps cope with such increases, but think of the ordinary labourer, the Hull or Ottawa carpenter, the Noranda miner who buys a little house through the Central Mortgage and Housing Corporation, having read newspaper advertisements which proclaim: Buy a lovely little house, own your home for just $85 a month.

Mr. Speaker, a worker, a miner, a labourer buys a house, using all the savings accumulated during 15 or 20 years of work, and becomes a property owner, but four or five years later, he finds himself in trouble because the monthly payment goes up following an increase in the school and municipal taxes, and instead of $85 a month, he has to pay back $125 or $130, and then he is forced to put his house up for sale. That is why we see today in many cities in Canada, and particularly in the province of Quebec, workers fighting a system which makes them lose the savings they accumulated during 15, 20 or 25 years of work.

Mr. Speaker, that system cannot go on much longer; it cannot continue with impunity to exploit the masses, the farmers and all social classes.

That is why I urge the Liberal government, the ministers concerned, the Minister of Finance (Mr. Sharp) or the Minister of National Revenue to give Canada a financial system which will reflect the real growth of Canada in the economic, political and social fields and will make it possible to see in our monetary system the real things the Canadian people are asking for.

If the evil lies in the financial system, it should be corrected. And that is where the evil lies when a school which costs $200,000 must be paid back at the rate of $300,000 or $325,000.

Mr. Speaker, it is pure and simple inflation when a little house worth $13,000 costs $28,000, $29,000 or $30,000 when it is finally paid for. Therefore, let us correct what must be corrected, namely the financial system. Let us break the financial shackles which bind the people. Let us not be afraid to throw light on those who exploit the people, who prevent the production and the consumer goods from reaching the consumers in order to set up in our country neither inflation, nor price control, nor something which does not make sense, but a balance between the production of Canadians and their purchasing power.

Then, Mr. Speaker, we would be able to say that we have in Canada a system of economic, political and social freedom and a sound economic system to serve the private individual.

We do not need a government to control us, but to serve the private individual. Let the government be at the service of the human being and then Canada will grow, not only from an economic standpoint, but from a cultural point of view, in national unity and mutual respect between the various elements of our population.

Then we shall be able to say: Canada is a prosperous country and it is inhabited and developed by prosperous Canadians.

• (5:10 p.m.)

[*English*]

Mr. John R. Matheson (Parliamentary Secretary to Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, we listened last night with interest to the address of the right hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Diefenbaker) concluding with a motion to the effect that the government has failed to act effectively to hold down the cost of living. As I read his address, and I have read it several times, it appears to me to be a great exercise in inconsistency, with on the one hand a recommendation for increased spending in certain sectors, and on the other a very violent criticism of the policy of this government for spending, spending and more

spending. The right hon. gentleman toward the end of his speech said:

> The government goes on with its other programs and spends and spends.

I have heard it said that the right hon. gentleman can be compared to the shopkeeper who sells a dozen oranges for 34 cents when he is out of stock but at 74 cents when he has them for sale.

During the course of this debate we have been waiting anxiously for precise recommendations as to the course that hon. members of the opposition would like to see pursued.

Mr. Vincent: This is the speech of the Minister of National Revenue (Mr. Benson).

Mr. Matheson: No, this is my own speech. I think it can be pointed out that the primary responsibility for direct control of price movements in normal circumstances, that is in conditions outside of war or extraordinary emergencies, belongs to the governments of the provinces and not to the federal authority. There are certain things, of course, that the federal authority can do which are helpful. I point out only by way of example the current policy for improving the technical training and mobility of workers in industry, which helps to relieve labour bottlenecks. In fact, I think this has gone further with our scientific approach to immigration. Second is the policy assistance in easing the expansion of demand by stretching out the federal construction program and helping the provincial governments to postpone work on some shared-cost programs. This, of course, can be successful only to the extent that it meets with the support of the provincial authorities.

The problems that have been raised by hon. gentlemen in the opposition are of course not peculiar to Canada. Today's *Globe and Mail* carries an article entitled "Higher Pay, Slow Growth Threaten Inflation, Europe Told". This Associated Press article datelined Geneva says:

> Soaring wages and a relatively slow growth rate are threatening western Europe with inflation—

The writer points out:

> —hourly industrial earnings in western Europe increased during 1965 by 7.5 to 11 per cent. This compared with a rise of 3 per cent in the United States.

The increase in the consumer price index over the past few months is not unexpected. Hon. members are aware of the supply shortage of meats, for example, which is due to a variety of causes. One is the increased demand for meat by Canadians and Americans. In the area in which I reside is located the largest cattle export point in Canada and I am aware of some of the factors that have caused an increase in cattle prices.

In addition, the introduction of the Canada and Quebec pension plans have undoubtedly led to a modest increase in costs and prices. I do not wish to go into this matter in detail but anybody who studies the effect of these two plans appreciates that initially they will result in certain modest increases. When the adjustments accompanying the introduction of the pension plans have been completed, they will no longer serve to stimulate higher costs and prices.

I am compelled, by some of the comments made by the hon. member for Cumberland (Mr. Coates), who was making comparisons with respect to the performance of this government and the former government, to refer to some of our Canadian economists with respect to conditions prevailing now and those which prevailed a short while ago. I think nearly all hon. members are familiar with the work of Harry G. Johnson, Professor of Economics, University of Chicago, who in 1963 in a book entitled "The Canadian Quandary" said:

> —I believe that the outstanding problem of the past five years has been mass unemployment. Second, I believe that the problem of mass unemployment has been seriously aggravated by perverse economic policies ineptly pursued by the Canadian economic policy makers.

When we study his chapter on economic growth and economic policy we see that Dr. Johnson indicates emphatically that "the past five years have witnessed the development of serious concern about the laggardness of economic growth in the three English-speaking countries of the North Atlantic region—the United Kingdom, the United States, and Canada." Then he says:

> In the United States and Canada, slow growth has been associated with other phenomena of economic stagnation—higher average unemployment than was previously considered normal, excess industrial capacity, and weak recoveries from recessions—

He makes a comparison with what prevailed in the United Kingdom until the previous year, which would be 1962-63, and other countries in western Europe. Then he says:

> The slow rates of growth realized in these three countries—

The United Kingdom, the United States and Canada.

—have been in sharp contrast with the rapid economic growth of Europe in the post-war period, and, for Canada and the United States, with the relatively high growth rates realized in the immediate post-war period.

So now we observe another situation wherein Europe is from a competitive point of view running into some of the burdens of higher costs and particularly higher labour costs. I would submit, Mr. Speaker, that an appreciably rising price level is predominantly a symptom of an economic problem rather than its cause. Those who are concerned with this phenomenon which in loose terms is described as "inflation" should be concerned with moderating and not increasing the rate of growth in demand for goods and services. I seriously ask the question whether the Leader of the Opposition has made any contribution whatsoever to this important economic problem.

• (5:20 p.m.)

The objective of monetary policy is to promote growth of the economy. Continued strong expansion of demand in the economy is our objective. In each of the past two years total spending on goods and services has risen by almost 10 per cent. Canada has experienced a major wave of capital expenditures by private business and by governments. Such expenditures have risen by more than 15 per cent in each of the last two years. Unemployment has been reduced to historically low levels and operating rates in most industries are now close to capacity.

I want to refer later in my comments to some rather classical comments by Von Haberler which were used in 1933 to describe some of the problems of the upswing. These indicate that economists at that time had a clear understanding that the economy in upswing may operate close to its effective capacity and that pressure of demand is likely to overload productive capacity. I think this is the burden of the warning of the Minister of Finance (Mr. Sharp). Monetary policy has always had to take account of the fact that we must borrow very substantial amounts of capital from financial institutions and markets in the United States if we are to pay for the balance of payments deficit of the size we are currently running. This is not a new phenomenon in Canada. We are well familiar with this pattern of trade. Interest rates in the Unites States have risen sharply in recent months. This puts a special burden on borrowers and presents Canada with a new, a special problem. It is more difficult for borrowers to find the money that they require and they have to pay higher interest rates. We have essentially a new problem of credit.

When I mention that the total of bank loans outstanding has increased by 16 per cent over the year ended February, 1966, I think we can appreciate this serious problem of our economy undergoing a rapid period of growth. Clarence L. Barber of the University of Manitoba is an economist for whom I have had a lot of respect over the years. He speaks of austerity in 1962 and says:

The source of our current difficulties goes back to the year the Conservatives first came back into power. Although Ottawa completely failed to understand it, Canada in 1957 was just entering a period that called for skilful monetary and fiscal management. The problem was there for any government. Well handled, Canada could have come through the period with flying colours. In fact, after five years of slow growth and a record level of unemployment, we have blundered our way into the present mess.

I think everybody on this side of the house likes to feel that if a Liberal government is capable of doing things it is capable of doing them particularly well in the area of finance. We think back to people like Dunning, Ilsley, Abbott, Harris, Gordon and we think that the name of Sharp is in this tradition. I feel that C. D. Howe made a contribution to our growth that was perhaps exemplary.

Mr. Ricard: All these people were white?

Mr. Matheson: I am sure I do not understand the hon. member's comment. I continue the quotation:

In 1957 Canada was enjoying—

These are the words of Professor Barber:

—a capital spending boom of record size. The Trans-Canada pipe line was being built. The. St. Lawrence Seaway was under way. Uranium mines and smelters were being rushed to completion. And with the shortages created by Suez there was a great burst of oil and gas exploration on the prairies.

Despite a fall in the volume of capital spending the inflow of capital funds continued at an exceptionally high level. Over the five years, 1957 to 1961, it amounted to $6.3 billion. Both Canadian exporters and manufacturers for the domestic market were hampered by the premium on the Canadian dollar. Our unemployment problem was needlessly aggravated. I do not want to go into the details of what has been described in many other debates as a major financial

blunder of the previous administration with respect to the reconversion loan. However, it seems to me, just as the Minister of National Revenue (Mr. Benson) indicated a few minutes ago, that there were a variety of objectives, all of which had to be considered together and in concert we now have to assess our targets in Canada in the collective sense. In the United States years ago there was a conviction that a boom could not continue for any considerable period of time. I remember that back in the thirties it was felt in the schools of economics that the upswings and downswings were largely inevitable, that we were simply the victims of this economic phenomenon.

In 1946 there was a difference of attitude, and I think of the very well known John Maynard Keynes of England. An example of a man who has been following along in the tradition of the new Keynsian thinking is Walter W. Heller, who has provided important leadership in the United States. The largest problem facing the new economists is the boom that threatens to get out of hand. We believe that the difference between what the economy could produce with full employment, considered achieved when unemployment is 4 per cent, and what it is actually producing is the growth gap. When there is a growth gap it is our purpose to solve this discrepancy by dramatic and effective means. The goal of the new economics is to close the growth gap and the key weapon is the budget.

I ask hon. gentlemen to listen with patience until we hear from one of the most able men who has ever served a Canadian government, the Minister of Finance, who will present his budget in a few days. The budget has already received an exhaustive consideration by some of the best brains in Canada. In my judgment the Department of Finance is still one of the finest departments existing in any modern country in the world. The new economics means that the government's budget can be in the red, no matter for how long or at what stage of business expansion, so long as the economy's actual production is below what could be produced with full employment. In short, the new economists calculate the country's economic potential and tailor spending and money policies to achieve that potential.

Now, of course, we are all concerned that there is an increase in the cost of goods. This is something that inevitably we must have expected. We could not have had this quality of progress in the past several years without this kind of increase. We find, for example, that in tobacco and alcohol there has been a modest increase of 1.3 per cent. Food, a basic commodity, had increased in February, 1966, over February, 1965, by 7.1 per cent. We can see that in all commodities there has been an increase of 3.5 per cent. The increase in the cost of services has been 3.3 per cent. There are special items such as car insurance which have affected the picture recently. We find also that such matters as work clothes for men have increased in cost as a result of a very substantial increase in demand. This is not the kind of demand that was indicated a few years ago when the right hon. gentleman was heading the government. The recreation and reading subindex to the cost of living index has moved up by a modest 0.6 per cent.

I remind hon. gentlemen of language which may now sound somewhat classical, but the following was written by Von Haberler:

> Professor Spiethoff describes the mechanism of the cumulative and self-sustaining process of expansion, which begins to work, after the dead point of the depression has been overcome...
>
> The revival of investment activity generates income and purchasing power. Demand rises, first for capital goods and investment materials (iron, steel, cement, lumber, bricks) and later also for consumption goods. Prices rise, mainly prices of capital goods and investment materials. This stimulates further investment. Profits are made which swell the funds available for investment and provide an important psychological stimulus for further expansion. Thus, like a snowball, prosperity increases rapidly as it proceeds.

● (5:30 p.m.)

The real question, my hon. friends, is, is it possible that we can continue with the enlightened techniques of modern economics, indefinitely into the upswing, as more and more factors of production are drawn into production and people become more and more enthusiastic, without a smaller increase in output and a large rise in costs. What we have seen in Canada with respect to the steady increases in prices is what one must normally expect for an expanding, growing and developing economy. At the beginning of the expansion part of the increase in capital certainly would have been absorbed by a rise in output and by a turnover of goods and a smaller part by increasing prices. But when full employment is gradually approached this necessarily changes. What is required now is the most thoughtful study and consideration of these problems, and I hope that before this vote is taken there will be some serious contribution to this debate by members of the opposition.

Of course we are interested in price movements. I suggest that the main reason we are interested in price movements is that these form the substance of the market economy. I could not quite understand the Conservative party's point of view on this matter. Do the members of that party believe in a market economy or do they not? Do they believe, for instance, that the economy is badly adjusted? Do they believe that there is low growth rate, high unemployment, and a balance of payments deficit? We have some of those problems, it is true. But are the members of that party dissatisfied with the current level of growth? If they are not dissatisfied, are they not prepared to accept what every economist regards—

An hon. Member: You have not brought the cost of living down.

Mr. Matheson: This is, of course, one of the burdens of growth. Goods and even labour become scarcer, and prices have to accommodate to this and tend to rise.

An hon. Member: I cannot understand that.

Mr. Matheson: Mr. Speaker, I thank hon. gentlemen for their courtesy and patience. It seems to me that the address of the Minister of Finance admirably summed this up where in his concluding sentences he said, as found on page 2950 of *Hansard* of March 21, 1966:

> Our problem is not to put a brake on the economy;—

I am sure none of us wants to disagree with that.

An hon. Member: Put the brake on the cost of living.

Mr. Matheson: I continue:

> —I suggest—

An hon. Member: Put the brake on the cost of living.

Mr. Matheson: I continue:

> —the problem is to see that we do not press too hard on the accelerator and throw the car off the road. Our problem in the future is going to be to keep the expansion going without inflation—

And that is the objective of us all.

Hon. J. W. Monteith (Perth): Mr. Speaker, we have listened to quite a philosophical dissertation by the hon. member for Leeds (Mr. Matheson), the Parliamentary Secretary to the Prime Minister. There was one matter that I did not get quite clear from his speech. Did he mean that the past years in Canada, to which he referred, have been that bad? I am not sure. I presume I shall have to wait until I see *Hansard* to get his real meaning.

The Minister of National Revenue (Mr. Benson) apologized to me a few moments ago because he thought he would not be here to hear me speak. Perhaps he will not miss very much except that what I have to say concerns something he said a short while ago.

It seems to me that one of the most important things he said was simply that the reduction in excise tax referred to by the right hon. Leader of the Opposition yesterday did not have to do with excise tax but customs duties. This to me is just nonsensical. The minister went on this vein in his speech. I do not think statements such as this bear the merit of rebuttal.

The minister quoted many figures in an attempt to show that the government of which I had the honour to be a member had done nothing toward the economic well-being of this country. The hon. member for Cumberland (Mr. Coates) quoted statistics which certainly refuted any claims the Minister of National Revenue may have made.

The minister stated that the price rise to date is not too serious. I would suggest that he ask all those on a fixed income such as pensioners or retired people as well as farmers caught in the cost-price squeeze and other individuals in this category whether they feel that the rise in prices is not too serious. I am sure that the answer would be very emphatic that the price rise is certainly the most serious in many years in this country's history.

I should like to deal briefly with the contents of the New Democratic party's subamendment which reads as follows:

> and this House further regrets that the Government has not established a prices review board to determine the extent to which price increases are unjustified and to take appropriate steps to reduce such prices accordingly.

The subamendment is really in two parts and it is the last part with which I quarrel. It reads:

> —to take appropriate steps to reduce such prices accordingly.

To me, sir, this is nonsense. I would also point out that this would be unconstitutional.

The Leader of the Opposition yesterday suggested a meeting between the provinces and the federal government in an effort to bring together representatives of the provinces so that together with the government

they could make a concerted attack on inflation. I think this is the only thing that can be done. I do not believe that the suggestion made by the New Democratic party can carry any weight. It is, as I said, unconstitutional. Anything that we could do would only have an effect on businesses under federal control.

I agree with the earlier remarks of the Minister of National Revenue when he said that the subamendment would automatically have the effect of bringing about some sort of wage control. I like the argument of the hon. member for Burnaby-Coquitlam (Mr. Douglas) but I am afraid that the meat of the subamendment does not live up to that argument.

In passing I should like to congratulate the hon. member for Vancouver-Kingsway (Mrs. MacInnis) on the excellent speech she made demonstrating her doctrinaire socialism. I wonder how her colleagues, the hon. member for Waterloo South (Mr. Saltsman) and the hon. member for Kootenay West (Mr. Herridge), would view the last part of the subamendment.

Yesterday the hon. member for Coast-Capilano (Mr. Davis) spoke at great length and very highly with regard to the automobile agreement. He went on to recommend freer trade in many areas. I wonder just what this means? I should like to refer to some answers given to questions which are found on pages 796 and 798 of *Hansard* for this session. These answers were given as a result of requests for information concerning the export of automobiles and automobile parts. The Leader of the Opposition also put a question concerning imports and the answer is to be found on page 798 of *Hansard*.

• (5:40 p.m.)

I think it would be well to point out that in 1963 there was an adverse balance of trade in automobiles and automobile parts. There were actually imports amounting to $577,633,000 and exports of $36,997,000. This leaves an adverse balance of trade in automobiles and in automobile parts of $540,636,000. In 1964 the adverse balance of trade was increased by $45,182,000 to $585,818,000. The picture the government tried to put on the record in response to a question by the hon. member for Essex West (Mr. Gray) attempted to show only the increase in exports. But the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Diefenbaker) insisted on an answer to his question concerning imports, and the increase in exports I have mentioned certainly does not look so favorable. In 1964 exports of automobiles and automobile parts amounted to $94,257,000. Imports had jumped from $577 millions to about $680 million leaving a net imbalance in trade of $585,818,000, an increase of $45,182,000.

The answers in *Hansard* to these questions only cover part of 1965. They were given for nine months so far as exports are concerned and for eight months so far as imports are concerned. In consequence I have to admit I have estimated the exports for the full year simply by developing the figure for three-quarters of the year already given and arriving at the total for the full year on an estimated basis. Since the imports were given on an eight month basis I have done the same with respect to them and simply raised the figures by one half. The estimated figure for exports comes to $160 million. Which is a big increase all along the line, but imports increased to $832 millions. This leaves an adverse balance of trade amounting to $672,527,000 on automobiles and automobile parts for 1965 on an estimated basis.

This represents an increase of $86,790,000 over the adverse balance for 1964. So we have a general picture of an increase in the adverse balance of trade in automobiles and parts despite the impression which the answers to the questions on exports attempted to leave.

I will not go into the details but there is another interesting question answered on page 2764 of *Hansard*. Since the hon. member for Coast-Capilano (Mr. Davis) yesterday mentioned the achievements, presumably, of the new Department of Industry, I think it should be pointed out that despite what was said back in the debate when the Department of Industry was set up there have been huge increases in the numbers of employees in the Departments of Industry, Trade and Commerce, and Defence Production. I clearly recall that when we on this side questioned the feasibility of setting up this department we were told that the intention was merely to take part of the Department of Defence Production and some employees from the Department of Trade and Commerce in order to set up this new department.

I am afraid the figures emphasize our warning at that time when we said this was simply another departmental bureaucracy building up, one which would not achieve the results for which it was created. So far as I can see, the result so far is an increasing deficit in the balance of payments. I do not

see that anything favorable has been achieved.

The Minister of Finance spoke yesterday in this debate. He said that everything the previous government had done was bad and he indicated that the present government were financial wizards. I think this must make everyone at least snicker a little if not laugh out loud. I ask the minister where he stands on the matter of responsibility. Does he stand with his colleagues along the front benches—I am looking at the Minister of National Defence (Mr. Hellyer) at the moment—

Mr. Knowles: He is the only one there.

Mr. Monteith: What has been his position since he voted in favour of debt free money? If ever there was an irresponsible action by a would-be government it was at that time when members opposite supported a motion from down the line in favour of debt free money. The Minister of Finance stands among those hon. gentlemen today and therefore I can only assume that he too would have voted for debt free money as did his predecessor in office. To me this was a completely irresponsible action.

In his remarks yesterday the minister did not indicate that any assistance would be provided for recipients of old age security benefits. What does the government intend to do for these people? The cost of living is spiralling. I know that members of the house and the citizens of Canada appreciate that we on this side did attempt to do something for these individuals, but the present government refused. The minister did not indicate that any help would be forthcoming for farmers caught in the cost-price squeeze.

Others have mentioned this problem. In most areas farm incomes are lower today than they were in 1951, and we all know how costs have skyrocketed. I know the difficulties which these farmers face. If something is not done to help them meet these inflationary prices the situation will soon be out of hand. I can only say that something has to be done.

• (5:50 p.m.)

The minister did not tell us yesterday what he intends to do about tight money. What about the situation of the small businessman or the small operator right now? I have in mind one case which came to my attention about ten days ago. Application was made to a bank manager for a loan. It was well secured and an excellent risk. The applicant asked for a loan additional to an amount he already had. The branch manager recommended it wholeheartedly. As I say, it was well secured. However, the word the manager got back was no, that the loan could not be increased under any circumstances, and this gentleman had to go elsewhere. He got his loan and, as I mentioned, it was well secured. He had excellent credit, but he had to pay a higher rate of interest than he would have paid to the bank. This can only be as the result of a tight money policy. It is something which is happening all across the country and the government has failed to act.

The Minister of Finance did not say anything to encourage consumers. Yesterday the Leader of the Opposition pointed out that the price of dressed carcasses of pork during the past few weeks had dropped from 45 cents a pound to 32 cents a pound and yet consumer prices continue to rise. There has been no relief for the consumer in that particular instance. The minister did not say anything about relief from the 11 per cent sales tax on machinery, equipment, building supplies and materials. On August 2, 1963, the minister spoke in favour of this tax. Apparently he is still in favour of it. Apparently we are going to get no relief from it although its elimination could put a halt to the spiralling cost of living.

Several hon. members have quoted statistics during this debate. I am not going to give any more than I have already mentioned in connection with the increased imbalance in trade in automobiles and automobile parts, but I think the 11 per cent sales tax is probably the most important factor in our increasing cost of living. Because building supplies and materials are affected it means that the cost of slight or major repair jobs is tremendously increased. Because machinery and equipment are affected the cost of everything that is produced in factories, including food products, is affected. If one wants to buy a new piece of machinery to produce articles more economically the 11 per cent sales tax has to be paid on the machinery and this increases the cost of the articles. This tax is affecting the cost of everything we export from Canada.

Yesterday the Minister of Finance said that the Leader of the Opposition had exaggerated everything during the course of his speech. I suggest there were many exaggerations by the Minister of Finance. Harking back to 1962, the Minister of Finance said that the Prime Minister had not criticized devaluation of the dollar but the manner in which

devaluation had been carried out. I say that the Prime Minister did criticize devaluation all through the election campaign that followed and also in this house. Liberal spokesmen talked about how everything we purchase would cost more. I recall seeing advertisements during that election campaign reading, "Here is what you are paying now; here is what you will have to pay with devaluation."

But the Liberals have done nothing about it since they took office. They accepted that it was the best thing to do. I claim that the upturn swing in the business cycle of this country commenced in 1961.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Monteith: Members of the Liberal party would have us believe that it started in June, 1963. What utter nonsense. There is much well-founded proof to support us in this matter. I suggest to the minister that he look at the record of the Liberal government prior to 1957, which was a do-nothing, standpat government. When we took over it took some time to get this country out of the doldrums in which they left it.

In this connection I should like to quote one statement by the governor of the Bank of Canada from his last annual report:

As the economy moved toward the completion of its fifth year of expansion—

As the hon. member for Kamloops (Mr. Fulton) suggests, I will even do the arithmetic for the minister. Five from 66 is 61. It was in 1961 that the upturn started.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Monteith: I read now from the Commercial Letter of the Canadian Imperial Bank of Commerce for May-June 1964:

The expansion phase of the current business cycle had lasted three years by the end of the first quarter of 1964.

Three from 64 is 61. It was 1961 when it started.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Monteith: I quote another excerpt:

Most of the primary stimulus during the current expansion has been provided by the external sector, especially since mid-1961 when the efforts to bring about exchange rate devaluation commenced.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Monteith: It is evident that the things done by the previous Conservative government to stimulate the economy began to take effect in 1961 and I am sure the most important was the devaluation of the dollar at 92½ cents. The Liberals discredited that step, but what have they done? They have maintained it.

The Minister of Finance admits that his problems are serious. As he said, he wants to keep the expansion going and not put on the brake but rather ease up on acceleration. But he did not put forth one positive proposal to help these people for whom we are attempting to get something done. I call it six o'clock, Mr. Speaker.

[*Translation*]

PROCEEDINGS ON ADJOURNMENT MOTION

SUBJECT MATTER OF QUESTIONS TO BE DEBATED UNDER ADJOURNMENT MOTION

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Rinfret): Order. It is my duty, pursuant to provisional standing order 39A, to inform the house that the questions to be debated at the time of adjournment tonight are as follows: the hon. member for Grey-Bruce (Mr. Winkler): Agriculture—Reported large importations of pork products by processors; the hon. member for Waterloo South (Mr. Saltsman): The Canadian economy—Newfoundland—Inquiry into food and drug prices.

Pursuant to special order made Monday, March 21, 1966, this sitting stands suspended until eight o'clock. Accordingly, I do now leave the chair.

[*English*]

At six o'clock the sitting was suspended.

SITTING RESUMED

The house resumed at eight o'clock.

SUPPLY

The house resumed consideration of the motion of Mr. Sharp for committee of supply, and the amendment thereto of Mr. Diefenbaker, and the amendment to the amendment of Mr. Douglas.

THE INCREASED COST OF LIVING

Mr. Monteith: Mr. Speaker, at the time the six o'clock recess was called I had been pointing out that the Minister of National Revenue (Mr. Benson) this afternoon claimed that the government of which I have the

honour to be a member, the previous government, had done nothing. I would like to reiterate what I had said before the dinner recess. I would suggest that the minister look back over the actual happenings in respect of what took place in that period.

When we came into power in 1957, we took over from a government which had done nothing, which had been a do-nothing government.

Mr. Winkler: And still will not.

Mr. Monteith: This is what we inherited, and it took us some time actually to get the wheels of this country moving and to get the economy moving. I think I quoted at that time from the Bank of Canada report, and as a consequence the statement of the governor of the Bank of Canada, to the effect that—

—as the economy moved toward the completion of its fifth year of expansion—

And so on. This is the 1965 report of the Bank of Canada.

I also had quoted from the commercial letter of the Canadian Imperial Bank of Commerce for the period May-June 1964, which pointed out that this period of economic progress had commenced at least three years prior to the first quarter of 1964, which naturally brings us back to 1961. In 1962 the London *Economist*—and if I recall correctly even President Kennedy—gave us credit for the best domestic economic management of any country in the free world.

Mr. Speaker, I am not going to go into the detail of what the previous government did to bring about this resurgence in the economy which had been so flat prior to 1957 but which eventually began to take hold in 1960 and 1961 as a result of our policies. Yesterday the Minister of Finance (Mr. Sharp) admitted the problem was serious. He said he wanted to keep the expansion going; he did not want to put on the brake, but simply to ease up on the acceleration. He did not suggest actually one specific proposal that was going to meet the needs of the people of Canada today. He intimated he would enlarge on his views at the time of the budget speech. I trust so.

Many many months have passed since this question has become crucial and important to the people of Canada, and he has let this slide without doing anything toward the betterment of those people. Yesterday I thought a very pertinent question was raised by the hon. member for Queens-Lunenburg (Mr. Crouse). If I have the details correct, I think the minister earlier had suggested that the Bank of Canada had suggested caution because of the risk of overloading the economy; I think those are his own words. The Economic Council in turn—and again I think I am quoting the minister's own words—said that the economy as at present is underdeveloped.

The hon. member for Leeds (Mr. Matheson), Mr. Speaker—I do not see him in his seat at the moment and that is quite understandable—said that other countries are experiencing inflation. Of course; but what we are concerned with is Canada. What in the world is this government going to do for Canada in this period of spiraling inflation and the upsurge that we have experienced in the cost of living; what are we going to do here? I ask the question, what is the Minister of Finance going to do? Whose advice is he going to take? One says one thing and another says another thing. Which way is he going to go? I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that this is the key to Canada's future, and that we have a right to ask this question of him.

Earlier I dealt with the amendment to the amendment by the New Democratic Party. I pointed out constitutional and other reasons in respect of why we could not accept it. I further repeat that it is simply socialistic doctrine.

Now Mr. Speaker, I come to our own amendment. I would like to point out that it reads this way:

This House regrets that the government has failed to act effectively to hold down the cost of living and to halt inflation.

Now, undoubtedly nobody can deny it has neglected to do this. Our amendment goes on to point out that this lack of action on behalf of the government—

—is having a serious effect on the economy generally and particularly on all people in receipt of social security payments, on war pensioners, old age pensioners, retired civil servants, those on fixed incomes, and all low income groups.

• (8:10 p.m.)

It is my claim that the government has failed to act, to the detriment of not only those people referred to in our amendment, but to all Canadians. The government by its inaction has let down the people mentioned in our amendment, who are our chief concern, and all other Canadians.

Most authorities agree that there will be a slight increase in the cost of living each year and that such an increase is acceptable. The

authors of the report of the Economic Council, and other economists, have agreed that a slight increase is acceptable. They do not agree however that the cost of living should double in such a short period of time. This government has allowed the inflation situation to run away from it and get out of hand. They cannot control it now because they are acting too late. The Minister of Finance has suggested he is going to propose certain things at the time he presents his budget, but the government should have acted long ago when the situation first became obvious.

I note that my time is becoming limited, so I shall conclude my remarks as quickly as possible. Several members on the other side of this house, including the Minister of Finance, the Minister of National Revenue (Mr. Benson) and the hon. member for Leeds (Mr. Matheson), have asked for suggestions as to the kind of action which should be taken. In reply I should like to repeat what the right hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Diefenbaker) has said. We should hold a conference of provincial leaders and the federal government to establish priorities. That is desperately required at this time.

An editorial which appeared in the Ottawa *Journal* this evening prompts me to ask the government what it has done about the Glassco report. The report of that commission suggests many ways in which the government could save money and thereby reduce its budget. I suggest it could reduce the budget it intends to bring down next Tuesday night by adopting certain of the recommendations of that commission, but it has not done so.

The Minister of National Revenue has given us many excuses for failure on the part of the government to adopt certain of the recommendations contained in the Glassco report, but I suggest that the government's inaction is nothing less than dilatory. This commission was instituted by the previous government. Its report was received a couple of years ago, yet nothing has been done by the present government to institute some of its recommendations.

Mr. Speaker, I see you are on your feet and before I sit down I should like to say that there are a number of other suggestions I wanted to make, but which I will defer until a later date.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. It being 8.15 p.m. it is my duty, pursuant to section 4(d) of standing order 56 to interrupt these proceedings and put forthwith the question on any amendment now before the house.

The house divided on the amendment to the amendment (Mr. Douglas) which was negatived on the following division:

YEAS

Messrs:

Barnett	MacInnis (Mrs.) (Vancouver-Kingsway)
Brewin	Macquarrie
Cameron (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands)	Martin (Timmins)
Douglas	Mather
Fawcett	Orlikow
Gilbert	Prittie
Herridge	Saltsman
Howe (Hamilton South)	Schreyer
Knowles	Scott (Danforth)
Lewis	Winch—20.

NAYS

Messrs:

Aiken	Dinsdale
Alkenbrack	Dionne
Allard	Drury
Allmand	Dubé
Andras	Duquet
Asselin (Charlevoix)	Émard
Asselin (Richmond-Wolfe)	Enns
Badanai	Éthier
Baldwin	Fairweather
Basford	Fane
Batten	Faulkner
Béchard	Favreau
Beer	Flemming
Bell (Carleton)	Forbes
Bell (Saint-John-Albert)	Forest
Benson	Forrestall
Berger	Fulton
Bigg	Gauthier
Blouin	Godin
Boulanger	Gordon
Bower	Goyer
Brand	Grafftey
Brown	Granger
Byrne	Gray
Cadieu (Meadow Lake)	Greene
Cameron (High Park)	Grégoire
Cantelon	Grills
Cantin	Groos
Caron	Guay
Carter	Haidasz
Cashin	Hales
Chatterton	Harkness
Choquette	Harley
Churchill	Hees
Clermont	Hellyer
Coates	Hopkins
Code	Horner (The Battlefords)
Comtois	Howard
Côté (Dorchester)	Howe (Wellington-Huron)
Côté (Longueuil)	Hymmen
Cowan	Irvine
Crossman	Isabelle
Crouse	Johnston
Danforth	Jorgenson
Davis	Kennedy
Deachman	Kindt
Diefenbaker	Klein
	Korchinski

[Mr. Monteith.]

Divisions

Lachance
Laflamme
Laing
LaMarsh (Miss)
Lambert
Langlois (Chicoutimi)
Laniel
Laprise
Latulippe
Laverdière
Leblanc (Laurier)
LeBlanc (Rimouski)
Leboe
Lefebvre
Legault
Lessard
Lind
Loiselle
Loney
Macaluso
MacDonald (Prince)
Macdonald (Rosedale)
MacEachen
MacEwan
MacInnis (Cape Breton South)
Mackasey
MacLean (Queens)
McCleave
McIlraith
McIntosh
McKinley
McLelland
McNulty
McQuaid
McWilliam
Madill
Mandziuk
Marchand
Martin (Essex East)
Matheson
Matte
Mitchell
Mongrain
Monteith
Moore
More
Morison
Muir (Cape Breton North and Victoria)
Muir (Lisgar)
Munro
Nasserden
Neveu
Nicholson
Nixon
Noble
Nugent
O'Keefe
Olson
Ormiston
Otto
Pascoe
Pennell
Pepin
Pickersgill
Pilon
Prud'homme
Pugh
Racine
Rapp
Régimbal
Reid
Ricard
Richard
Rideout (Mrs.)
Rinfret
Robichaud
Rochon
Rock
Roxburgh
Ryan
Rynard
Sauvé
Scott (Victoria (Ont.))
Sharp
Sherman
Simard
Simpson
Smith
Southam
Stafford
Stanbury
Starr
Stefanson
Stewart
Tardif
Teillet
Thomas (Middlesex West)
Tolmie
Tremblay
Trudeau
Tucker
Turner
Vincent
Wadds (Mrs.)
Wahn
Walker
Watson (Assiniboia)
Watson (Châteauguay-Huntingdon-Laprairie)
Webb
Whelan
Winkler
Winters
Woolliams
Yanakis—209.

Mr. Speaker: I declare the amendment to the amendment lost. The question now is on the amendment to the main motion.

The house divided on the amendment (Mr. Diefenbaker) which was negatived on the following division:

YEAS

Messrs:

Aiken
Alkenbrack
Allard
Asselin (Charlevoix)
Baldwin
Barnett
Bell (Carleton)
Bell (Saint John-Albert)
Bigg
Bower
Brand
Brewin
Cadieu (Meadow Lake)
Cameron (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands)
Cantelon
Chatterton
Churchill
Coates
Code
Crouse
Danforth
Diefenbaker
Dinsdale
Dionne
Douglas
Enns
Fane
Fawcett
Flemming
Forbes
Forrestall
Fulton
Gauthier
Gilbert
Godin
Grafftey
Grégoire
Grills
Hales
Harkness
Hees
Herridge
Horner (The Battlefords)
Howe (Hamilton South)
Howe (Wellington-Huron)
Irvine
Jorgenson
Kennedy
Kindt
Knowles
Korchinski
Lambert
Laprise
Latulippe
Lewis
Loney
MacDonald (Prince)
MacEwan
MacInnis (Cape Breton South)
MacInnis (Mrs.) (Vancouver-Kingsway)
MacLean (Queens)
Macquarrie
McCleave
McIntosh
McKinley
McLelland
McQuaid
Madill
Mandziuk
Martin (Timmins)
Mather
Monteith
Moore
More
Muir (Cape Breton North and Victoria)
Muir (Lisgar)
Nasserden
Noble
Nugent
Orlikow
Ormiston
Pascoe
Prittie
Pugh
Rapp
Régimbal
Ricard
Rynard
Saltsman
Schreyer
Scott (Danforth)
Scott (Victoria (Ont.))
Sherman
Simard
Simpson
Smallwood
Smith
Southam
Starr
Stefanson
Thomas (Middlesex West)
Vincent
Wadds (Mrs.)
Watson (Assiniboia)
Webb
Winch
Winkler
Woolliams—108.

NAYS

Messrs:

Allmand
Andras
Asselin (Richmond-Wolfe)
Badanai
Basford
Batten
Béchard
Beer
Benson
Berger
Blouin
Boulanger
Brown
Byrne
Cameron (High Park)
Cantin
Caron
Carter
Cashin
Choquette
Clermont
Comtois
Côté (Dorchester)
Côté (Longueuil)
Cowan
Crossman
Davis
Deachman
Drury
Dubé
Duquet
Émard
Ethier
Faulkner
Favreau
Forest
Gordon

Goyer	Neveu
Granger	Nicholson
Gray	Nixon
Greene	O'Keefe
Guay	Olson
Haidasz	Orange
Harley	Otto
Hellyer	Pelletier
Hopkins	Pennell
Howard	Pepin
Hymmen	Pickersgill
Isabelle	Pilon
Johnston	Prud'homme
Klein	Racine
Lachance	Reid
Laflamme	Richard
Laing	Rideout (Mrs.)
LaMarsh (Miss)	Rinfret
Langlois (Chicoutimi)	Robichaud
Laniel	Rochon
Laverdière	Rock
Leblanc (Laurier)	Roxburgh
LeBlanc (Rimouski)	Ryan
Leboe	Sauvé
Lefebvre	Sharp
Legault	Stafford
Lessard	Stanbury
Lind	Stewart
Loiselle	Tardif
Macaluso	Teillet
Macdonald (Rosedale)	Tolmie
MacEachen	Tremblay
Mackasey	Trudeau
McIlraith	Tucker
McNulty	Turner
McWilliam	Wahn
Marchand	Walker
Matheson	Watson (Châteauguay-Huntingdon-Laprairie)
Matte	Whelan
Mitchell	Winters
Mongrain	Yanakis—121.
Morison	
Munro	

• (8:50 p.m.)

Mr. Speaker: I declare the amendment lost.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Cadieux (Terrebonne): Mr. Speaker, had I voted, I would have voted against the amendment.

[*English*]

Mr. Groos: I was paired with the hon. member for Edmonton East (Mr. Skoreyko). Had I voted I would have voted against the amendment.

Mr. Speaker: The question is on the main motion.

INDUSTRIAL ACTIVITY IN THE MARITIMES

Mr. Donald MacInnis (Cape Breton South): My grievance this evening concerns the lack of action—I might even say the lack of interest—on the part of this government in respect to the economic problems facing the maritime provinces and the Cape Breton industrial area particularly.

[Mr. Speaker.]

Mr. Speaker: Order. Perhaps before the hon. member continues we might have order in the chamber.

Mr. MacInnis (Cape Breton South): My grievance, as I have said, has special reference to the industrial area of Cape Breton. In this area Dosco is the major employer both in steel and coal, and in each of these fields we are today looking to this government for action.

During the election campaign in Nova Scotia the people in that area, and possibly people throughout the country were subjected to a slogan—I imagine the Minister of National Health and welfare (Mr. MacEachen) will well recall it—"A Liberal government cares, acts and makes things happen". We might follow up that slogan by asking: "For whom, how, and when?"

Over the week end the minister apparently made an announcement to the effect that he, together with the Minister of Mines and Technical Surveys will be going to Nova Scotia shortly to speak to the interested parties about the government's intention with respect to the opening of a new mine in Lingan and the provision of $15 million to mechanize existing mines in the area. I might call the minister's attention to the fact that though last week he expressed the intention of meeting with the interested parties, including the union and the provincial government, I find on checking this matter that neither the Minister of National Health and Welfare nor the Minister of Mines and Technical Surveys (Mr. Pepin) had made any approach whatsoever to the union or to the company with respect to this get-together meeting in Halifax.

The Minister of National Health and Welfare who will not accept responsibility in this house for questions concerning coal, nevertheless preached on this subject throughout the province and throughout the maritimes during the election campaign. He has sat silent in the house since his return, hiding behind a rule which says he can deal only with matters affecting his own department. Yet at the same time he combines with the Minister of Transport (Mr. Pickersgill) in giving out press releases concerning matters which do not affect his department. It is time we had some answers from this minister who went along with another minister of the Crown to imply in Nova Scotia that his government had provided $25 million—I repeat, "had provided"—to the coal industry to mechanize existing mines and open a new

mine at Lingan. This was referred to as an accomplished fact. But since his return to Ottawa the minister has sat silent. We want action on this.

• (9:00 p.m.)

We do have a heavy water plant in the Cape Breton area. I cannot give any credit to the Cape Breton members sitting about a council table for the fact that this came about in Cape Breton. I notice that the Minister of Industry (Mr. Drury) is looking on with a smirk on his face. I would remind him he does not know what is going on. This same Minister of Industry, faced with a question when his estimates were going through the house with respect to heavy water, said this matter was transferred to the Department of Mines and Technical Surveys. Yet it was in his estimates when they were going through the house. The minister does not know what is going on.

Mr. Drury: Mr. Speaker, perhaps I should point out to the hon. gentleman that while in the printed estimates items are apparently allocated to a particular department, under the authority of the Financial Administration Act transfers of responsibilities, including the amounts appropriated, are possible by order in council. I would suggest to the hon. gentleman that such an order in council in respect to responsibility for Atomic Energy of Canada Limited was passed prior to the date of the discussion of the estimates, transferring it to the Department of Mines and Technical Surveys.

Mr. MacInnis (Cape Breton South): I would remind the minister that when an estimate is going through the house he is responsible to answer for that particular estimate at the time it is going through.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order. I should point out to the hon. member for Cape Breton South that at this particular part of our procedure he is permitted to raise one grievance and he must remain with that grievance. I understood the hon. member's grievance had to do with the amount of money to be expended in connection with coal mining in Nova Scotia. If that is the hon. member's grievance then of course he would not be permitted to move on to any other grievance at this time.

Mr. MacInnis (Cape Breton South): Mr. Speaker, with all due respect to you, my grievance is concerned with the operations of Dosco in the Cape Breton area, and this takes in coal and steel. The interjection by the Minister of Industry only brought me to reply that he was responsible at the time, and did not know what was going on. This again deals directly with the economy of the Cape Breton area.

I would refer the minister to a question I asked him in the house yesterday. As reported at page 2934 of *Hansard* I put this question:

> Mr. Speaker, I wish to direct a question to the Minister of Industry and ask him whether the government is aware of DOSCO's intention to remove production equipment from their wire and nail mill at the Sydney steel plant. If so has the government received a request for aid, or does it intend to give aid to that area?

The minister's answer to that question was:

> I was not aware of this intention, Mr. Speaker, but I shall make inquiries.

With respect to my grievance, Mr. Speaker, I refer to the lack of action, or possibly the lack of interest on the part of the government. I would emphasize the lack of interest because there is no doubt the government was made aware of this move, even though the minister who should be in a position to know apparently did not know that the matter was brought to the attention of his colleague, the Minister of National Health and Welfare (Mr. MacEachen), who represents Nova Scotia.

A wire was sent to the Minister of National Health and Welfare with respect to the move being made by Dosco to curtail its operations in that plant. I would tell the Minister of Industry that the Minister of National Health and Welfare received a wire from James C. Nicholson, district director of the United Steelworkers of America, suggesting that immediate consultations be held with the heads of Dosco to end the stripping of the Sydney steel mill plant.

The wire went on to say:

> Press reports indicate the committee of Atlantic Development Board has been studying the Nova Scotia steel industry for the past year. Possibly this is the avenue for solution to this problem now that Dosco has made known its intentions of further curtailing operation here.

We have the government professing no knowledge of this, even though one of the ministers received a wire from the union. There was an answer from the Minister of Labour (Mr. Nicholson) putting forward only the company's side of the story. We members from Nova Scotia, and I make particular mention of the hon. member for Cape Breton North and Victoria (Mr. Muir) and myself.

are in a bit of a dilemma because the only way we can assist the miners and the steel workers in our area is to seek assistance for Dosco in order that the benefits would be handed down to the workers; and so we find ourselves on both sides of the argument.

I think that the incentive programs, which the government has so much to say about, should be applied in such a way that they would benefit an area like Sydney. What is the enticement to move any portion of the Sydney plant to other parts of the country? I say the government should step in to see that what we have in Sydney, and the Cape Breton area in general, remains with us, rather than let the government sit back. That the government is sitting back has been very evident since the change of governments.

During the administration of the Conservative government many conferences were held with interested parties in the area, including mayors, clergy, and councillors, to deal with the problems facing the area. But since this government came into office not one such conference has been held. I ask that the minister from Nova Scotia set up such a conference so that the people from Cape Breton can present their views before the government, rather than doing it through correspondence which does not, when checked out, compare favourably with something else said by another minister on another occasion.

The Minister of National Health and Welfare has on many occasions spoken of $25 million as an accomplished fact. Now we see where he made an announcement over the week end that he intends to go down to Nova Scotia very shortly to meet with the interested parties. I ask, has the government been in touch with the union and in touch with the company to see that they will be present when the minister goes, or is this intended to be, as it was before, a get acquainted trip for the Minister of Mines and Technical Surveys?

I could go further, Mr. Speaker, in respect to the employment situation in Cape Breton. For instance, I could remind the Minister of Transport (Mr. Pickersgill) that on March 2 I had correspondence from his office in reference to a lay-off at the Sydney airport terminal, a matter which he said he was going to look into and advise me on very shortly. However, I have yet to hear further from the Minister of Transport. But people are laid off in Cape Breton by this government which says it acts and makes good things happen.

I cannot even get the minister's nose out of his notes over there, to draw his attention to the fact that I do have a letter from his office, dated March 2, which he has not yet followed up. This is just another indication of the government's lack of interest in matters concerning Nova Scotia and Cape Breton in particular. The Minister of National Health and Welfare, when he goes to Cape Breton, takes credit for everything, but I can tell the Minister of Industry he does not know what is going on with respect to heavy water.

All he has to do to verify that fact is look up his own speeches in *Hansard* and he will find he contradicted the former minister of labour, now the Minister of National Health and Welfare, and on occasion he contradicted himself, and it is down in the record.

Mr. Drury: I wonder if the hon. gentleman, because I am interested in these contradictions, would quote me these occasions. I have been unable to find them.

Mr. MacInnis (Cape Breton South): Well, if the minister is looking for contradictions, he does not have to look very hard. I would ask the Minister of Industry this question: What are the requirements in Canada for heavy water today? If he could give the answer to that question I would go further and—

• (9:10 p.m.)

Mr. Drury: Mr. Speaker, if that question is addressed to me, as a I pointed out when the same question was asked by the same hon. member some two weeks ago, the responsibility for this particular function now, as it has for some time, resides with the Minister of Mines and Technical Surveys (Mr. Pepin). So far as possible I endeavour not to mix in other people's business.

An hon. Member: At that time you were responsible.

Mr. MacInnis (Cape Breton South): Cannot the minister recall a few short weeks ago when he was responsible, and does he mean to tell me now he did not know what were the requirements for heavy water in Canada? Off the top of your head, what is the figure for the requirement in respect of heavy water in Canada?

Mr. Pepin: Would the hon. member like to know the answers to these questions? If so, he has only to ask.

Mr. MacInnis (Cape Breton South): Would the minister just throw out the figure.

Mr. Pepin: Mr. Speaker, these figures are well known by Atomic Energy of Canada

Limited. It is quite difficult for Atomic Energy of Canada to state these figures very clearly, because for one thing they depend on contracts which they enter into with other countries of the world. It is quite difficult to know when these contracts will materialize. Second, it depends on production in Canada. It is quite difficult for Atomic Energy of Canada to know whether the contracts entered into by Canadian production companies will be concluded.

Mr. MacInnis (Cape Breton South): I have one simple question. Originally the figure was 400 tons and then they got to 600 tons. I ask the minister now, what is the actual figure they are working toward? They are supposed to be dealing right at this moment with the Canadian General Electric Company. I asked the question yesterday and the minister then gave what I would consider a rather ridiculous answer. I asked him whether Canadian General Electric had come up with an approved process for the manufacturing of heavy water, and he has made the answer: We do business with General Electric, and it stands to reason they must have an approved process for manufacturing heavy water. This is most ridiculous. This government dealt with British American Oil Company in the development of heavy water, and it turned out that they did not have a process at all; yet, you were willing to deal with them on the basis that if at all possible you would have taken the heavy water plant away from Nova Scotia and Glace Bay, but you could not do it because the lower bid was in. That is why the contract went to Nova Scotia.

Now, they have said they need 400 tons. They are involved in the 400-ton deal with General Electric and they cannot even answer whether or not General Electric is capable of producing heavy water. What is the figure; is it 400, 600 or 800?

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order, please. If the minister wishes to answer the questions posed by the hon. member for Cape Breton South, he can do so by replying to the hon. member; but I should point out to the house that this is not a question and answer period.

Mr. MacInnis (Cape Breton South): Mr. Speaker, I was only giving the government front bench the opportunity to show their ignorance in the matter. It is nothing less than ignorance. The Minister of Transport, still with his nose in his notes, has no concern whatsoever for the fact that, under his jurisdiction, Cape Bretoners have been laid off and unemployed. Of course he does not give any consideration to us. I am quite sure my hon. friend from Cape Breton North and Victoria (Mr. Muir) will have something to say about his side of the harbour. The minister had no concern when they closed out the base. He said that they started the coastguard college.

What is the relation between this coastguard college and the fact that we have had such lay-offs at the naval base. Yet, this same Minister of Transport came to Cape Breton during the campaign and made the statement that our shipyards were never so busy. They are busy in places other than Cape Breton, because they have taken a lot of the work away from the Cape Bretoners. The minister is still buried in that book; I do not know whether it is fiction.

An hon. Member: He wrote it.

Mr. MacInnis (Cape Breton South): The minister ignored the fact that there have been lay-offs under his jurisdiction, and ignored it despite the fact that he has the letters received in his office on March 2. He has yet to provide any answers to the problem concerning these people who have been unemployed.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the activity of Dosco as the largest employer in the Cape Breton area, affects the welfare of every man, woman and child in Cape Breton and the province of Nova Scotia. The Liberal government cares. How much did they care? Again, when I refer to the economic problems and their relation to Cape Bretoners I speak for the youngest child and the oldest pensioner. They care enough that one of their first actions here was to deny an amendment from this side of the house to increase the old age pension to $100.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Surely the hon. member is drifting far afield now from the grievance with which he began.

Mr. MacInnis (Cape Breton South): Mr. Speaker, with all due deference, I do not see how you can say I am going astray. I am speaking about the economic problems of Cape Bretoners. As I say, what Dosco does has an influence on how the pensioner lives, because practically every pensioner in Cape Breton is subsidized by a steel worker or miner, and this affects his living.

The member for Red Deer (Mr. Thompson) has said they never voted against old age pensions, but I can quote from the speech of the Minister of Trade and Commerce (Mr.

Winters) in Toronto when he said that it was not easy for members on their side of the house to vote against the resolution introduced by the opposition to increase the old age pension to $100 a month. How much does the Liberal government care; how have they acted, what have they done, and for whom and where have they done it? The Minister of Transport says that the shipyards never have been so busy. Naturally they will get busier in other places when they take everything we had. Upwards of 600 men were employed, and then in the last six months many of them were unemployed.

Why does not the Minister of National Health and Welfare stand up now and support the statements he made about assistance to the Nova Scotia coal industry? Where is that $25 million he referred to as an accomplished fact? When are you going to meet and whom are you going to meet with?

So far as the Donald report is concerned, it is the most ridiculous thing to hide behind. I do not know whether Dr. Donald went near a mine. He spoke to mining officials and other officials who met with him in the hotel at Sydney, a long way from the face—and when I say "face" I am sure the Minister of National Health and Welfare knows I am talking about the face in the mine. What has Dr. Donald done to find out about what is needed in the Cape Breton coal industry. Is he going to do anything more than summarize for the government the findings of the British coal board officials who visited here a short while ago?

• (9:20 p.m.)

Why does the government hide behind the Donald report in its short-range program? I notice it always refers to the Donald report as an indication of how it will approach the long-range program for the Cape Breton coal industry. The Donald report has some merit where it deals with improved mechanism of existing colleries, but it has nothing whatever to do with the opening of a new mine at Lingan, and should not be considered in any way, shape or form in that regard. Where is the $10 million of the $25 million that was supposed to be directed toward the opening of this new mine? What method is the government going to adopt to obtain some return on its money in this regard?

All these questions bring again to my mind the argument presented by the leader of the New Democratic party of Cape Breton during the last election campaign, who made reference to an article by Mr. Meyers in the *Financial Post*. At that time the former minister of labour, the present Minister of National Health and Welfare (Mr. MacEachen) used a great amount of time and a great many words in denying the suggestions made by the leader of the New Democratic party, that the whole question revolved around what was contained in fine print in the government's promises.

The minister of labour at that time, the hon. member for Inverness-Richmond, said there was not any fine print as far as the promises were concerned, but toward the end of the campaign Cape Bretoners began to ask whether there was any large print. They began to doubt whether this government intended to come through with its promises. They are now waiting for this government to make good what the minister of labour of that day, and the minister of mines referred to as an accomplished fact.

Let us have some concern for the people of Cape Breton. The government should take some action in this regard. I make an appeal once again to the Minister of National Health and Welfare—although I know it is useless because he will not take his nose out of his paper,—to do something about the situation and make good some of the government's promises. I direct this appeal to the Minister of Transport (Mr. Pickersgill) as well, in spite of the fact that, although he represents a riding in that area he is not from the maritimes.

I could quote chapter and verse of the promises made by these ministers just prior to the last election, but I will only appeal to them to make available at least 10 per cent of what they promised, which would do a great deal to help the situation in the maritimes.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: May I ask the hon. member for Cape Breton North and Victoria whether he intends to speak on the same grievance referred to by the hon. member for Cape Breton South?

Mr. Robert Muir (Cape Breton North and Victoria): Yes, Mr. Speaker. I will deal with the economic problems of Cape Breton. The former speaker, my colleague from Cape Breton South (Mr. MacInnis) did mention that his grievance was related to the economic conditions of the maritime provinces in general and Cape Breton island in particular. I was a little afraid that the Minister of National Health and Welfare (Mr. MacEachen) was going to rise before I had an opportunity to say a few words. However, in the spirit of a good Cape Breton islander, he

has yielded the floor so that I may criticize him and his government a little bit more.

Within recent days we have been greatly discouraged by statements made in the Nova Scotia legislature regarding the steel industry in Nova Scotia, located particularly in Cape Breton. These statements have been made by the former minister of trade and industry in the province of Nova Scotia, Mr. E. A. Manson. I have before me the *Chronicle-Herald* Friday, March 18 which carries the headline "Immediate Cure for Steel or Sydney may Die—Manson". For the benefit of the Minister of Industry (Mr. Drury) and the Minister of National Health and Welfare, I should like to read extracts from this article because, as the hon. member for Cape Breton South, I feel that the Minister of Industry does not seem to realize what is going on outside of Montreal and the immediate surrounding area. Apparently there is no liaison between the Minister of Industry and his colleague, the Minister of National Health and Welfare. Had there been some liaison he would have known that there is worry and concern in Cape Breton and throughout Nova Scotia regarding the future of the steel industry there. They would also be aware that telegrams have been sent out about this matter expressing grave concern.

The Minister of Industry is showing extreme interest at this time and I hope that he and his colleague will listen carefully to this quotation from the issue of that newspaper to which I referred. Mr. Manson is reported as having said:

> Steel city Sydney could "whither and die" in the next 20 years if there was not an immediate cure found for a sick steel industry, the legislature was warned yesterday.

The article then continues as follows:

> Cape Breton South MLA, E. A. Manson, a former minister of trade and industry, and mines, took a swipe at the huge Dosco empire, and predicted that the Sydney steel works would have nothing more to do than fill orders at busy periods or when there was a short supply from the huge Quebec province steel complex, if the downhill trend was not rapidly reversed.
>
> He was speaking in the opening day of debate on the first report of the Voluntary Planning Board. He outlined recommendations to save the Sydney steel mills.

I hope that the temporary government we have here will listen intently to what Mr. Manson suggested should be done, and then come forward with their own ideas and suggestions as to what can be done to assist Dosco and thereby assist the steel workers in the province of Nova Scotia.

As reported in this newspaper, Mr. Manson made the following recommendations:

> Appoint a steel economist to co-ordinate efforts of organizations working to better the economy and that industry;
>
> Make a thorough study of transportation to central Canada, with the idea of subsidies from the Atlantic Development Board;
>
> Establish a plate mill to take up the slack and offer new steel products;
>
> Ask the VEP board to establish whether or not it is too late to move a sheet and strip metal mill to the Sydney site;
>
> Concentrate more production on small and medium structural steel;
>
> Call on Dosco to take on its responsibilities as a citizen of this province.
>
> On this latter point Mr. Manson said it was difficult to sit down and work out a program with a company owned and operated by people outside the province. "We are mystified where we are going," he said.
>
> He said he was not making a direct attack on Dosco.
>
> "But they should be called to account!"

Later on in this same article the following is reported, and I wish to bring this particularly to the attention of the Minister of Industry:

> Mr. Manson told the House that the labour force in the Sydney mill had dropped 2,000 in the last 20 years—to a total employment figure of 3,160 in 1964, at full plant capacity.
>
> This cutback, he said was due to the increased use of oxygen in the open hearth, and technical advances. And, he predicted that in another 20 years, 2,000 more could be lopped off the steel plant payroll.
>
> "There is a danger we are getting ourselves in a complacent attitude about steel, saying steel's all right," he said.

The Monday, March 21, edition of the *Chronicle-Herald* reported that telegrams had been sent to Premier Stanfield and the Minister of National Health and Welfare regarding this very serious situation. The headline is "Sydney Steel Union Seeks Intervention" with a subheading "Stripping of Mill Opposed". I hope the Minister of National Health and Welfare will listen and take note of this article, and advise us when he replies what action he intends to take to provide some relief for the steel workers in Sydney. The article states:

> James C. Nicholson, district director for the United Steelworkers of America has sent telegrams to Premier Stanfield and National Health and Welfare Minister Allan MacEachen urging the immediate consultation be held with heads of Dosco, to end the "stripping" of the Sydney plant's wire mill.

• (9:30 p.m.)

In the telegrams, Mr. Nicholson said the general manager of the Sydney works of Dosco has informed the Sydney steelworkers that the management will shortly order the dismantling of two

"wire drawing" machines, now operating in the Sydney wire mill. These machines are to be transferred to the Etobicoke works, the Dosco subsidiary in Ontario.

The hon. member for Cape Breton South posed a question yesterday to which in my opinion the minister gave a rather fluffy answer today, to the effect that this would not be a serious problem, that nothing was really going to happen, that we were going to employ many more people, and that sort of thing.

I notice the minister seems very interested in replying to me. I hope he will get up and say something is really going to be done for this Sydney steel industry and possibly within four or five months we will expand it and employ another 400 or 500 people.

Mr. Drury: Mr. Speaker, I have a question I should like to put to the hon. gentleman. I should like to ask whether he heard the answer to which he has referred, and did he understand that I made it clear that this excitement which the hon. member is trying to build up about a prospective disaster is actually going to lead to an increase in steel production in the Sydney mill, and to an increase in employment? Is the hon. gentleman complaining about this?

Mr. Muir (Cape Breton North and Victoria): I am complaining about the fact that you, along with your colleagues, most of the time sit on what brains you have and do not make any effort to try and do something for the industry. What is this great progress you were suggesting in your answer today? Is this the type of progress that has taken place in the past few years in the Sydney steel plant, where we once employed close to 5,000 people, I believe, but which number has gone down to slightly over 3,000?

Is this the progress the minister is speaking about? I do not agree with that type of progress. In my opinion progress is made when you are employing more people. I hope the minister has more background and knowledge of the industry than he has expressed tonight. Surely he must know something more about it than he has expressed, because of his relationships with Dosco. I am sure he is close enough to Dosco to know what is happening in that organization. We want to know what has happened with Dosco and what chance this company has, if any, to receive assistance from the Minister of Industry.

[Mr. Muir (Cape Breton North and Victoria).]

Through you, Mr. Speaker, I say to the Minister of Industry that we direct proposals, criticisms, questions and representations to him and we would like a little assistance from him. We do not want the minister to suggest that we are trying to stir up trouble. Is the minister suggesting that Mr. Manson, a very highly regarded former minister of trade and industry in the province of Nova Scotia, is trying to stir up controversy, or is the minister suggesting that what Mr. Manson says is perhaps wrong, that he is a prevaricator or something like that? Is the minister suggesting that the Halifax *Chronicle-Herald*, which is a completely independent newspaper—I am sure the Minister of National Health and Welfare (Mr. MacEachen) would agree with that—is wrong? I think particularly the hon. member for Antigonish-Guysborough (Mr. Stewart) would agree with me in this respect because he is very often quoted from this newspaper.

Mr. Stewart: I would not want to agree with that.

Mr. Muir (Cape Breton North and Victoria): I would not want to get in a scrap with the hon. member because he might throw his hand up to me. But is he suggesting that the Halifax *Chronicle-Herald* is stirring up this worry and fear and there is no basis for it? Is he suggesting that James Nicholson, district director for the United Steelworkers, is in the same category; that we are all people with wild and weird dreams and are causing this trouble and a little inconvenience to the government without any basis in fact? I hesitate to get up in this house every once in a while and criticize the minister and other members of the cabinet, but we are forced to do so. Since this government came into office, through the aegis of the brilliant, scholarly member for Bonavista-Twillingate, the Minister of Transport (Mr. Pickersgill) and the efforts of the government, 550 jobs will be lost at North Sydney in connection with the terminal for the shipment of goods to Newfoundland. We have to find alternative jobs for these people.

What has the Minister of National Defence (Mr. Hellyer) done since he came to power? He closed down the Point Edward naval base. Here again 600 jobs have disappeared.

An hon. Member: They have made a mess of things.

Mr. Muir (Cape Breton North and Victoria): He made a mess of everything—not

only the minister, but his government, and the prime minister. I cannot understand the reaction of the Minister of Industry to this situation. Let us look at an article which appeared in the Halifax *Chronicle-Herald* of March 19. This article is entitled "Gloomy View". We are called doomsters and gloomsters by the minister but I do not mind being put into this category. Premier Stanfield is worried and upset about this situation and I am sure is willing to do everything he can to assist. I think this government should be prepared to do the same thing and should not do nothing but make crazy statements. For instance, while the hon. member for Cape Breton South was speaking he mentioned that there was a lack of interest on the part of ministers of this government, and the Minister of Industry mumbled in his beard and said something to the effect that there was a lack of interest in the hon. member for Cape Breton South.

We find this attitude being adopted so many times by this government. These people, who do not have any intestinal fortitude, refuse to get on their feet, and instead make interjections from their seats. This is because they are afraid to stand up and make statements. This is their problem and we wish they would admit it. Perhaps the minister has heard about Peter Nicholson—although he may not have heard of him because he does not go far out of Quebec. Peter Nicholson is the leader of the Liberal party in the Nova Scotia house. He said, according to a press statement yesterday, I believe it was, "that there should be a good, hard look at the steel question and it is a deep problem." Surely the minister would not say he could be wrong.

Mr. Drury: Of course not.

Mr. Muir (Cape Breton North and Victoria): You are mumbling again.

Mr. Drury: "Of course not".

Mr. Muir (Cape Breton North and Victoria): Of course he is not wrong. Let me read this editorial that appeared in the Halifax *Chronicle-Herald*:

> The "whither and die" speech on the Sydney steel industry, delivered in the legislature on Thursday by the Hon. E. A. Manson... was the most startling and effective contribution to debate in the house so far this session, and well merited the congratulatory handshakes offered by fellow MLAs afterwards.
>
> Obviously, Mr. Manson had done a great deal of homework, and had given considerable thought to the subject. This apparent fact only served to underline the gravity of his remarks. In effect, he claimed that, unless measures were taken by Dosco and government agencies, 2,000 members of the Sydney steel plant's work force of approximately 3,700 would be unemployed by 1972; in 20 years, the plant might be closed.
>
> This gloomy prediction, coupled with the knowledge that the proposed 25 million rationalization of the Cape Breton coal industry by the federal government will reduce mine employment while it increases mine efficiency, can only serve to focus provincial attention on Nova Scotia's most serious economic problem—the very real threat of social and economic disruption in Cape Breton.
>
> Hopefully, Mr. Manson's speech, following so closely the warning of Harry J. Waisglass, research director of the United Steelworkers of America (Canada), that the Voluntary Planning Board's prediction of marginal growth in steel production in the next decade was "wishful thinking," will prompt the board's steel committee to greater efforts than it has apparently made in the past.
>
> The committee, formed a year ago, is composed of representatives of the board, the Atlantic Development Board, the federal Department of Industry, and Dosco itself.

The minister probably does not even know he is represented on that board. This editorial continues:

> During its year of existence, it has been unable to produce a detailed report on the prospects of the industry in this province. In the face of fears such as those expressed so eloquently by Mr. Manson, it should press on with greater energy.
>
> The reason is obvious. As Mr. Manson said, the Dosco steel plant alone accounts for 17 per cent of the province's manufactures. Understandably, the Voluntary Planning Board recently pointed out that "realistic economic planning in Nova Scotia would require detailed information regarding the future of the steel industry in Nova Scotia" No "detailed information" has yet been developed, however.
>
> The steel committee, particularly its Dosco members, faces a serious public duty. It is obvious that the industry stands in need of further investment and product diversification. Can Dosco be induced to take these steps?

I have just received the Halifax *Chronicle-Herald* for this evening, March 22. For the information of the Minister of Industry I would point out that it has a very pretty picture of the minister on the front page. The headline on the front page of this newspaper is "Nicholson Requests Debate To Clarify Dosco Situation". So now he must feel it is of vital importance; he must believe it is something to worry about. After all, he is the Liberal house leader in the Nova Scotia Legislature.

• (9:40 p.m.)

I do not mind being placed in the same category as Mr. Nicholson, if the Minister of Industry feels that what Mr. Nicholson says is

right. A few moments ago the minister seemed to feel that what I said was wrong, and intimated that what others said, including the Halifax *Chronicle-Herald,* was wrong. Now, he is changing his point of view. This is Grit strategy. If a Grit says that black is white or white is black, that is it; it does not matter.

Now, I should like to ask the Minister of National Health and Welfare if the government will show some leadership and undertake an immediate investigation of steel operations so that we can find out if something can be done to assist the industry. There appears to be something wrong somewhere. This is a very bad situation. I recall the Minister of National Health and Welfare appearing on television during the last campaign with a beautiful backdrop of the hills of Cape Breton and the Bras d'Or Lakes. Then, with the countenance of a smiling Buddha, the minister would appear saying that the Liberal government cares; acts and makes good things happen. I heard some strong Liberal people say if the minister appeared on television once more he was going to drive them all up the wall.

Is the minister going to care? Is he going to act? Is he going to make good things happen? Is the Minister of Industry (Mr. Drury) going to do anything? Is this government going to do anything? We have some time left and I hope the Minister of National Health and Welfare will explain to us what is going to be done by the government with regard to this apparently serious problem.

There is another thing I should like to mention before I resume my seat. I wonder if the Minister of Industry is familiar with the unemployment situation in the Atlantic provinces? Does he know that the regional figures are twice those of the national average? I suppose the minister will say the situation was worse a few years ago. This is not an answer. I hope the government will, and I press upon the government to give serious consideration to the problem. I hope the Minister of National Health and Welfare, but more particularly the Minister of Industry since his department is directly concerned, will show some leadership in connection with this problem. I am sure if the minister gets the facts, he will find there is something drastically wrong in the steel industry in Nova Scotia. I ask him and the Minister of National Health and Welfare to show some leadership in this problem, and to work in close co-operation with the provincial government.

I noticed that, according to yesterday's newspaper, the Minister of National Health and Welfare said he was working in close co-operation with the provincial government and they, in turn, were working in close co-operation with him. He felt no one should try to claim credit for anything that might happen, either the federal government alone or the provincial government alone. I realize that this is a change in attitude. He did not feel that way during the last election campaign. I am glad to note that the minister has been converted to the proper way of thinking. At that time he took credit for everything under the sun. Last year in Nova Scotia we had a tremendously good summer, and he took credit for that. A very close clerical friend of mine said that if the minister continued with this attitude he would be claiming credit for the visit of His Holiness the Pope to the United Nations.

I trust that I have made one or two points this evening for the benefit of the ministers and the government. Once again I ask that some leadership be given by the Minister of Industry. He says there is nothing to this allegation. I am sure no one will be happier than the members of the Steelworkers Union, and the members of parliament from Cape Breton, including the Minister of National Health and Welfare, if that is true.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order; the Chair would not wish to pre-judge the situation, but I suppose the hon. member for Pictou was rising to speak on exactly the same situation.

Mr. H. Russell MacEwan (Pictou): Indeed, I am, although the hour is quite late.

Mr. Pickersgill: Will the hon. member for Pictou permit me to ask him a question?

Mr. MacEwan: I have not much time.

Mr. Pickersgill: It is a very brief question. Will the hon. member define his grievance succinctly?

Mr. MacEwan: I will attempt to do that. I am glad to see the Minister of Transport (Mr. Pickersgill) has finally awakened. It is good to have him with us because he is a minister from the Atlantic provinces. It is always good to have Jack around.

I should like to endorse, and I will do this most succinctly, the remarks made by the

hon. members for Cape Breton North and Victoria (Mr. Muir) and Cape Breton South (Mr. MacInnis). I should like to deal mainly with this question of the removal of the equipment from the wire and nail mill at the Sydney steel plant. The reason I mention this situation is that something along this line took place in the constituency which I represent some time ago. I am referring to the time when the nut and bolt department was removed from the Trenton plant to Montreal. This caused a lot of unemployment in the area. I ask you, Mr. Speaker, to guess what party formed the government at that time? Naturally it was the Liberal party. This nut and bolt department was moved. There were a lot of promises made and I believe an inquiry was conducted, but the department was still moved to Montreal.

May I point out that during the time our party formed the government of this country, from 1957 to 1963, there was a move made from Montreal to Nova Scotia. I refer to the closing of the Canada Car plant which did make rolling stock in Montreal. This plant was closed in Montreal and the equipment moved to our area. This just illustrates the difference between what was done by our party and what is done by another party. This move meant a great deal of work for the people of our area. I believe at least 100 people were employed. I recall that at the time there was a great deal of pressure on the government to return the Canada Car plant, but we did not succumb to that pressure. As I say, it has done a lot for our area.

I should like to refer also to the $25 million. I do not know whether the Minister of National Health and Welfare (Mr. MacEachen) has it, or the Minister of Mines and Technical Surveys (Mr. Pepin). However, I am sure the Minister of National Health and Welfare recalls that story about the great Cape Breton magistrate, A. B. McGillivary who had a Cape Breton coal miner before him charged with intoxication. I do not know how that would ever happen in Cape Breton. However, the magistrate fined him $10 and costs. The fellow put his hand in his back pocket and said, "Well, A.B., I have the $10 in my back pocket." The magistrate said, "Ten days in the Cape Breton county jail; have you got that in your back pocket?" I ask the Minister of National Health and Welfare, where is that $25 million?

Mr. Pickersgill: In his back pocket.

• (9:50 p.m.)

Mr. MacEwan: If he has it, he has not done very much with it. I think perhaps the Minister of Transport has taken some of it to Newfoundland with the able assistance of the Premier of that province. I might say that we want to see a little bit of this cash and we want to see it soon. I just want to endorse what was said by my two hon. friends; I think definitely that there should be a movement in this direction.

I think the Minister of Mines and Technical Surveys is very anxious to get to Nova Scotia to meet with the various groups and, barring another crisis, as the Minister of National Health and Welfare said, surely they will be down there soon so that a decision will be made at a very early time.

I now want to say something that I have said in this house before. I hope that the Minister of National Health and Welfare will be able to hold his own in the cabinet. In former cabinets we know that our Nova Scotian minister, the late Mr. Nowlan, the former hon. member for Digby-Annapolis-Kings often told me that he and the Minister of Finance were often held to the true course. He had difficulty in matters affecting our province, but he seemed to be able to come through. I would hope, with the other members here, that our sentiment in this regard will be made plain by the Minister of National Health and Welfare or by the Minister of Industry.

What should be borne in mind are the exact effects of the movement of the equipment from Sydney to Etobicoke, and also the details of the $25 million grant, which was a commitment during the last election campaign by the Minister of National Health and Welfare.

I think it is about time we had the facts on these matters. Questions in this house have been asked many times with regard to them, and I hope that something may be done in that regard.

Finally, sir, there is one thing which many of us who have shipbuilding yards in our areas are wondering about. As I understand it, very little ship refitting and naval refitting is coming to the two yards in Cape Breton. I know in my own area there has not been a sizeable naval refit for a long time.

Mr. Forrestall: Nor in Halifax.

Mr. MacEwan: The junior member for Halifax says, nor in Halifax. That is so.

We are worried about this. We have brought this forward to the attention of the house. I think the final straw was when H.M.C.S. *Bonaventure* went to Montreal. She went up the river and will be there for one year, as we understand. Mr. Speaker, we have been asking questions in this regard. I have put them on the order paper. I have asked orally of the minister what the story is. Of course the Minister of Industry, following the announcement of policy made I think in July, 1965, pointed out that all this naval refitting work must be done by way of tender.

I recall a question I put to the minister. It was respecting a ship bearing a Cape Breton name, H.M.C.S. *New Waterford,* which, during the winter of 1964-65 was due for a sizable refit that would mean much to a small yard such as would be found in my own constituency. At that time we were told, after putting in a new drydock, after doing the building necessary to handle a ship of this size, that we could not do it. We had gone to considerable expenditure; but the Minister of Industry apparently said that tenders would be called. Coming back to what I was speaking of, I am not sure whether the Halifax shipyards and officials concerned were given an opportunity of bidding on H.M.C.S. *Bonaventure.* On speaking to the former general manager of the yard that would have done the work, I understood that they were not given an opportunity to tender.

There are other questions we could put to the minister, which would succinctly bring out what we have in mind. I see that the Minister of Transport did not wait for me to finish. He has gone, as well as the money from the Minister of National Health and Welfare.

Tomorrow, sir, I intend to put a private member's resolution on the order paper asking for a return to the original shipbuilding subsidy program instituted by the former Conservative government and which has been cut down by the present government. The resolution is to the effect that there should be a return to the original program.

In his original announcement the Minister of Transport seemed to think that the cutback to 25 per cent, and so on, which is to go on in succeeding years is sufficiently large enough to provide for our Canadian shipyards. Well, sir, the original plan was brought forward by the government of the present Leader of the Opposition to enable our Canadian shipyards to compete effectively with foreign shipyards. As a result, after a few years in this country we were able to do this, especially in the construction of fishing trawlers. The Minister of Transport has now said that no doubt these fishing trawler subsidies will continue, but on the commercial end of it they are not sure just what will happen. This is the kind of thing—

Mr. Howard: I wonder if the hon. gentleman would permit a question?

Mr. MacEwan: Yes, certainly.

Mr. Howard: I wonder if the hon. gentleman, realizing that it is only two or three minutes to ten, would perhaps desist in his remarks. I do not say that he should do that because of the importance of his question or otherwise, but I suggest he ought to wait for a moment or two, because it is almost ten o'clock, and because it seems to me that some minister on the other side is waiting for the hon. gentleman to sit down so that he can rise and make a declaration of policy.

An hon. Member: They have not risen yet.

Mr. Howard: I know they have not risen yet. I have watched them attentively. I wonder if the hon. member for Pictou would give them at least one last opportunity to say something.

Mr. Muir (Cape Breton North and Victoria): Make a statement, you mean?

Mr. MacInnis: The interjection of the hon. gentleman who did not rise in his seat, to the effect that the hon. member for Pictou did not want to give the minister an opportunity to speak, is unwarranted. I would draw to the attention of members of this house, including the Minister of National Health and Welfare that the hon. member for Pictou in making his remarks offered an opportunity for the Minister of National Health and Welfare to say something on this matter, and the minister declined.

An hon. Member: He refused to get up.

Hon. A. J. MacEachen (Minister of National Health and Welfare): Mr. Speaker, I should like to make a short reply to the comments which have been made, It is true that I did invite the hon. member for Pictou, because I thought he ought to have the opportunity to participate in what is becoming known to the House of Commons as a—

Mr. MacInnis: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker—

Some hon. Members: Closure, closure.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. The hon. member for Cape Breton South on a point of order.

Mr. MacInnis: This point of order was brought on by an interjection. I am now asking the Minister of National Health and Welfare if the hon. member for Pictou did not give him an opportunity to speak at twenty minutes to ten.

Mr. MacEachen: Mr. Speaker, the hon. member for Pictou of course was ready to yield the floor. I did not accept the offer because I thought he might conclude very soon; and if he did not, I thought the house might allow me to make a very brief reply to some of the comments which have been made.

If I have unanimous consent, I should like to make a few brief comments.

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order, please. Has the Minister of National Health and Welfare the unanimous consent of the house to continue.

Mr. Starr: He can say what he needs to say in three minutes.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Does the house give unanimous consent?

Mr. Starr: What he has to say will only take three minutes. He can say it in three minutes.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Does the house give unanimous consent?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Agreed.

Mr. MacEachen: Mr. Speaker, I do not want to miss an opportunity of sharing in the billing of the Cape Breton hit parade that has been hitting the House of Commons regularly since this session began.

Mr. MacInnis: Let us get on.

Mr. MacEachen: I am glad to share even in a modest and minor way in this. The stars have already appeared in the show before this evening. To me, it sounded like a re-run. It was a re-run.

Mr. Starr: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. The minister so far has not said anything. I call it ten o'clock.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order, please.

Mr. Muir (Cape Breton South and Victoria): What about steel?

Some hon. Members: Closure.

Mr. Winkler: You know all about those things.

An hon. Member: You are past masters at closure.

• (10:00 p.m.)

Mr. Deputy Speaker: It being ten o'clock, it is my duty pursuant to Section (4) of standing order 56 to interrupt forthwith these proceedings and put forward any question before the house. Is it the pleasure of the house to adopt the motion?

Mr. Starr: On division.

Motion (Mr. Sharp) agreed to, and the house went into committee, Mr. Batten in the chair.

The estimates of the following departments were first taken up and entered for consideration:

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORT

1. Departmental administration, $4,899,800.

DEPARTMENT OF TRADE AND COMMERCE

1. Departmental administration including fees for membership in the international organizations listed in the details of the estimates, $6,664,500.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

1. Departmental administration including the Canadian Agricultural Services Co-ordinating Committee, contributions to the Commonwealth Agricultural Bureaux and a special contribution not exceeding $20,000 to the Agricultural Economics Research Council, subject to approval by the Treasury Board, $4,750,800.

DEPARTMENT OF EXTERNAL AFFAIRS

1. Administration, operation and maintenance including payment of remuneration, subject to the approval of the Governor in Council and notwithstanding the Civil Service Act, in connection with the assignment by the Canadian government of Canadians to the staffs of the international organizations detailed in the estimates, and authority to make recoverable advances in amounts not exceeding in the aggregate the amounts of the shares of those organizations of such expenses, and authority, notwithstanding the Civil Service Act, for the appointment and fixing of salaries of commissioners (International Commissions for Supervision and Control in IndoChina), secretaries and staff by

the governor in council; assistance and repatriation of distressed Canadian citizens and persons of Canadian domicile abroad, including their dependents; payment to the Roosevelt Campobello International Park Commission for the purposes and subject to the provisions of the act respecting the commission established to administer the Roosevelt Campobello International Park; a cultural relations and academic exchange program with the French community; payment to the Gut Dam International Arbitral Tribunal, and grants as detailed in the estimates, $15,403,400.

DEPARTMENT OF SECRETARY OF STATE

1. Departmental administration including a grant of $100,000 to the Fathers of Confederation Memorial Trust, Charlottetown, P.E.I., $743,600.

DEPARTMENT OF NATIONAL DEFENCE

1. Departmental administration, including grants to military associations, institutes and other organizations as detailed in the Estimates and authority, notwithstanding section 30 of the Financial Administration Act, and subject to allotment by the Treasury Board, for total commitments of $2,632,006,370 for the purposes of votes 1, 15, 20, 25, 30, 35 and 45 of this department regardless of the year in which such commitments will come in course of payment (of which it is estimated that $1,106,752,370 will come due for payment in future years) and authority to make recoverable advances under any of the said votes and, notwithstanding the Financial Administration Act, to spend revenue received during the year from the sale to military personnel of clothing and kit items and revenue received in respect of assistance rendered to the United Nations, any party of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization or any provincial or municipal government, $5,640,000.

DEPARTMENT OF FISHERIES

1. Departmental administration, including grants and contributions as detailed in the estimates, $1,552,000.

DEPARTMENT OF NATIONAL HEALTH AND WELFARE

1. Departmental administration, including recoverable expenditures on behalf of the Canada Pension Plan, $2,495,800.

DEPARTMENT OF MINES AND TECHNICAL SURVEYS

1. Departmental administration, including the administration of the Explosives Act, Canada's fee for membership in the Pan-American Institute of Geography and History and a grant of $10,000 to the Mining Association of British Columbia, $3,217,400.

DEPARTMENT OF NORTHERN AFFAIRS AND NATIONAL RESOURCES

1. Departmental administration, including grants as detailed in the Estimates, $2,196,100.

Proceedings reported.

[Mr. Starr.]

MOTION TO REFER ESTIMATES TO APPROPRIATE STANDING COMMITTEES

Mr. Starr: I wish to ask the leader of the house what the program will be for Friday.

Mr. McIlraith: Before I answer that question I should like to complete a small matter in connection with these estimates, that is, referring them to the appropriate committees.

It will be recalled that pursuant to Order No. 14 of the last session, which order was continued in operation during this session of parliament, the detailed examination of the estimates would be undertaken by standing committees. That is an order of the house.

So that there may be no doubt about it I propose, pursuant to standing Order No. 57, which provides that a motion referring estimates can be made without debate and without notice on the routine proceedings of any day, to ask unanimous consent to make this motion now.

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Does the house give unanimous consent for the minister to move a motion?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Mr. McIlraith: I move:

That, saving always the powers of the Committee of Supply in relation to the voting of public moneys, the items listed in the main estimates for 1966-67 relating to the departments of: Agriculture, External Affairs, Fisheries, National Defence, Health and Welfare, Mines and Technical Surveys, Northern Affairs and National Resources, Secretary of State, Transport, and Trade and Commerce, entered for consideration this day, be withdrawn from the Committee of Supply and referred to the Standing Committees of the House as follows:

Department of Agriculture to Standing Committee on Agriculture, Forestry and Rural Development.

Department of External Affairs to Standing Committee on External Affairs.

Department of Fisheries to Standing Committee on Fisheries.

Department of National Defence to Standing Committee on National Defence.

Department of National Health and Welfare to Standing Committee on Health and Welfare.

Department of Mines and Technical Surveys to Standing Committee on Industry, Research and Energy Development.

Department of Northern Affairs and National Resources, to Standing Committee on Northern Affairs and National Resources.

(a) Indian Affairs to Standing Committee on Indian Affairs, Human Rights and Citizenship and Immigration.

Secretary of State, and all other Agencies for which the Minister is answerable in the House, except the Chief Electoral Officer to Standing Committee on Broadcasting, Films and Assistance to the Arts.

(a) Office of the Chief Electoral Officer to Standing Committee on Privileges and Elections.

Department of Transport to Standing Committee on Transport and Communications.

Department of Trade and Commerce to Standing Committee on Finance, Trade and Economic Affairs.

I should indicate that in this list, where there is reference to the estimates of the Department of the Secretary of State, the office of the Chief Electoral Officer should, I believe, be referred to the Standing Committee on Privileges and Elections rather than to the other standing committee.

Mr. Starr: Agreed.

Motion (Mr. McIlraith) agreed to.

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE

Mr. McIlraith: Mr. Speaker, in reply to the question asked by the hon. house leader for the official opposition, on Friday we propose to call interim supply and the final supplementary estimates for the current fiscal year; not necessarily in that order.

Mr. Starr: For what period of time is the interim supply being called?

Mr. McIlraith: For three months; it is usually for three months at the start of the year—April, May and June. I believe that is the custom according to precedents.

COMMITTEES OF THE HOUSE

JOINT COMMITTEE ON DIVORCE—HOUSE OF COMMONS PERSONNEL

Mr. Bernard Pilon (Chambly-Rouville): Mr. Speaker, may I have permission to revert to motions?

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Does the house give unanimous consent to revert to motions?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Mr. Pilon: I move:

That a message be sent to the Senate to acquaint Their Honours that this house will unite with them in the formation of a joint committee of both houses to inquire into and report upon divorce in Canada, and that the members to serve on the said committee, on the part of this house, will be as follows: Messrs. Aiken, Baldwin, Brewin, Cameron (High Park), Cantin, Choquette, Chrétien, Fairweather, Forest, Goyer, Honey, Laflamme, Langlois (Mégantic), MacEwan, Mandziuk, McCleave, McQuaid, Otto, Peters, Ryan, Stanbury, Trudeau, Wahn and Woolliams.

Motion agreed to.

JOINT COMMITTEE ON PENITENTIARIES—HOUSE OF COMMONS PERSONNEL

Mr. Bernard Pilon (Chambly-Rouville): Mr. Speaker, I move:

That a message be sent to the Senate to acquaint Their Honours that this house will unite with them in the formation of a joint committee of both houses to consider the state of penitentiaries under the control of the government of Canada, and that the members to serve on the said committee, on the part of this house, will be as follows: Messrs. Aiken, Allmand, Dionne, Fulton, Lachance, Macdonald (Rosedale), Matheson, McQuaid, Prud'homme, Ricard, Stafford, Tolmie, Watson (Châteauguay-Huntingdon-Laprairie), Winch and Woolliams.

Motion agreed to.

JOINT COMMITTEE ON CONSUMER CREDIT—HOUSE OF COMMONS PERSONNEL

Mr. Bernard Pilon (Chambly-Rouville): Mr. Speaker, I move:

That a message be sent to the Senate to acquaint Their Honours that this house will unite with them in the formation of a joint committee of both houses to inquire into and to report upon the problems of consumer credit, and that the members to serve on the said committee, on the part of this house, will be as follows: Messrs. Allmand, Andras, Basford, Bell (Saint John-Albert), Cashin, Clancy, Coates, Crossman, Deachman, Duquet, Hales, Lachance, Lefebvre, Macdonald (Rosedale), Mandziuk, Matte, McCutcheon, Nasserden, Olson, Otto, Ryan, Saltsman, Scott and Vincent.

Motion agreed to.

PROCEEDINGS ON ADJOURNMENT MOTION

A motion to adjourn the house under provisional standing order 39A deemed to have been moved.

AGRICULTURE—PORK—REPORTED LARGE IMPORTATIONS BY PROCESSORS

Mr. Eric A. Winkler (Grey-Bruce): Mr. Speaker, it is very uncommon that I remain in the house after ten o'clock but this evening the question I wish to raise is of such grave importance to the hog producers of the country that I felt I should continue to raise the question which I placed before the Minister of Agriculture this afternoon, because it may be that in his lengthy answer he missed the point completely.

I must explain that the question arises from petitions made by members of the Canadian Federation of Agriculture, specifically so far as I am concerned by members of that organization representing the province of Ontario. It would seem that there was an irregularity in the marketing of the carcasses of hogs last week. This afternoon when the minister gave his answer with respect to

figures of imports he specifically mentioned the dates from March 1 to March 8, and gave the number of pounds of imports that came into this country.

• (10:10 p.m.)

Further, Mr. Speaker, he made quite sure that his figures and remarks were directed to the North American market; in other words, the import that he was referring to was from the United States. The entire basis of the interest, so far as this industry is concerned, is that for about the fifth or sixth continuous week farmers had received exceptionally high prices for the carcasses of hogs they were taking to market, and the minister was very fair in giving these prices at the high of February, and then mentioning the drop which occurred last week. The significant factor is that he mentioned nothing about imports last week. I was informed there were imports by a processor from a European country either close to or exceeding two million pounds of the product, and that this directly is the reason there was such a drop in the market.

It is easy to understand how a situation could arise where processors could band together and import a product of this kind for a given number of days, because it is a continuing type of market and the prices would decline because Canadian producers would be suffering from the amount of the imported product which would be used in the packing plants, and there would be no demand for their own product.

As background for the question in respect of the importation, I would like to state that it is granted that the price of carcasses dropped on the United States as well as the Canadian markets, but there is a differential of almost 100 per cent. Therefore it follows that it may be that the statement of this official is factual. In my question to the ministry I made it very clear that I had no argument if the parliamentary secretary would give me the answer.

To be absolutely fair to the house and to the parliamentary secretary, I think I should put into the record the note which I forwarded to the minister's office following the question period this afternoon. It is addressed to the Minister of Trade and Commerce (Mr. Winters). I informed him this afternoon that I had a question for him on the adjournment debate. I stated that the question involved imports of pork or pork products from Europe in the period from March 7 to March 18, and asked that if there were such imports, to what companies were they made and did they have an import licence accordingly.

When I asked the Minister of Agriculture today, he answered me by referring only to the North American market. In this regard, my question to him is in respect of the claim by the Federation of Agriculture that the import in the time referred to was basically the cause of the tremendous drop in the return to farmers in this particular industry which occurred last week. I would say that the drop which occurred was very sharp. If markets in this regard can be manipulated to this extent, I believe the government should take action. I will appreciate the answer to my question.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Jean-Charles Cantin (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Trade and Commerce): Mr. Speaker, pork and pork products are not included in the import control list. Therefore, no licence is required in order to import those products from Europe.

Finally, for the period in question, the department does not yet have the information regarding the importation of those products.

[*English*]

THE CANADIAN ECONOMY—NEWFOUNDLAND—INVESTIGATION INTO FOOD AND DRUG PRICES

Mr. Max Saltsman (Waterloo South): Mr. Speaker, this afternoon I directed a question to the Prime Minister in reference to a news item which appeared in the *Financial Post* of March 19. The item is reported from St. John's, Newfoundland, and indicates that a royal commission has been appointed by the provincial government to investigate food and drug prices in Newfoundland.

I think the action of the Newfoundland government in establishing this royal commission to look into food and drug prices is of the utmost importance, especially in the light of the debate that is taking place in this house regarding the high cost of living in Canada. This is an enormous and bold step forward which is much needed.

When I directed my question to the Prime Minister I asked him whether he and his government intended to support the royal commission set up in the province of Newfoundland, and what assistance he might render in their behalf. Unfortunately the Prime Minister did not feel that he could answer my question, and suggested that it be placed on the order paper.

I think in the light of the special pertinence and the overriding importance of this whole question to consumer cost of living in Canada, it is essential that this matter be debated and drawn to the attention of the government. I think we should find out what proposals and actions the federal government intends to take in this important matter. It may be that the federal government does not at the present time have the power to regulate prices when abuses are found, and I am not certain whether it is absolutely necessary or desirable that the government possess this power.

The hon. member for Burnaby-Coquitlam (Mr. Douglas), the leader of our party, suggested that the government should set up a prices review board. In outlining its functions he stated that it would look into increased prices regarding any commodity, with power to examine the books, profit and loss statements, cost accounting material and other things of material interest, to find out whether or not increased wage costs, costs of raw materials and overhead warranted such an increase being imposed. We have listened for a number of days to comments as to why this cannot be done. Newfoundland, the newest province of Canada, has been able to do this, and this is one of our supposedly underdeveloped areas. The authorities in that province have felt that this is a worth-while and far-sighted step. They are not saying that this cannot be done or that the government does not have jurisdiction.

I should like to quote the suggested terms of reference of that board as reported in the *Financial Post* of March 19, as follows:

> The commission will have a free hand to conduct a thorough and independent investigation of prices and profits at both wholesale and retail levels, and all factors and elements entering into prices, including freight rates, trucking, labour rates, overhead, profit received both wholesale and retail.

We have heard in this house almost every day during this session about the need for federal leadership, yet time and time again it has been the provinces that have acted and the federal government which has said there is nothing that can be done about a situation. If we are going to have leadership in this country the federal government must admit that the provinces are ready and that the federal government is willing.

The kind of answers we have received from the government regarding this whole matter of the rising cost of living are completely unsatisfactory. Why is the government afraid to establish a prices review board such as we have suggested? Does it feel that knowledge of our economy is too heady a wine for themselves and for the people of this country? The premier of the province of Newfoundland does not think so, and neither do the people of that province. The federal government often seems to be pursuing a policy of keeping information from the province. Even in the small way of ensuring that manufacturers indicate the contents of their products, this government has been reluctant to act.

• (10:20 p.m.)

I do not think the government can put forward the excuse that they do not possess the power to act in this situation. We are not even asking for the power of enforcement. We ask for the power of publicity. It is interesting to note that this whole probe in Newfoundland came about because a housewife got mad and decided to picket a supermarket. I say to the government of Canada, "You don't need any regulations. All you need to do is give the housewives of this country the information and they will take care of the rest."

I think it is important that the housewives know who is to blame and whose fault it is that the cost of living is going up. I have all the faith in the world that the Canadian housewife, militant in the defence of her home and family, will watch, read the publicity, do something about the situation and save the government a great deal of trouble. It is a very small thing that we ask.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Rinfret): Order. I regret to interrupt the hon. member, but the time allotted for his speech has now expired.

Mrs. Margaret Rideout (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of National Health and Welfare): Mr. Speaker, I listened with a great deal of interest to the hon. member for Waterloo South (Mr. Saltsman), not only because I am now speaking as parliamentary secretary to the Minister of National Health and Welfare but because I, too, am a housewife.

The hon. member's question related to a report in this week's *Financial Post* to the effect that a royal commission has been appointed by the government of Newfoundland to investigate food and drug prices in that province. In relation to that question I should

like to say that the matter has not been drawn to the attention of the federal government or the officials of the Food and Drug Directorate of the Department of National Health and Welfare. Therefore this government has not offered to assist the province of Newfoundland in its investigation, and has not been asked to do so by the province. However, may I say at this time that the machinery to set up the House of Commons special committee on food and drug prices is now under way and we expect that meetings will be held very shortly.

Motion agreed to and the house adjourned at 10.25 p.m.

APPENDIX

LETTER RESPECTING PURCHASE OF SECURITIES

Minister of Finance
Ottawa 4, March 18, 1966.

Dear Mr. .....

I am writing to you and to the heads of many other Canadian financial institutions and firms to ask for your cooperation in connection with the request I made on behalf of the Government in my statement in the House of Commons on March 16, 1966, a copy of which is enclosed.

To help ensure that Canadian savings are available to meet the present large demands for capital in Canada the Government is asking all Canadian investors, including financial institutions such as the banks, life insurance companies, and trust and loan companies, as well as other corporations, pension funds and individuals, not to acquire securities, denominated in Canadian or U.S. dollars, which are issued by U.S. corporations or their non-Canadian subsidiaries and which are subject to the U.S. Interest Equalization Tax if purchased by U.S. residents. Investments in such securities made by Canadian financial institutions and pension funds to cover foreign currency liabilities to non-residents of Canada and the United States are exempt from this request.

I feel confident that Canadian investors will in the national interest cooperate fully with this request.

Yours sincerely,
Mitchell Sharp.

Encls.

HOUSE OF COMMONS

Wednesday, March 23, 1966

The house met at 2.30 p.m.

PRIVILEGE

MR. MACQUARRIE—NEWSPAPER COMMENT ON VOTE IN HOUSE

Mr. Heath Macquarrie (Queens): Mr. Speaker, one of the well established traditions of parliamentary practice precludes casting reflections upon the votes of hon. members. I should therefore like to invoke privilege in reference to a comment in today's *Globe and Mail* which states:

> Mr. Macquarrie's vote was greeted by hoots from Liberal benches and he sat down quickly, pink with embarrassment.

Lest such a reference leave the impression that my vote was cast by inadvertence, I must make the modest claim that although not outstanding in athletic prowess, my alacrity in rising to vote was at least as great as that displayed in resuming my seat after voting.

Having been blessed with a ruddy, cherubic countenance lo these 46 years, I therefore must deny any suggestion that the pink cast of my complexion stems from the coincidence of voting on that occasion with members of the New Democratic party. Further, Mr. Speaker, I may say that while my life has had its embarrassments, the act of demonstrating lack of confidence in the present government was certainly not one of them.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Speaker: I might say at first blush that the hon. member does not have a question of privilege.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh.

TRADE

HIDES AND LEATHER—REQUIREMENT OF EXPORT PERMITS

Hon. Robert Winters (Minister of Trade and Commerce): Mr. Speaker, I wish to inform the house that under the powers of the Export and Import Permits Act, general export permit Ex-2 has been amended effective tomorrow, March 24, deleting hides, skins, leather and leather manufactures from the schedule to the permit. This has the effect of requiring individual export permits for all such products of foreign origin exported from Canada to all destinations except the United States.

On March 7 the U.S. Department of Commerce announced that shipments of cattle hides, calf and kip skins and bovine leathers destined anywhere in the world except Canada would require a validated export licence. On March 11 the U.S. Department of Commerce announced that export quotas had been established for cattle hides, calf and kip skins and bovine leathers "to provide adequate supplies for domestic needs." As Canada was exempt from the control, no quotas were established for exports to this country. However, U.S. exporters are required to certify that exports to Canada are for consumption in Canada.

• (2:40 p.m.)

In trade with the U.S. Canada is a net importer of cattle hides. Our tanners rely heavily on U.S. hides, particularly during the winter months when supplies of suitable Canadian hides are at their lowest. It is important to this Canadian industry to have free access to cattle hide supplies from the U.S. as well as domestic sources. The action taken to require individual export licensing will permit the government to control possible diversion of United States supplies through Canada to offshore destinations, and is designed to maintain Canadian access to United States supplies.

THE CANADIAN ECONOMY

TABLING OF REPORT "PRIVATE AND PUBLIC INVESTMENT IN CANADA—OUTLOOK 1966"

Hon. Robert Winters (Minister of Trade and Commerce): Mr. Speaker, at this time I would ask leave to table a report entitled "Private and Public Investment in Canada—Outlook 1966" in English and in French.

The report indicates that total capital expenditures in Canada are expected to reach $14.5 billion this year. Such a program, if realized, would be nearly 14 per cent above the actual outlay in 1965. The strong advance in capital investment indicated for 1966 follows increases of 17 per cent in each of the two preceding years. A notable feature of the program is the increased emphasis on the buildup of facilities in basic industry. Capital

outlays in all goods producing industries are expected to be up 18 per cent. Within this goods producing sector an increase of 20 per cent is indicated for manufacturing and 36 per cent for mining.

These outlays involve both expansion and modernization of existing facilities. Once these programs are completed Canadian industry should be more competitive and also better able to supply rising demands in both domestic and foreign markets. Outlays for social capital needs are expected to increase by 15 per cent in 1966; spending for universities and schools is likely to rise by 26 per cent.

The strong advance in capital spending indicated for Canada as a whole is reflected in the program in each of the five principal geographic regions. The increases expected range from 10 per cent to 11 per cent in Quebec and the prairies, to 15 per cent in the Atlantic provinces and 16 per cent in Ontario and British Columbia.

The substantial increase in investment outlays planned for the current year indicates that capital spending will continue to give strong expansionary impetus to the Canadian economy. The program envisaged will add to the demand pressures now present in the economy, particularly for technical skills and materials which are already in tight supply. In these circumstances capital programs are increasingly subject to delays arising from supply limitations.

To forestall the further buildup of demand pressures, there is need for reasonable restraint on the part of all groups concerned in embarking upon new projects, particularly those not urgently required to improve efficiency or expand industrial capacity.

Mr. Winch: Does that apply to politicians' minds?

Hon. Alvin Hamilton (Qu'Appelle): Mr. Speaker, I wish to make a remark or two with regard to the first part of the minister's statement concerning the permits now required to export hides. This by itself is not too significant, but when you realize that the Canadian government faithfully followed the example of the United States government in applying export controls on shipments on copper and copper products, with this following so shortly afterward, once again following the United State's lead, this seems to indicate a very faithful following by the government of United States economic practice.

[Mr. Winters.]

Even though this country is short of certain products, as is the United States, this policy does bring into grave question the path upon which the government now is seemingly embarking. Now, to keep within the small framework of North America production of all goods here for our own advantage does not appreciate that in the long run Canada's interest lies in the maximum amount of multilateral trade. The production of this country should be available to all countries of the world, not to just one or two neighbours.

If this policy is to continue it will mean a radical change from what governments in Canada have done for a good many years, and I suggest it means we are heading into very grave danger.

Mr. Colin Cameron (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands): Mr. Speaker, following on the comments of the hon. member for Qu'Appelle, what I would remark in this regard is that the Minister of Trade and Commerce has now given the definition that he said he was unsure of a little while ago, when someone asked him whether he was a continentalist. Obviously this statement today indicates that he is a continentalist.

In regard to the second statement the minister made in reference to the private end public investment program for 1966, one of the important things that is revealed is the way the ratio between social capital, private capital and industrial capital investment has been changing since 1961. Business capital expenditures have now reached 61.6 per cent of total investment, whereas social capital investment has declined to 38.4 per cent. In 1962 there was a ratio in this regard as between 57 per cent and 43 per cent, so it was almost in balance.

I suggest there is not much use in the government warning us that our economy is being overheated when apparently it accepts with some nonchalance this evidence of further fuel being added to the fire.

The first part of the minister's statement seems to indicate a certain satisfaction over these revelations, yet at the end we have the usual rather weak suggestion that there must be some reasonable restraint. The minister does not tell us just what sort of restraint the government intends to exert to prevent the continuation of this imbalance between business investment and social and capital investment, which I think can reasonably be said to be one of the causes of the overheating of our economy and one of the dangers of inflation

about which we have been told so much lately by various ministers of the government and various spokesmen on behalf of the government.

Mr. R. N. Thompson (Red Deer): Mr. Speaker, I think the comments I could make regarding the trade policy mentioned by the minister have been covered by the hon. member for Qu'Appelle. This policy points up several important factors which relate to trade that go beyond any comment that could be made at this time. However, I should like to comment briefly on the latter part of the statement.

I think it is significant to note the minister's concern, and I can understand that concern in view of the general policy the government has been outlining. Our borrowings in New York in January and February were 11 times as much as they were last year during the same period. When we speak about $14½ billion, we are speaking about 80 per cent of our total money supply in Canada. I suggest that the problem to which the minister has referred in this case will never be solved until there is a distinction placed between social or public capital and commercial or industrial capital. At the same time the government must understand that in differentiating between these two types of capital there is need for a broader monetary policy than it is advocating at the present time.

[*Translation*]

AGRICULTURE

ANNOUNCEMENT OF NEW DAIRY POLICY

Hon. J. J. Greene (Minister of Agriculture): Mr. Speaker, members of the house know that a new government policy is usually announced in one language only.

I therefore wish to inform the house that I shall announce the new government policy for the dairy year starting on April 1, 1966. This policy will ensure a price of $4.00 per hundredweight of milk to Canadian producers.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

[*English*]

Mr. Greene: Mr. Speaker, I wish to announce a new policy for the dairy year beginning April 1 which is intended to raise producers' incomes, stabilize the industry and prevent any uncontrollable consumer price increases caused by shortages.

During the dairy year now ending government policy was to ensure producers, through a combination of supplementary and deficiency payments, a national average price of $3.50 per 100 pounds of manufacturing milk. While this represented a significant improvement in the producers' position over previous years, when prices averaged less than $3, production has not kept pace with population growth and demand.

• (2:50 p.m.)

During the last calendar year domestic consumption of butter exceeded production by some 20 million pounds. Farmers have been moving out of dairying at a disturbing rate during recent years. Some have switched to other kinds of farming, such as raising beef and hogs, because these offer a better living. Far more disturbing are the numbers moving out of farming altogether and going into industry and other urban occupations because they cannot make a living on their dairy farms any more. Because dairy farming requires a substantial investment in relatively permanent equipment, farmers who leave do not tend to return even when prices have improved.

The outlook for the new dairy year is for continued deterioration in the economic position of the dairy farmer, unless government action such as I am now announcing is taken. Unless the producer's confidence in his ability to make a decent living from dairy farming is restored, we face the prospect of shortages. Shortages would, of course, raise the prospect of consumer price increases that could contribute seriously to a higher cost of living. Because of these considerations the government has decided to make the following major changes in its support program for the new dairy year:

1. The support level will provide for an average net return of $4 per hundred pounds of manufacturing milk testing 3.5 per cent butterfat content, basis f.o.b. the factory.

2. The support level will be achieved by direct monthly or quarterly payments to producers from the federal government.

3. The federal payments will be made on a portion of surplus fluid milk.

The Agricultural Stabilization Board will provide details on the application of the new policy to the various categories of producers. The policy will apply in general as follows: For producers of manufacturing milk, the board will take measures designed to permit processors to pay a price of $3.25 per hundred pounds for 3.5 per cent manufacturing milk. Direct payments to producers from the board

of 85 cents, minus a 10 cent export assistance levy, will be used to bring producers' average net returns up to the $4 level.

For cream shippers the board's offer to purchase price for butter will be raised to 59 cents a pound. The cream shipper should therefore receive from the market for his butterfat the equivalent of 59 cents per pound for butter. To this will be added a direct federal payment of the equivalent, on a butterfat basis, of 85 cents per hundred pounds, less the 10 cent export assistance levy.

For fluid milk shippers the board will make direct payments of 85 cents per hundred pounds, minus the 10 cent export levy, for deliveries surplus to 120 per cent of deliveries sold for the fluid milk price. The direct payments will be made to milk shippers each month and to cream shippers each quarter.

It is still the intention of the government to introduce at this session legislation for the establishment of a Canadian dairy commission. One of the functions to be proposed for the commission on its establishment is provision of export assistance on dairy products. In order to finance this activity a levy will be made against all milk and cream supported under this program to finance the movement into export markets of dairy products surplus to domestic requirements. Until the commission is established the board will be authorized to operate the export program and deduct the export assistance levy at a rate of 10 cents per hundred pounds of 3.5 per cent milk. In the event that the whole of the export assistance levy is not required, the balance in this fund at the end of the dairy year will be distributed to producers.

Effective April 1 the present subsidy of 10.9 cents per pound on eligible butterfat used for the production of creamery butter will be discontinued. The board at the same time will raise its offer to purchase butter from the present 55 cents per pound to 59 cents per pound. This will be offered on the basis of designated centres across Canada and present price differentials between these centres will be removed. This level of butter price support will be combined with an appropriate offer to purchase and export assistance on primary products such as skim milk powder and cheddar cheese. The government is confident that this combination of support will permit processors to pay a base price of $3.25 per hundred pounds for 3.5 per cent milk.

However, the federal government has no authority to set the prices that processors pay to producers. I feel it is important, therefore, to stress that it is incumbent upon producer groups and boards to do all they can to see that this market price level is achieved. In discussions with provincial ministers I have been impressed by the degree of co-operation and interest shown in the federal government's dairy policy proposals, and I am confident that this support will continue.

As was the case during the dairy year now closing, the Agricultural Stabilization Board will continue to be advised on its export assistance program by a joint committee of producers and processors.

As indicated already, an innovation in the new dairy policy will be an extension of federal price support to a portion of surplus fluid milk. The payment to fluid milk producers will be at the same rate of 85 cents per hundred pounds, minus the 10 cent export assistance levy. The payment will apply to milk delivered in excess of 120 per cent of the producer's deliveries for which he receives fluid milk prices. If the supply-demand situation indicates a need, this percentage will be adjusted accordingly in subsequent years.

Let us assume, for example, that a fluid milk shipper delivers during the month a total of 20,000 pounds, but he is paid at fluid milk prices for only 14,000 pounds and at lower prices for the rest; 120 per cent of 14,000 pounds is 16,800 pounds. The amount of this producer's deliveries eligible for the direct federal payment would therefore be 20,000 pounds minus 16,800 pounds. The federal payment would be made for 3,200 pounds.

Because the registration of fluid milk producers under this new policy and the establishment of a reporting system from processors will require some time, it is not anticipated that it will be possible to make the first federal payments to fluid producers as quickly as to manufacturing milk producers.

Authority will also be provided to permit the board to make an appropriate adjustment in the direct payment to producers should the board's selling price of butter be increased above the purchase price of 59 cents per pound during the support year.

Obviously this new policy represents a massive administrative undertaking, and to be successful will require the co-operation of everyone involved whether they be producers or processors, all of whom stand to benefit from effective implementation of this policy.

Only the fullest co-operation will ensure rapid and accurate mailing of producers' payments.

The policy on which we are embarking is designed to bring economic stability to the dairy industry and to ensure adequate domestic sources of dairy products for Canadian consumers. Should the supply situation become such that importation of butter were required, any such imports would be brought in through the medium of a government agency in order to avoid disruption of the dairy support program.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, may I thank hon. members of this house, both those from this side who have been pushing me and those from the other side who have been pulling me. I sincerely hope we have achieved a new day in dairy policy which will bring a better way of life to dairy producers and a more secure supply to avoid any dangers to the consumers of dairy products in this country.

Mr. Clément Vincent (Nicolet-Yamaska): Mr. Speaker, I listened with great pleasure to the announcement of the new dairy program by the Minister of Agriculture which will commence next week. Since the minister made the announcement in both languages perhaps I would be better advised to answer in both languages.

The first point I want to make, Mr. Speaker, is that parliament, the country and everyone will recognize that an effective opposition have succeeded in bringing about a policy they have been advocating for the last 12 months.

• (3:00 p.m.)

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh.

Mr. Ricard: We convinced them.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Vincent: As a matter of fact, Mr. Speaker, if you will recall, we, on this side of the house, prepared last year a program asking the government to grant a minimum price of $4 per hundredweight for manufacturing milk. Under that program, we suggested to the Canadian people that a minimum price of $4 per hundredweight be set. At that time, if you will recall, we heard our hon. friends opposite say that it was nonsense, that it was impossible to carry out such a project.

We kept on asking for it and we had the support of the farming organizations in the country and of the whole population. We kept on asking for it until today and it must be admitted now that thanks to its continued efforts, the opposition succeeded in getting what it had been asking for the last 12 months.

Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Greene) spoke a little earlier about last year's dairy policy. You will no doubt recall that last year, as soon as the new policy was announced, we rose to complain about some measures included in that policy. Afterwards, and there again, the opposition was right. In fact, some Canadian dairy producers were forced to say recently in a telegram addressed to the Minister of Agriculture and to other cabinet members, as well as to some new experts in dairy farming, more exactly the hon. members for Hochelaga and Mount Royal (Messrs. Pelletier and Trudeau), that last year's policy was insufficient, that it had not reached the prices set by the government, that is $3.50 per hundredweight.

In this year's new program an average price of $4 per hundredweight is mentioned. Mr. Speaker, allow me to tell you right away that the farmer does not want an average price but a minimum price. It is humanly impossible to break down all the figures given by the minister but one sure thing is that over the week-end, we will take a close look at that new policy. If it really grants a minimum price of $4 per hundredweight to the dairy producers, we will be the first to congratulate the present Minister of Agriculture. On the other hand, if that new policy does not guarantee a minimum price, in short guarantees only an average price, that will not satisfy the dairy producers of Canada.

The minister also pointed out the shortage of dairy products. As a matter of fact, we know that this year the national dairy production went down by 500 million pounds. We also know that there is a shortage of butter in Canada at this time. In fact, only this morning I received a telephone call from a store owner who has been asking the Department of Agriculture for butter since last week. He was asked to wait for two days. He phoned again and was asked again to wait two more days. That proves that there is a shortage of butter now in the warehouses administered by the agricultural stabilization board.

There is a shortage of cheese in Canada. It will be necessary to find new export markets and that is something we will ask the Minister of Trade and Commerce (Mr. Winters) to do so as to help the Canadian dairy

producers. That minister also told us that payments would be made to the dairy producers every month. In that regard, and on behalf of the Canadian dairy producers, I must ask the minister to see to it that those payments are not delayed like those which the producers have been waiting for since last year. The dairy producers will have to get those payments as soon as possible in order to benefit from that money and spend it as they see fit.

Figures were given us about fluid milk. We will make the calculations and we will see if that policy will satisfy the producers of fluid milk who are sometimes forced to sell their surplus which make up at times 40 to 50 per cent of their production.

Another point, Mr. Speaker. The minister referred to a subsidy of 85 cents per hundredweight, from which is deducted 10 cents per hundredweight for export assistance.

It was asked in the past, and again today by us, as well as by dairy producers, that the first $5 million for export assistance be paid by the government, and this, I think, is normal.

Mr. Speaker, the last point I wish to raise is that related to the announced establishment of a national dairy commission, which we have been expecting since last year, when the minister told us that everything would be done to prepare legislation in this regard.

We still have to hear that announcement, and we want this dairy commission to be established as soon as possible so that it may render appreciable services to eastern farmers, to dairy farmers, who have been asking the federal government to set up that commission for several years. This leads me to refer to the job done by the hon. member for Qu'Appelle (Mr. Hamilton), when he was Minister of Agriculture. He started that job back in 1961 and his work was completely stopped from 1963 up to now.

Mr. Speaker, in conclusion I shall say once again that we are glad to learn that the government has apparently adopted, point by point, our dairy policy and we hope for one thing only, that is a minimum of $4 per hundredweight for manufacturing milk.

[*English*]

Mr. T. C. Douglas (Burnaby-Coquitlam): Mr. Speaker, the dairy farmers in this country have been waiting with impatience and anxiety for an announcement by the Minister of Agriculture of the dairy policy for the coming year. I am sure they are glad he has made the announcement, and that the support level for milk is now going to be set at $4 per hundred and the support price for butter at 59 cents.

There are only two brief comments I want to make. The first is that the problem in deficiency payments is to ensure that the benefits accrue to the producer and that the full $4 will be the minimum price for the producer which he will be absolutely sure of receiving, plus any additional amount which the market may warrant.

The minister put his finger on the real problem when he himself said:

> However, the federal government has no authority to set the prices that processors pay to the producers. I feel it is important, therefore, to stress that it is incumbent upon producer groups and boards to do all they can to see that this market price level is achieved.

• (3:10 p.m.)

I think the minister touched there on what is the real problem, because in many cases the benefits of the support prices have not always found their way back to the producers. In many cases the producers have not been getting the full benefit of the agricultural prices stabilization legislation. This is not the time to suggest techniques by which better results could be achieved, but there needs to be some federal co-ordination of the various provincial marketing boards and co-operatives. We also need something for which this party has been pressing for a long time, a national co-operative act to allow groups to organize on a federal basis. Certainly at the present time there does not seem to be any guarantee at all that this support level will in fact bring to the producer the price which has been named by the minister.

The other point I wish to make has to do with the proposed Canadian dairy commission to deal with the export of dairy products. Such a commission is certainly required and we hope the necessary legislation will be brought down this session. I would say this to the minister, however: The suggestion that there should be a levy on all dairy products to provide the necessary funds to subsidize exports seems to me to be taking away with one hand what is given by the other. I do not know any government in the western world which does not subsidize exports, particularly of agricultural products, out of general revenue rather than by placing a levy on producers. It seems to me this is a responsibility and a burden which society as

a whole ought to assume, and that it should not be placed on the shoulders of an industry which is already very close to being bankrupt.

I hope that before the minister brings this legislation down he will give serious thought to this aspect of the matter. I can see very little value in taking 10 per cent away from dairy producers to subsidize their exports. If the minister were prepared to recommend that his colleagues give some thought to subsidies out of general revenue he would be going much further to help in the export of dairy products.

[*Translation*]

Mr. C. A. Gauthier (Roberval): Mr. Speaker, for several weeks now we had been looking forward to the statement made this afternoon by the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Greene). The minister notes that the national consumption of butter exceeded the production, and he mentions it at the outset. I trust this will open the eyes of agricultural organizations across Canada and particularly in Quebec. When the dairy industry is our main industry, and we realize it cannot even produce enough butter to meet the Canadian demand, agriculture has reached a crucial point and it is time for the minister to give greater assistance to the farmers.

He also stated that in the last few years farmers have quit dairying, for good reasons. First of all, for lack of prices in line with production costs. That, I believe, if the first cause the second being the fact that governments fail to help the farmers soon enough.

A while ago the spokesman for the Conservatives said: "We have been asking these adjustments from the minister for the last 12 months". To my mind, the first to have failed to help the farmers are precisely the Conservative party when they were in power.

We have been asking for this, not only in the last 12 months, but since we came here four years ago. It is not only in the last 12 months that things have been going from bad to worse, on the contrary, for over ten years now agriculture has been on the wane in Quebec. People wonder how this will end up. Prices paid to farmers are far from being what might be called "average", or "equivalent" prices.

There is also another cause, the epidemics which often decimate the dairy herds as has been happening in our area for the past two years. It is absolutely necessary that the minister do something about that. We are witnessing the disappearance of more than a third of our dairy herds on account of brucellosis. The government has done nothing to increase assistance to farmers whose herds have been decimated by this epidemic. It is absolutely essential that the minister take steps to enable farmers to rebuild their herds and bring their production to the level at which it should be in the province of Quebec.

At long last something is announced that all farmers—with the Catholic Farmers' Union at the forefront—have been asking for, a price of $4 per hundredweight for manufacturing milk.

On the other hand, there is in the statement one part I do not relish, the one which speaks of producers' average net returns. There is still talk of "average". The Catholic Farmers' Union has always called for a $4 per hundredweight minimum price. The famous $3.50 average price paid last year never gave the producers $3.50 but $3.10, $3.05. The minister must correct this part of his statement to read: the minimum price is $4 per hundredweight for consumption milk.

I congratulate the minister, particularly when he states that the federal payments will apply to that part of the surplus of fluid milk. This policy was imperative in the province of Quebec because of the many producers of fluid milk, who, without help or subsidy, had to sell the rest of their milk as manufacturing milk.

I also congratulate the minister on having hurried, as I mentioned to him the other day that this matter had to be dealt with this year. I think the farmers will be very happy for everything is mentioned aside from the small lack which I pointed out at the beginning. However, I thank the minister for his fine effort and I hope that this will continue so that the farmers will be treated fairly and be able at least to meet the demand of the country.

• (3:20 p.m.)

[*English*]

Mr. H. A. Olson (Medicine Hat): Mr. Speaker, I wish to comment briefly on the statement made by the Minister of Agriculture. At the outset I want to say we welcome this announcement respecting a national dairy policy or national dairy price policy, if I may put it that way because, as mentioned in the statement, the national dairy commission has not yet been set up. The minister indicated that he intended to bring in legislation during this session for that purpose, but that has not yet been done.

It would be very easy to say that this statement is a repetition of some of the same old things, that it is too little and too late. In his opening remarks the minister indicated that the government was motivated first of all by the large number of dairy farmers who are going out of the dairy industry into other production such as hogs and beef. He also said he was disturbed by the number of dairy farmers who have moved out of farming altogether to the point where Canada now faces the prospect of a severe shortage of dairy products for our own home consumption. I think that is altogether too painful a process to go through before there is positive government action taken to correct the causes. Therefore when I say it is too little and too late I am sure the Minister of Agriculture will agree that according to his own statements it is, because literally thousands of dairy farmers had been severely hurt prior to the minister's statement.

Further, in looking over the statement we recognize there will be a massive administrative problem involved and we hope members in all parts of the house will support the minister in setting up an efficient administrative machine to deal with the problem. But, Mr. Speaker, most statements of government policy do not always turn out to be what they appear to be at first glance.

For example, it may look as if the cream shippers are going to have an advance of 4 cents a pound in the offer to purchase under the Agricultural Stabilization Board, plus 85 cents per cwt. for milk—that is, the 3.5 per cent milk. However, when one contrasts that with the 10.9 cent subsidy now being paid, the apparent increase mentioned in the minister's statement is not going to take place, because at least to the extent of about 50 per cent this is a transfer of the subsidies from one route to another.

I am not suggesting, Mr. Speaker, that there is no increase to the cream shippers, but it is only about 50 per cent of what it appears to be. I now have one or two questions to raise.

[Mr. Olson.]

We are wondering whether this 85 cents per hundredweight is going to be paid to the producers of manufacturing milk at all places of delivery in Canada. That is not spelled out in the statement. We also hope, along with the hon. member for Burnaby-Coquitlam, that there is not going to be a temptation on the part of the processors to reduce the price they are now paying, that is, 3.25 cents a pound for the milk, and take advantage of the subsidy so that it will not get back to the producers.

Generally, we think this is a step forward and the closing paragraph of the minister's statement, in which he suggested that there is going to be some protection for the importation of butter into Canada, or at least some government supervision—I think he even said a government agency for bringing butter in if we need it—does in fact fall into line with our contention that our home market should be insulated to some extent from the surplus prices at which butter and butter fat is sold in other countries.

We hope, as the minister moves into this massive new administrative program and policy, that he will be successful in his determination to raise the net income of the dairy producers in Canada.

QUESTIONS

(Questions answered orally are indicated by an asterisk.)

FEDERAL REVENUE FROM ALCOHOLIC BEVERAGES

Question No. 378—**Mr. Mather:**

1. What, in dollars, was the federal revenue on the sale of beer, ale, wine and distilled liquor during 1965?

2. What was the federal expenditure in that year in promoting temperance and supporting anti-alcoholic programs?

Hon. Judy V. LaMarsh (Secretary of State): I am informed by the Departments of National Revenue and National Health and Welfare as follows:

1. 1965 Revenue—Ale, Beer, Spirits, Wine

Commodity	Domestic			Import (Jan.-Oct. only) available
Ale and Beer	(excise duty)	$106,394,832	(customs duty)	$ 228,736
Spirits	(excise duty)	$145,268,424	(customs duty)	$25,344,210
Wine	(excise tax)	$ 4,204,677	(customs duty)	$ 2,095,559
TOTALS		$255,867,933		$27,668,505

Note: Above revenue figures do not include the 11 per cent federal sales tax which also applies but is not identifiable with specific commodities.

2. In so far as the Department of National Health and Welfare is concerned, expenditure on promotion of temperance and supporting anti-alcoholic programs was nil.

AIR PASSENGER TRAFFIC

Question No. 656—**Mr. Knowles:**

During 1965, how many passengers embarked by air from, and how many arrived by air at, each of the following airports (a) Halifax (b) Montreal (c) Ottawa (d) Toronto (e) Winnipeg (f) Regina (g) Saskatoon (h) Calgary (i) Edmonton (j) Vancouver?

Mr. J. A. Byrne (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Transport): Passenger statistics for the full year 1965 are not yet available. Preliminary estimates for the first nine months for scheduled services only, are:

	Emplaned	Deplaned
Halifax International	140,000	141,000
Montreal International	989,000	1,027,000
Ottawa International	162,000	164,000
Toronto International	1,228,000	1,265,000
Winnipeg International	264,000	264,000
Regina International	58,000	57,000
Saskatoon International	38,000	37,000
Calgary International	209,000	207,000
Edmonton International	133,000	133,000
Edmonton Industrial	51,000	50,000
Vancouver International	445,000	445,000

AVAILABILITY OF SOCIAL INSURANCE INFORMATION

Question No. 686—**Mr. Rapp:**

1. Is information from the files of the central index in connection with social insurance made available in whole or in part to the Royal Canadian Mounted Police or other police forces?

2. Is the information on file, as obtained for the purpose of securing social insurance numbers, made available directly or indirectly to the Department of National Revenue for income tax purposes?

Hon. J. R. Nicholson (Minister of Labour): 1. Yes, pursuant to section 98 of the Unemployment Insurance Act, the commission, when it deems it advisable to do so, continues to make certain statistical information contained in the files of the central index and received under the said act, available on request to the Royal Canadian Mounted Police and other police forces.

2. Under the Canada Pension Plan, the Minister of National Health and Welfare is responsible for the general administration of the act, the Minister of National Revenue is responsible for the collection of contributions for all persons covered by the Canada Pension Plan, and the comptroller of the treasury has the responsibility of assisting in the administration of the act.

As provided by the legislation which established the Canada Pension Plan, information from the central index is provided to these departments for these purposes.

Questions

C.N.R. ASSETS, LIABILITIES, PROFITS, LOSSES

Question No. 743—**Mr. Godin:**

1. What were the total assets and liabilities of the C.N.R. for the years 1945 and 1965?

2. What were the profits and losses of the C.N.R. during the years 1945 and 1965?

Mr. J. A. Byrne (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Transport): The information relating to the year 1945 is shown hereunder as recorded in the company's annual report for that year. Figures for 1965 are not yet available in Ottawa, but will be in that year's annual report to be published very shortly:

1. Total assets at 31 December, 1945, $2,303,355,017; Total liabilities, including shareholders' equity, at 31 December, 1945, $2,303,355,017.

2. Surplus—year 1945, $24,756,130.

NORTHERN ONTARIO PIPE LINE—BILINGUAL NAME

Question No. 745—**Mr. Caouette:**

1. How and when was the Northern Ontario Pipe Line incorporated?

2. Has this crown corporation a bilingual name and, if not, for what reason?

3. Does the government intend to give this crown corporation a bilingual name, and (a) if so, when will it do so (b) if, not, for what reason?

[*Translation*]

Hon. Jean-Luc Pepin (Minister of Mines and Technical Surveys): 1. The company was incorporated on June 7, 1956 by an Act of the Parliament (Chap. 10 of the Statutes 1956).

2. The title of the Company in the French edition of the Statutes reads as follows: "loi établissant la société de la Couronne 'Northern Ontario Pipe Line' ".

3. The Government intends to liquidate the Company as soon as an appropriate Act can be submitted to the House.

[*English*]

SIX INCH GUN, FORT MCNAB

Question No. 773—**Mr. Forrestall:**

1. Has the Department of Northern Affairs and National Resources received a request for the removal of a 6-inch mark VII rifled breech loading gun on mounting with shield from Fort McNab for display at Fort Rodd Hill in British Columbia?

2. If so, what decision has been reached?

3. If no decision has been reached, when will action in this matter be finally determined?

4. What immediate plans has the department for this gun?

5. Have any acts of vandalism been noted in connection with the gun?

[Mr. Nicholson.]

6. If so, what damage has been done?

7. Can the damage, if any, be repaired or corrected?

Hon. Arthur Laing (Minister of Northern Affairs and National Resources): 1. No.

2. N/A.

3. N/A.

4. Because of the importance of this piece of equipment to the collection of armament related to the national historic park system, the department's immediate plans are to remove this gun to the mainland to protect it against the ever present danger of vandalism.

5. No doubt over the years vandalism has occurred, but no specific recent incidents have been noted. While the department had been informed that the breech lock had been stolen, it has now been determined that this vital part of the gun was already in safe storage.

6. Fortunately no significant damage has yet occurred.

7. Yes.

GREAT NORTHERN RAILWAY USE OF C.N.R. TRACKS

Question No. 797—**Mr. Winch:**

1. What is the basis of charge to the Great Northern Railway for the use of the Canadian National Railways' tracks between New Westminster and Vancouver?

2. Does the federal government or the Canadian National Railways, or any other authority, make any payment to the Great Northern Railway for its service from the international border to Vancouver?

3. What charge, if any, is levied against the Great Northern Railway for running passenger and freight service over Canadian territory in British Columbia?

Mr. J. A. Byrne (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Transport): Regarding parts 1 and 2, the management of Canadian National Railways advise as follows:

1. The Great Northern Railway operates over its own trackage between New Westminster and Vancouver.

2. No. However, the C.N.R. has running rights over Great Northern trackage between New Westminster and Vancouver for which it pays rental on an agreed formula basis.

3. None.

WAGE RATES OF CARPENTERS

Question No. 800—**Mr. Muir (Cape Breton North and Victoria):**

1. What is the hourly rate required by the Department of Public Works to be paid to contractors for the services of a first class carpenter?

2. What rate is being paid by the contractor at the construction of the Christmas Island post office for the services of a first class carpenter?

Hon. G. J. McIlraith (Minister of Public Works): 1. Each construction contract contains labour rates established by the federal department of Labour for the particular project. These vary depending upon the location of the project, but are the minimum the contractor must pay to workmen employed on the project.

2. Prior to February 28, 1966, $1.50 per hour; subsequent to February 28, 1966, $1.75 per hour.

EXPO '67—INVITATION TO NATO

Question No. 816—**Mr. Dinsdale:**

1. Has NATO been invited to participate in Expo '67?

2. If not, what is the reason?

Hon. Paul Martin (Secretary of State for External Affairs): 1. No.

2. NATO has not been invited to participate in Expo '67 because of its policy not to take part in fairs or exhibitions such as Expo '67. NATO was not represented at the last first category exhibition recognized by the Bureau of International Exhibitions held in Brussels in 1958. However, the Canadian government has invited all member countries of NATO to come to Expo '67 and almost all have agreed to participate.

CONSOLIDATION OF STATUTORY ORDERS AND REGULATIONS

Question No. 848—**Mr. Caouette:**

Has the government published a consolidation of the decrees, orders and regulations in force in Canada, and (a) if so, when will it become available to members of parliament (b) if not, what is the reason?

Mr. John R. Matheson (Parliamentary Secretary to Prime Minister): The last consolidation of all statutory orders and regulations was published in 1955, following the 1952 revision of the statutes of Canada.

Regulations are now being consolidated where possible on an ad hoc basis after a certain number of amendments have been promulgated. The consolidated regulations together with any amendments are listed in the "Consolidated Index and Table of Statutory Orders and Regulations" which is published quarterly by the Queen's Printer.

Consideration is being given to the publication of a consolidation of regulations following the revision of the statutes of Canada which is now in progress.

RESERVATIONS OF BROADCAST TIME DURING ELECTIONS

Question No. 849—**Mr. Caouette:**

1. Does the Board of Broadcast Governors know who reserves certain time periods on radio and television during an election period (a) on the national network (b) on the local networks?

2. What was the period reserved by each political party during the official election campaign of 1965 (a) on the French national network (b) on the French local networks (c) on the English national networks (d) on the English local networks?

3. What amount of money does this time represent for each political party?

4. What total amount does this time purchased for political broadcasts represent?

Hon. Judy V. LaMarsh (Secretary of State): 1. (a) The board is advised of the arrangements between political parties and the networks.

(b) The permission of the board is required before a temporary network may be formed and operated.

2.

C.B.C. Network

	Radio		Television	
	English	French	English	French
Liberal	1 hr. 15 min.	1 hr. 15 min.	1 hr. 52½ min.	1 hr. 52½ min.
P.C.	1 hr. 5 min.	1 hr. 5 min.	1 hr. 37½ min.	1 hr. 37½ min.
N.D.P.	40 min.	40 min.	1 hr.	1 hr.
Social Credit	20 min.	20 min.	30 min.	30 min.
Creditiste	20 min.	20 min.	30 min.	30 min.
Total	3 hrs. 40 min.	3 hrs. 40 min.	5 hrs. 30 min.	5 hrs. 30 min.

Questions

CTV Network

	Paid	Free
Liberal	12 min.	15 min.
P.C.	15 min.	15 min.
N.D.P.	10 min.	15 min.
Social Credit	—	15 min.
Creditiste	—	—
Total	37 min.	1 hour

Temporary Networks (English)

	Radio	Television
Liberal	2 hrs.	10 min.
P.C.	3 hrs. 50 min.	—
Total	5 hrs. 50 min.	10 min.

3. Unknown.

4. Unknown.

SUMMER EMPLOYEES, MINES AND TECHNICAL SURVEYS

Question No. 855—**Mr. Caron:**

1. How many extra employees were hired for summer positions by the Department of Mines and Technical Surveys (a) at the head office (b) in the other Ottawa offices, during the summer of 1965?

2. Who recommended these employees?

3. Do they have relatives—father, mother, brothers, sisters, uncles and aunts—who work for the department?

Hon. Jean-Luc Pepin (Minister of Mines and Technical Surveys): 1. (a) 243 (b) nil.

2. They were employed through, and with the approval of, the Civil Service Commission.

3. No records are maintained which show where an employee's relatives are employed.

SUMMER EMPLOYEES, TRANSPORT DEPARTMENT

Question No. 862—**Mr. Caron:**

1. How many extra employees were hired for summer positions by the Department of Transport (a) at the head office in Ottawa (b) for the Canadian National Railways (c) in summer hotels, during the summer of 1965?

2. Who recommended these employees?

3. Do they have relatives—father, mother, brothers, sisters, uncles and aunts—who work for the department?

Mr. J. A. Byrne (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Transport): 1. (a) 117 extra employees comprising those hired as part of a planned overall government program for university students for summer work, those engaged as temporary leave replacements for continuing staff, those hired to meet peak office work loads, and those hired for general labouring duties. (b) and (c) The Department of Transport does not hire any staff for the C.N.R. or summer hotels.

2. Thirty one applied to and were referred by the Civil Service Commission as student assistants in connection with the overall federal government program. The balance, on the basis of application direct to the department or referral from the National Employment Service, were selected either by the Civil Service Commission or by the department depending on the position involved.

3. Information not available.

[Miss LaMarsh.]

ONTARIO SCHOOL BROADCASTS

Question No. 884—**Mr. Reid:**

1. Does the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation carry the Ontario Department of Education's programs known as "Ontario school broadcasts", and (a) if so, what are the arrangements between the Ontario Department of Education and the C.B.C. (b) if not, what is the reason?

2. Are these programs carried over C.B.C. stations or affiliated stations in Northwestern Ontario?

3. Are these programs carried over the C.B.C. satellite stations in the districts of Kenora and Rainy River and, if not, what is the reason?

Hon. Judy V. LaMarsh (Secretary of State): 1. No. The corporation offered the facilities of its full Ontario network to the provincial department of education, including C.B.C. and affiliated Ontario stations. The offer was not taken up by the department of education and therefore there is no C.B.C. network feed.

2. These programs are not carried over C.B.C. stations. The department of education approached a number of private affiliated stations individually, including those in northwestern Ontario which have been carrying the programs.

3. C.B.C. relay stations in the Kenora-Rainy River area do not carry the programs in question, although they do receive the school telecasts distributed through the C.B.C.'s national and Ontario networks. The corporation is not prepared to make just one part of its Ontario network available to complete a non-C.B.C. distribution system when the full facilities of the network have been offered but declined.

RESEARCH INTO GASOLINE PRODUCTION FROM COAL

Question No. 896—**Mr. Dinsdale:**

1. Is Canada conducting research into the possibilities of deriving gasoline from coal by (a) coal hydrogenation (b) Fischer-Tropsch synthesis (c) H-coal process (d) or any other procedures?

2. What are the merits of these various systems?

Hon. Jean-Luc Pepin (Minister of Mines and Technical Surveys): 1. No.

2. (a) Coal hydrogenation (Bergius process) is uncompetitive with gasoline derived from oil, but mines branch of this department is using the extensive wartime experience of an engineer on their staff who periodically reviews technical and economical possibilities with particular reference to the maritimes coal problem.

(b) The Fischer-Tropsch process, though considered a little less costly than the Bergius process, still cannot produce gasoline at present day prices. In Great Britain all research on the process has been discontinued.

(c) The H-coal process is a more promising process than the Bergius and Fischer-Tropsch, but is competitively unfavourable with the H-oil process treating cheap, heavy residual oils. Mines branch is conducting research on variants of the H-oil process to obtain insight on the merits of this process in relation to the H-coal process and to secure data on refining Canada's large low grade oil reserves.

(d) A project financially supported by the U.S. office of coal research is aimed at producing gasoline by hydrogenation of the distillation products from a multistage fluidized coal bed system. This project is in its early stages.

SAFETY INSPECTION OF VESSELS

Question No. 909—**Mr. Forrestall:**

1. Does any department of government assume responsibility or exercise jurisdiction in matters of safety inspection aboard vessels including Canadian forces craft, foreign or domestic commercial craft, while they are in Canadian territorial waters and ports for loading and discharging purposes, ship repairs, overhauls and inspections?

2. If not, has this matter been considered and, if so, by what government authority and with what results?

Mr. J. A. Byrne (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Transport): 1 and 2. The Department of Transport exercises jurisdiction in those matters of safety aboard Canadian-registered civil vessels which pertain to soundness of hull, machinery, equipment and the safety of the ship and its passengers and crew. Repair and other personnel from shore establishments when working on board the ship from time to time are also subject to workmen's compensation regulations relating to their trades. Non-Canadian ships may be brought under departmental jurisdiction at the request of a collector of customs if he has reason to doubt seaworthiness. Ships' cargo handling gear is subject to departmental jurisdiction in all Canadian ports regardless of flag.

TENDER FOR MOBILE HOMES, NEW BRUNSWICK

Question No. 911—**Mr. MacRae:**

In connection with tender No. 556-5, dated January 14, 1966, for two mobile homes for the forestry department in New Brunswick (a) who was the successful dealer who was awarded the contract for these mobile homes (b) what were the sizes and makes of the mobile homes supplied (c) what were the successful tender prices?

Hon. Maurice Sauvé (Minister of Forestry): (a) Bradshaw's Trailer Sales & Rentals, Restigouche Road and Pawnee Drive, Oromocto, N.B., One (1) house trailer; General Coach Works of Canada Ltd., Hensall, Ont., Two (2) house trailers;

(b) From Bradshaw's Trailer Sales & Rentals, Oromocto, N.B.: One (1) house trailer with tandem axle assembly 10 ft.×45 ft. manufactured by Glendale Mobile Homes (Maritime) Ltd., with factory at Sussex, N.B. From General Coach Works of Canada Ltd., Hensall, Ont.: Two (2) house trailers with tandem axle assembly, 10 ft.×42 ft., manufactured by General Coach Works of Canada Ltd., Hensall, Ont.

(c) Bradshaw's Trailer Sales & Rentals, Oromocto, N.B.: One (1) house trailer at a cost of $4,900.00 F.O.B. Fredericton, N.B., sales tax included. General Coach Works of Canada Ltd., Hensall, Ont.: Two (2) house trailers at a cost of $4,394.00 each, F.O.B. Fredericton, N.B., sales tax included.

HOUSE OF COMMONS TELEPHONE OPERATORS

Question No. 917—**Mr. Caouette:**

1. How many telephone operators are employed by the government for the House of Commons, and (a) how many speak French (b) how many speak English (c) how many are bilingual (d) among those who are bilingual, how many claim French as their mother tongue?

2. Do these employees belong to the Civil Service?

3. Are they better paid when they are bilingual?

4. Does the government seek especially the services of bilingual telephone operators?

5. Does the government allow employees who are not bilingual to occupy these positions and, if so, for what reason?

Mr. J. A. Byrne (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Transport): 1, 2, 3, 4 and 5. No telephone operators are employed by the government for the House of Commons. Telephone operator service is furnished by the

Bell Telephone Company as part of the switchboard service, and it has been the practice to expect the company to provide bilingual service. In this connection the company has advised: in regard to 1 (a), that half the operators employed on the government switchboard speak French; in regard to 1 (b), that all speak English; in regard to 1 (c), that approximately one half the total list of operators, from which the duty operators are drawn, are bilingual, and this is generally true of the shift on duty at a particular time; in regard to 1 (d), that this information is not available.

USE OF GOVERNMENT WHARF, SAMBRO, N.S.

Question No. 929—**Mr. McCleave:**

1. How many fishing boats and approximately how many fishermen have used the government wharf at Sambro, Halifax county, in (a) 1960 (b) 1963 (c) 1965?

2. What were the weights and values of the fish catch landed on said wharf in the same years?

Hon. H. J. Robichaud (Minister of Fisheries): 1. (a) 1960—10 vessels over 10 gross tons and 70 men on a continuous basis; 35 resident boats under 10 gross tons and 50 resident fishermen and 10 non-resident boats under 10 gross tons and 20 non-resident fishermen on an intermittent basis; (b) 1963—10 vessels over 10 gross tons and 70 men on a continuous basis; 50 resident boats under 10 gross tons and 60 resident fishermen and 15 non-resident boats under 10 gross tons and 30 non-resident fishermen on an intermittent basis; (c) 1965—12 vessels over 10 gross tons and 85 men on a continuous basis; 25 resident boats under 10 gross tons and 50 resident fishermen and 20 non-resident boats under 10 gross tons and 40 non-resident fishermen on an intermittent basis.

2.		Weight	Value
(a)	1960	489,000 lbs.	$176,000
(b)	1963	558,000 lbs.	$120,000
(c)	1965	315,000 lbs.	$118,000

RESTRICTIONS ON USE OF WHARF, SAMBRO, N.S.

Question No. 930—**Mr. McCleave:**

1. Has the government wharf at Sambro, Halifax county, been condemned and are these restrictions on the amount of weight which may be permitted on the wharf?

2. Are there plans to rebuild the wharf, or to build a new wharf?

Hon. G. J. McIlraith (Minister of Public Works): 1. No, not condemned. The wharf was designed to carry a five ton concentrated truck load or a uniform loading of 150 pounds per square foot and since trucks in excess have been using the wharf it was necessary to erect a warning sign regarding the load limits.

2. No.

SKI SAFETY MEASURES IN NATIONAL PARKS

Question No. 938—**Mr. Lambert:**

1. Among the regulations of the national parks branch of the Department of Northern Affairs and National Resources, are there requirements for first aid and medical facilities at the site of various skiing developments in the Banff and Jasper national parks?

2. If so, what are such requirements?

3. Do these regulations call for qualified medical practitioners to be on duty or readily available especially on week ends?

4. If not, is consideration being given to this and other related safety measures on ski slopes in the national parks?

Hon. Arthur Laing (Minister of Northern Affairs and National Resources): 1. No.

2. N/A.

3. N/A.

4. This department has always provided for the safety of skiers in the parks. For many years ski patrols have been maintained in developed ski areas for the purpose of providing first aid and evacuation of injured skiers. Ski patrol personnel are thoroughly trained and highly qualified to perform the duties required of them.

Adequate telephone or radio communication systems exist between ski development areas and visitor services centres where medical practioners, hospital and ambulance services are available. Our present policy calls for ski patrol, first aid and evacuation services to become the responsibility of the ski area operators. The department will continue to set standards for these facilities and services.

DEATH IN FIRE ON H.M.C.S. "PROVIDER"

Question No. 942—**Mr. McCleave:**

1. Did fire occur aboard H.M.C.S. *Provider* in August, 1965, while she was drydocked at Halifax shipyards, taking the life of William Scudder?

2. What investigations were carried out by civil and military authorities into the death of Mr. Scudder?

3. What were the findings of such investigations?

4. Were any recommendations made to prevent further fatalities?

5. If such recommendations were made, has action been taken upon them and, if so, what action?

6. Was the work being carried out by William Scudder, just prior to his death under supervision and inspection of others and, if so, by whom?

Hon. Léo Cadieux (Associate Minister of National Defence): 1. Yes, Mr. Scudder an employee of Halifax Shipyards Limited, died as a result of burns sustained in a flash fire aboard H.M.C.S. *Provider*.

2. A naval board of inquiry was held to determine the cause of the fire and report on the damage to H.M.C.S. *Provider*. It is not known whether any civil inquiry was held in regard to Mr. Scudder's death. This would be a provincial responsibility.

3 and 4. Service boards of inquiry are not public inquiries. The findings and recommendations of such a board are privileged.

5. Appropriate action is being taken on the recommendations of the board of inquiry.

6. Yes, the contractor, Halifax Shipyards Limited.

FEED GRAIN STORAGE, ATLANTIC PROVINCES

Question No. 953—**Mr. Flemming:**

1. Are feed grains from western Canada now available at various distribution points in the Atlantic provinces at reasonable prices?

2. If so, have adequate storage facilities been provided to guarantee continuity of supply?

3. If so, at what points?

4. Are feed grains brought in during the summer season via the St. Lawrence seaway and thereby made available to consumers in the Atlantic provinces after the seaway traffic has ceased?

Hon. Maurice Sauvé (Minister of Forestry): 1. Until March, supplies were short, but with the coming into effect, on March 9, of new reduced and competitive rail rates from the lakehead, western feed grains will now be available at more reasonable prices.

2. At the close of navigation, storage space at Halifax was not sufficient to cater to both domestic and export trade.

3. See 1 and 2 above.

4. Yes, for most of the needs.

*GRANT TO HIGHWAY SAFETY COUNCIL

Question No. 959—**Mr. Noble:**

1. Has the government made a decision on the application of the Canadian highway safety council for an increase in their grant?

2. If so, what is the amount of the increase in the grant?

3. If not, when will a decision be made?

Mrs. Margaret Rideout (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of National Health and Welfare): 1. Yes.

2. $15,000, to bring total grant to $40,000.

3. Not applicable.

OIL EXPLORATION PERMITS, EAST COAST

Question No. 960—**Mr. MacLean (Queens):**

Has the government of Canada issued exploration licences or permits to persons or companies for the exploration of oil off the east coast of Canada and, if so, how many such licences or permits have been issued in the last three years?

Hon. Jean-Luc Pepin (Minister of Mines and Technical Surveys): Yes, 986.

AID TO DEVELOPING COUNTRIES

Question No. 965—**Mr. Mather:**

What percentage of Canadian aid to developing countries during 1965 was in the form of direct aid, such as food and other supplies, and what percentage was used to assist in "self-help" programs, i.e., the modernization and development of capital agricultural facilities and the improvement in production methods?

Hon. Paul Martin (Secretary of State for External Affairs): Of the total of $165 million in multilateral and bilateral grant aid and development loans made available to developing countries during the fiscal year 1965-66, 21 per cent was in the form of foodstuffs. Approximately 16 per cent was devoted to the modernization and development of capital agricultural facilities in the form of projects such as irrigation and land reclamation, construction of food storage facilities, resources surveys, provision of fertilizers and fertilizer components and rural electrification schemes. In addition, substantial amounts were allocated for other economic development projects, many of which indirectly benefit agricultural production, including in particular power development, improvement in transport, increased educational facilities, and the provision of technical assistance.

*"CANADA 1966"— MAP OF AIR ROUTES

Question No. 976—**Mr. Sherman:**

1. When preparing the map for the publication *Canada 1966*, will the Department of Mines and Technical Surveys undertake to show thereon (a) the existence of a direct Air Canada route from Winnipeg to the United Kingdom via Hudson Bay (b) the existence of a direct Air Canada route from Winnipeg to Ottawa (c) the existence of a direct Trans Air route from Winnipeg to Churchill?

2. If not, for what reason?

Questions

Hon. Jean-Luc Pepin (Minister of Mines and Technical Surveys): 1. The next edition of maps MCR 20 and 21 will show (a) the existence of a direct air route from Winnipeg to the United Kingdom via Hudson Bay and (b) the existence of a direct air route from Winnipeg to Ottawa; (c) No.

2. Because of the small size of the maps, regularly scheduled routes only are shown. TransAir does not provide a direct service between Winnipeg and Churchill. However, this carrier does provide a service between these points via The Pas. The service between Winnipeg and The Pas is regularly scheduled and this route will be shown. TransAir provides a specific point service between The Pas and Churchill with some degree of regularity dependent on traffic volume. This route will not be shown.

FILM BOARD FILM "EVERY SECOND CAR"

Question No. 979—**Mr. Dionne:**

Has the C.B.C. been requested to show a second time the National Film Board's film "Every Second Car" and its French translation "Une auto sur deux", concerning traffic security in automobile construction?

[*Translation*]

Hon. Judy V. LaMarsh (Secretary of State): "Every Second Car" was telecast over the English Network twice, on March 3, 1965 and as a summer repeat on June 28, 1965. There have not been any requests to show it again and there are no plans to do so.

"Une Auto Sur Deux" was telecast over the French Network in September, 1965. There have been no requests to repeat it and there are no plans to do so.

[*English*]

REPRESENTATIONS BY TORONTO BRANCH, NAVAL OFFICERS ASSOCIATION

Question No. 993—**Mr. Howe (Hamilton South):**

1. Has the government received representations from the Toronto branch of the Naval Officers' Association of Canada, suggesting increased regulation of small boats?

2. If such representations were received, did they contain reference to the dumping of refuse, debris or human effluent in lakes or coastal waters and, if so, what was the precise nature of such reference?

3. What has been the reply to any such representations?

Mr. J. A. Byrne (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Transport): 1. Yes.

[Mr. Sherman.]

2. Yes, rules proposed as follows: No debris, refuse, or human effluent shall be deposited or pumped into any body of fresh water, or into coastal waters, within a distance of twelve miles from land. All boats shall be equipped as required with proper containers for such sewage and waste, for subsequent deposit in authorized places ashore.

No broken or empty glass or metal containers shall be deposited in any coastal or inland waters, or indiscriminately deposited on beaches or other shore areas.

3. A meeting was held between the Naval Officers Associations and the Department of Transport on February 15, 1966, to discuss the above representations. It was decided at that meeting that the representations be put forward for discussion at the next federal-provincial conference on small boats, invitations to which will be issued shortly.

*NAMES FOR NATIONAL LIBRARY AND NOVA SCOTIA PARK

Question No. 1,018—**Mr. McCleave:**

Will the government consider, or has it considered, giving the name of Sir Robert Borden or any other former prime minister to the national library of Canada and, if not, will the government consider giving the name of Sir Robert Borden to the new national park in western Nova Scotia?

Hon. G. J. McIlraith (Minister of Public Works): When a decision has been taken as to what name will be given to the National Library of Canada and to the new national park in western Nova Scotia, it will be announced in the usual way.

WINTER WORKS, NOTRE DAME DE LA GUADELOUPE, QUE.

Question No. 1,024—**Mr. Langlois (Megantic):**

1. What proportion of the total cost of the winter works carried out in the parish of Notre Dame de la Guadeloupe, during 1961-62, 1962-63, 1963-64, 1964-65 and 1965-66, was paid by the federal government?

2. What amount was paid in each year?

3. What was the nature of the work carried out in each winter season?

4. What was the cost of such work in each particular case?

5. How many people were employed on such works during each winter season?

6. What are the names of the persons so employed during each of these winter seasons?

7. What amount has each person received for the work done each season during which he was employed?

[*Translation*]

Mr. John C. Munro (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Citizenship and Immigration): The Province of Quebec municipal guide does not list the parish of Notre Dame de la Guadeloupe as a municipality.

The information provided hereunder refers to the Village of La Guadeloupe, County of Frontenac.

1. 1961-62—38%; 1962-63—35%; 1963-64—51%; 1964-65—11%; 1965-66—20% (Estimated).

2. 1961-62—$6,564.63; 1962-63—$9,048.76; 1963-64—$28,199.65; 1964-65—$9,187.15; 1965-66—$39,638.00 (Estimated Federal Government Share).

3, 4 and 5.

Project No.	Description	Total Cost of Project $	No. of Workers Employed
1961-62			
Que. 293	Clearing of creek and ditches.	6,600	50
Que. 1677	Digging water reservoir, brushing and clearing water course.	10,750	33
1962-63			
Que. 237	Improvements to roads, construction of reservoir.	16,562	59
Que. 1729	Clearing area around reservoir, digging ditches.	9,550	20
1963-64			
Que. 538	Road improvements, fence construction.	23,700	50
Que. 1836	Construction of fire station.	31,900	60
1964-65			
Que. 596	Construction of warehouse, development of playground.	85,730	103
1965-66			
Que. 1524	Installation of water mains and sewers.	159,200	26 (Estimated)
Que. 1525	Improvement to roads, construction of bridge.	34,863	25 (Estimated)

---

6. Information not available.

7. Information not available.

[*English*]

REMOVAL FROM MARKET OF ANTIBIOTIC LOZENGES

Question No. 1025—**Mr. Howe (Hamilton South):**

Has the government taken any action to remove from the market any kinds of antibiotic throat lozenges and, if so, on what date was such action taken, and for what reason?

Hon. A. J. MacEachen (Minister of National Health and Welfare): No. The food and drug directorate of the Department of National Health and Welfare has notified manufacturers of throat lozenges containing less than 3,000 international units of penicillin, that these products will be placed on prescription. Action has been initiated to amend the food and drug regulations to bring this requirement into effect. This action is being taken to ensure that these products are used under medical direction, since small doses of penicillin may result in the development of sensitivity to this drug in certain individuals as well as the development of resistant organisms.

*REPORT ON WINNIPEG BASE OF AIR CANADA

Question No. 1034—**Mr. Sherman:**

When does the government expect to have the Thompson commission report, on Winnipeg's aviation future, available for presentation to Parliament?

Mr. John R. Matheson (Parliamentary Secretary to Prime Minister): I am informed by the commissioner as follows: The report, in English, of the commission of inquiry into

problems relating to the future of the aircraft overhaul base maintained by Air Canada at Winnipeg international airport is ready, and as soon as the documents have been translated into French and the printing completed it will be submitted to the governor in council. It will then be for the government to consider the question of publication of the report.

GRANTS TO CLASS A FAIRS

Question No. 1037—**Mr. Dinsdale:**

1. What funds are made available by the government of Canada to class A fairs?

2. How have these funds been disbursed to each class A fair for each year since 1963?

3. What programs are contemplated for the fiscal year 1966-67?

Hon. J. J. Greene (Minister of Agriculture): 1. Funds are available to each class "A" exhibition in respect to the following, on an annual basis:

(a) *Permanent improvement grants* for the building, repair or alterations of facilities for the display of agricultural products or improvements to exhibition grounds. This grant is based on 50 per cent of actual expenditure to a maximum of $3,000.

(b) *Grants with respect to judges.* This is a total expenditure grant for payment to judges of specified agricultural exhibits to a maximum of $500.

(c) *Junior activities grants.* A total expenditure grant to pay for transportation of club exhibits, accommodation and meals of exhibitors, trophies and prize monies on interclub competitions. Maximum grant $1,000.

(d) *Prize money grants.* Class "A" exhibitions showing under the new livestock classifications receive 50 per cent of the prize money paid out in the new classes.

Major capital grants

Major capital grants are paid in respect to agreements made effective prior to June 21, 1962.

2.

GRANTS TO CLASS "A" EXHIBITIONS—FISCAL YEAR 1964-65

	Judges	Junior Activities	Permanent Improvements	Major Capital	Prize Money	Total
			MARITIME PROVINCES			
Truro, N.S.	500.00	1,000.00	2,339.11			3,839.11
Windsor, N.S.	500.00	1,000.00	3,000.00			4,500.00
Charlottetown, P.E.I.	500.00		2,150.89			2,650.89
			QUEBEC			
Sherbrooke	500.00	1,000.00	2,201.30			3,701.30
Quebec City	500.00	1,000.00	4,000.00			5,500.00
Montmagny	500.00	1,000.00	2,012.91	8,217.65		11,730.56
Lachute	500.00	970.87	3,000.00			4,470.87
Trois Rivières	470.00	987.75	3,000.00			4,457.75
Victoriaville	425.00	1,000.00	2,000.00			3,425.00
Rimouski	500.00	1,000.00	856.99			2,356.99
Ormstown	500.00	838.73	2,132.20			3,470.93
St. Hyacinthe	500.00	1,000.00	3,000.00			4,500.00
			ONTARIO			
Belleville	465.00	1,000.00	3,000.00			4,465.00
Toronto	500.00	1,000.00	3,000.00			4,500.00
Ottawa	500.00	1,000.00	3,000.00			4,500.00
Lindsay	500.00	1,000.00	3,000.00			4,500.00
Simcoe	500.00	977.00	3,000.00	3,750.00		8,227.00
Galt	500.00	942.73	894.73			2,337.46
Peterborough	500.00	1,000.00	2,708.82			4,208.82
Welland	332.00	645.00	3,000.00			3,977.00
London	500.00	971.00	3,000.00		9,222.50	13,693.50
			MANITOBA			
Brandon	500.00	1,000.00	3,000.00			4,500.00
Winnipeg	500.00	1,000.00	3,000.00		1,837.50	6,337.50

	Judges	Junior Activities	Permanent Improvements	Major Capital	Prize Money	Total
			SASKATCHEWAN			
Prince Albert	165.00	1,000.00	2,868.53			4,033.53
Regina	500.00	1,000.00	3,000.00		1,995.00	6,495.00
Saskatoon	500.00	1,000.00	3,000.00		2,135.00	6,635.00
			ALBERTA			
Calgary	500.00	895.00	3,000.00			4,395.00
Edmonton	500.00	1,000.00	3,000.00		2,810.00	7,310.00
Lethbridge	500.00	1,000.00	3,000.00			4,500.00
			BRITISH COLUMBIA			
Cloverdale	500.00	1,000.00	3,000.00			4,500.00
Vancouver	500.00	1,000.00	3,000.00			4,500.00

GRANTS TO CLASS "A" EXHIBITIONS—FISCAL YEAR 1965-66
TO MARCH 15 ON APPLICATIONS RECEIVED TO DATE

			MARITIME PROVINCES			
Truro, N.S.	500.00	1,000.00	1,939.40		4,062.00	7,501.40
Windsor, N.S.	500.00	1,000.00	3,000.00		3,960.00	8,460.50
Charlottetown, P.E.I.	500.00		2,334.93		8,167.00	11,001.93
			QUEBEC			
Sherbrooke	500.00	1,000.00	2,075.98		5,232.50	8,808.48
Quebec City	500.00	1,000.00	4,000.00		10,047.50	15,547.50
Lachute	500.00	880.57	3,000.00		3,975.00	8,355.57
Trois Rivières	440.00	934.00	3,000.00		7,755.00	12,129.00
Victoriaville	500.00	1,000.00	312.70		6,485.00	8,357.70
Rimouski	500.00	1,000.00	3,000.00			4,500.00
Ormstown	500.00	830.16	3,000.00			4,330.00
			ONTARIO			
Toronto	500.00	1,000.00	3,000.00		28,433.50	32,933.50
Ottawa					19,115.00	19,115.00
Lindsay	500.00	1,000.00	2,571.54		4,031.50	8,103.04
Simcoe	500.00	951.28	3,000.00		4,264.50	8,715.78
Galt	500.00	942.73	894.73			2,337.46
Peterborough					5,391.00	5,391.00
Welland	378.95	646.00	3,000.00		3,202.00	7,226.95
			MANITOBA			
Brandon	500.00	1,000.00	2,633.33		12,908.00	17,041.33
Winnipeg	500.00	1,000.00	3,000.00		8,747.50	13,247.50
			SASKATCHEWAN			
Prince Albert					1,476.00	1,476.00
Regina	500.00	1,000.00	3,000.00		16,196.50	20,696.50
			ALBERTA			
Calgary	500.00	340.00	3,000.00		24,237.50	28,077.50
Edmonton	500.00	1,000.00	3,000.00		25,574.00	30,074.00
Red Deer	500.00	1,000.00	3,000.00		5,092.50	9,592.50
			BRITISH COLUMBIA			
Cloverdale	500.00	1,000.00	3,000.00			4,500.00
Vancouver	500.00	1,000.00	3,000.00		10,432.50	14,932.50

3. A continuation of the current program is proposed. Any decision to modify plans will be announced.

DUTY FREE ENTRY OF FARM EQUIPMENT

Question No. 1049—**Mr. Mather:**

Is consideration being given to permitting the entry, free of duty and excise tax, of farm equipment and apparatus of a type not made in Canada and needed in the preparation of fruit and vegetable products?

Hon. Mitchell Sharp (Minister of Finance): Requests that the duty and sales tax be removed from equipment and apparatus of a class or kind not made in Canada used in the preparation of fruit and vegetable products, as well as representations on other tariff and sales tax matters, are being studied during the preparation of the budget.

BILL OF RIGHTS PRINTED ON PARCHMENT

Question No. 1051—**Mr. Stefanson:**

Has the Queen's Printer on hand a stock of the Canadian Bill of Rights printed on parchment and, if not (a) for how long has this document been out of print (b) what plans has the government for printing additional copies so that they will be available to the general public?

Hon. Judy V. LaMarsh (Secretary of State): No for the English version; yes for the French version; (a) February 1966 for the English version; (b) demand did not warrant the cost of a reprint so far.

LIMIT ON FEDERAL ELECTION CAMPAIGNS

Question No. 1089—**Mr. MacRae:**

Is consideration being given by the government to introducing legislation which will have the effect of limiting federal election campaigns to a maximum of four weeks?

Mr. John R. Matheson (Parliamentary Secretary to Prime Minister): The answer to this question is the same as that given to starred question No. 927 on March 21, 1966, reference *Hansard* page 2928.

QUESTIONS PASSED AS ORDERS FOR RETURNS

RESEARCH GRANTS AND SCHOLARSHIPS

Question No. 41—**Mr. Allard:**

1. By grants and research scholarships, what amounts were spent in each province by the National Research Council in 1960, 1961, 1962, 1963, 1964 and 1965?

2. What federal institutions in addition to the National Research Council are engaged in research?

3. By grants and research scholarships, what are the amounts spent by the Canada Council in each province in 1960, 1961, 1962, 1963, 1964 and 1965?

Return tabled.

[Mr. Greene.]

DOMINION-PROVINCIAL CONFERENCES

Question No. 71—**Mr. Macquarrie:**

1. Since June 15, 1963, how many dominion-provincial conferences have been held?

2. Which of these conferences were held at the (a) ministerial and which at the (b) official level?

3. At which conferences were the sessions open to press and public?

Return tabled.

ARDA PROJECTS, QUEBEC

Question No. 373—**Mr. Laprise:**

1. In 1964-65, what projects were undertaken under the Agricultural Rehabilitation and Development Act and what was the nature of these projects in (a) the province of Quebec (b) the county of Chapleau?

2. What is the cost of each of these projects?

3. What projects are under study and due to begin soon in (a) the province of Quebec (b) in the county of Chapleau?

4. What amount will be earmarked for each of these projects?

Return tabled.

USE OF AIRCRAFT BY FORESTRY MINISTER

Question No. 516—**Mr. Coates:**

1. On how many occasions has the Minister of Forestry had the use of a Department of Transport aircraft or a private aircraft at the government's expense since he was appointed to the cabinet?

2. On what dates did the Minister of Forestry have the use of an aircraft at the government's expense, what was the destination of his flight on each occasion, and for what period of time was the plane available on each occasion?

3. What are the names of all the passengers who joined the minister on each of the aforementioned flights and what was the purpose of the flight in each instance?

USE OF AIRCRAFT BY EXTERNAL AFFAIRS MINISTER

Question No. 517—**Mr. Coates:**

1. On how many occasions has the Secretary of State for External Affairs had the use of a Department of Transport aircraft or a private aircraft at the government's expense since he was appointed to the cabinet?

2. On what dates did the Secretary of State for External Affairs have the use of an aircraft at the government's expense, what was the destination of his flight on each occasion, and for what period of time was the plane available on each occasion?

3. What are the names of all the passengers who joined the minister on each of the aforementioned flights and what was the purpose of the flight in each instance?

USE OF AIRCRAFT BY HEALTH AND WELFARE MINISTER

Question No. 518—**Mr. Coates:**

1. On how many occasions has the Minister of National Health and Welfare had the use of a Department of Transport aircraft or a private aircraft at the government's expense since he was appointed to the cabinet?

2. On what dates did the Minister of National Health and Welfare have the use of an aircraft at the government's expense, what was the destination of his flight on each occasion, and for what period of time was the plane available on each occasion?

3. What are the names of all the passengers who joined the minister on each of the aforementioned flights and what was the purpose of the flight in each instance?

He said: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if I could get an explanation from the parliamentary secretary to the Secretary of State as to why he has announced that questions Nos. 516, 517 and 518, standing in my name, are to be made orders for returns. I would like to know why and when this information will be made available. I do not quite understand why they are being made orders for returns.

Mr. Speaker: Well, it is a decision of the house which has been rendered already; therefore I do not think the hon. member can ask for an explanation at this time.

Mr. Coates: There was no question of unanimous consent that they be made orders for returns.

[*Translation*]

MOTIONS FOR PAPERS

Mr. Albert Béchard (Parliamentary Secretary to Secretary of State): Mr. Speaker, notices of motions for the production of papers Nos. 108 and 112 are acceptable to the government, subject to the usual reservations regarding classified documents and subject to the approval of the provincial authorities concerned. Would Your Honour call notices of motions Nos. 106, 107, 109, 110 and 111? I ask that the remaining notices of motions be allowed to stand.

[*English*]

NEW BRUNSWICK—RE-ROUTING OF TRANS-CANADA HIGHWAY

Motion No. 106—**Mr. Flemming:**

That an humble Address be presented to His Excellency praying that he will cause to be laid before this House a copy of all correspondence, telegrams and memoranda of telephone conversations or verbal interviews between the Minister of Public Works of the Government of Canada, or any official of said department, and the Premier of New Brunswick, or the Minister of Public Works of the Province of New Brunswick, or any official of the Government of New Brunswick or any other person, concerning the change in routing of the Trans-Canada Highway between the highway bridge situated approximately 1 mile north of Hartland in the county of Carleton and Andover in the county of Victoria, since April 22, 1963.

Hon. G. J. McIlraith (Minister of Public Works): Mr. Speaker, it will be noticed that this motion asks for a copy of all correspondence, telegrams and memoranda of telephone conversations or verbal interviews between the Minister of Public Works of the government of Canada, or any official of said department, and the premier of New Brunswick, or the Minister of Public Works of the province of New Brunswick, or any official of the government of New Brunswick, or any other person. The expression "any other person" if it is taken to include memoranda of conversations between departmental officials and other persons within the federal department, or exchanges between the minister, deputy minister and officials, or between ministers within the federal government, there would be objection to that; but if that phrase merely is meant to include memoranda of telephone conversations or interviews between federal officials and officials of New Brunswick, there is no objection. Subject to that reservation I am quite agreeable to the order passing.

Hon. Hugh John Flemming (Victoria-Carleton): That is quite satisfactory, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: Subject to the reservations and conditions expressed by the Minister of Public Works is it the pleasure of the house that notice of the motion No. 106 be adopted?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Motion agreed to.

AMENDMENT OF DISABLED PERSONS ACT

Motion No. 107—**Mr. Douglas:**

That an humble address be presented to His Excellency praying that he will cause to be laid before this house a copy of all correspondence and other documents between the government of Canada and the government of Saskatchewan regarding any request from the government of Saskatchewan that the Disabled Persons Act be amended to (a) increase the benefits, and (b) alter the federal regulations with a view to increasing eligibility.

Hon. A. J. MacEachen (Minister of National Health and Welfare): Mr. Speaker, this motion No. 107 is acceptable subject to the usual

reservation that the assent of the provinces is received and that the expression "other documents between the government of Canada and the government of Saskatchewan" shall not be interpreted to include documents that normally are regarded as privileged.

I would apply the same reservation to motions Nos. 109, 110 and 111 standing in the name of the hon. member.

Mr. Speaker: Subject to the reservations and conditions expressed by the Minister of National Health and Welfare is it the pleasure of the house that notices of motion Nos. 107, 109, 110 and 111 be adopted?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Motion agreed to.

UTILIZATION OF SASKATCHEWAN LIGNITE COAL

Motion No. 108—**Mr. Douglas:**

That an humble address be presented to His Excellency praying that he will cause to be laid before this house a copy of all correspondence and other documents between the government of Canada and the government of Saskatchewan since May 22, 1964 regarding a joint study of the utilization of Saskatchewan lignite coal.

Motion agreed to.

FEDERAL-PROVINCIAL CONFERENCE ON HEALTH SERVICES

Motion No. 109—**Mr. Douglas:**

That an humble address be presented to His Excellency praying that he will cause to be laid before this house a copy of all correspondence and other documents between the government of Canada and the government of Saskatchewan since June 1, 1964 regarding a federal-provincial conference on health services.

Motion agreed to.

CANADA PENSION PLAN—CORRESPONDENCE WITH SASKATCHEWAN

Motion No. 110—**Mr. Douglas:**

That an humble address be presented to His Excellency praying that he will cause to be laid before this house a copy of all correspondence and other documents between the government of Canada and the government of Saskatchewan since May 22, 1964 regarding the Canada Pension Plan.

Motion agreed to.

IMPLEMENTATION OF REPORT OF COMMISSION ON HEALTH SERVICES

Motion No. 111—**Mr. Douglas:**

That an humble address be presented to His Excellency praying that he will cause to be laid before this house a copy of all correspondence and other documents between the government of Canada and the government of Saskatchewan concerning implementation of the recommendations of the royal commission on health services, or any steps preliminary thereto, since May 22, 1964.

[Mr. MacEachen.]

Motion agreed to.

APPLICATION OF TAX REGULATIONS TO POTASH MINES

Motion No. 112—**Mr. Douglas:**

That an humble address be presented to His Excellency praying that he will cause to be laid before this house a copy of all correspondence and other documents between the Minister of Finance and the premier of Saskatchewan concerning a request by the government of Saskatchewan for changes in the application of tax regulations as they affect potash mines using the solution method of mining.

Hon. Mitchell Sharp (Minister of Finance): Mr. Speaker, notice of motion No. 112 is acceptable with the same reservations that have been expressed concerning the consent of the premier of Saskatchewan.

Mr. Speaker: Subject to the reservations and conditions expressed by the Minister of Finance is it the pleasure of the house that notice of motion No. 112 be adopted?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Motion agreed to.

ADMINISTRATION OF JUSTICE

GEORGES MARCOTTE—PRESS REPORT OF INTERVIEW

On the orders of the day:

Right Hon. J. G. Diefenbaker (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, some time ago I directed a question to the Solicitor General with regard to a convicted murderer, Georges Marcotte, who gave a lengthy interview in the prison, and also evidence in respect of his artistic ability was made available to the press. The question was, under what circumstances was permission given to him. Is the Solicitor General now in a position to give the information.

Hon. L. T. Pennell (Solicitor General): Mr. Speaker, I thank the right hon. gentleman for giving me notice of his intention to ask this question. I should say that this matter arose as a result of a visit by Mrs. K. H. Lines and Mr. Grant Johnston. Mrs. Lines is president of the Creative Awards Association. This association was founded to promote creative talents among prison inmates in the fields of art, music and literature. As president of this association, Mrs. Lines was a welcome visitor to the federal institutions in the Montreal area.

On the day in question Mrs. Lines was granted permission to inspect hobbycraft articles at St. Vincent de Paul penitentiary. On this occasion she was accompanied by Mr. Grant Johnston, who apparently also was interested in the program of the Creative Awards Association. St. Vincent de Paul penitentiary lacks facilities to exhibit hobbycraft in any place other than the place where hobby work is actually carried on. Mrs. Lines and Mr. Johnston were escorted to that area by a penitentiary officer. A group of inmates were there, engaged in hobby work. The purpose of the visit was specifically to inspect hobby work and no authorization for a press interview had been issued. One of the inmates in the hobby area at the time of the visit was Georges Marcotte. It appears that Mr. Grant Johnston took advantage of this opportunity to interview Marcotte and apparently as a result of that interview, the publication appeared in the press.

Again I re-emphasize that no authorization was issued for a personal interview by any person with Marcotte for the purposes of publication.

THE CANADIAN ECONOMY

INQUIRY AS TO STEPS TO CANCEL PRICE INCREASES

On the orders of the day:

Mr. T. C. Douglas (Burnaby-Coquitlam): Mr. Speaker, may I direct a question to the Minister of Finance. Has the minister's attention been drawn to the fact that in recent days price increases on a number of commodities have been voluntarily rolled back in the United States in order to comply with the guide lines which were established by that government? I would like to ask the minister whether any thought is being given by him and his colleagues to instituting a similar type of action in Canada.

Hon. Mitchell Sharp (Minister of Finance): Yes, Mr. Speaker, a great deal of thought has been given to this matter, but so far we have not concluded this would be a useful means of controlling prices. We might change our minds, but the view at the present time, looking to the situation in the United States, the United Kingdom and Europe, where in most cases prices have risen much more quickly than in Canada, is that experience has not been such as to encourage us in this direction.

[*Translation*]

NATIONAL SECURITY

REPORTED ADMITTANCE TO CANADA OF VIET CONG SYMPATHIZER

On the orders of the day:

Mr. Réal Caouette (Villeneuve): Mr. Speaker, I should like to direct a question to the Minister of Citizenship and Immigration.

Could the minister tell the house how a revolutionary such as Ronald Ramsey could have been admitted to Canada?

Could the minister tell us also about the possibility given to him of entering this country?

Hon. Jean Marchand (Minister of Citizenship and Immigration): Mr. Speaker, I cannot inform the house about all the possibilities there are of entering Canada. We know how easy it is to enter Canada from the United States and even from European countries.

I do not think anyone in Canada would find it acceptable if we were to maintain such a close check at our borders that vexations would result for all our people.

So, I have no way of knowing. Unless the hon. member for Villeneuve tells us how Mr. Ramsey entered Canada, I myself cannot say.

Mr. Caouette: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker.

The minister should ask the C.B.C. Perhaps they could tell him. But here is my supplementary question: Did Mr. Ramsey ask the minister to grant him the right of sanctuary in Canada or must he still ask for it?

Mr. Marchand: Not to my knowledge, Mr. Speaker.

[*English*]

INQUIRY AS TO ESTABLISHMENT OF JUDICIAL INQUIRY

On the orders of the day:

Mr. R. N. Thompson (Red Deer): Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the Prime Minister and concerns his announcement on March 7 that a judicial inquiry would be established to investigate the general operation of our security procedures, with a view to determining whether or not they are now adequate, and to assure the protection of the rights of private individuals in any investigation. Can the Prime Minister tell us when he expects to announce the establishment of this very vital and important judicial inquiry and, if possible, who will be heading it?

Inquiries of the Ministry

Right Hon. L. B. Pearson (Prime Minister): Yes, Mr. Speaker, I hope to announce the establishment of this commission as soon as possible.

AGRICULTURE

COST OF DAIRY POLICY—EFFECT ON GATT

On the orders of the day:

Hon. D. S. Harkness (Calgary North): Mr. Speaker, I should like to direct my question to the Minister of Agriculture. Can the minister inform us what will be the total cost to the treasury of the subsidies and so forth which will be paid during the coming dairy year under the dairy policy he just announced?

Hon. J. J. Greene (Minister of Agriculture): Mr. Speaker, it is estimated to cost somewhere in the neighbourhood of $90 million.

Mr. Harkness: I have a supplementary and related question which perhaps should more properly be addressed to the Minister of Trade and Commerce and the Minister of Finance, rather than to the Minister of Agriculture. What will be the effect on our position in GATT of these subsidies on the export of dairy products which will result from the announced program?

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. I do not think that question should be asked at this time. The hon. member is asking what the effect of this policy will be on GATT. I do not really believe that the information which might be conveyed to the hon. member at this time is the type of information which should be sought during this question period.

Mr. Harkness: Mr. Speaker, I think this is the very type of question which is appropriate at this time. The effect to which I refer is one of the most important of the policy or program just announced, and one which the members of this house should know about.

Mr. Speaker: The minister might perhaps have given this information during his announcement, although I felt the announcement was long enough. If hon. members want to hear more from the Minister of Agriculture, then perhaps he should be allowed to answer.

Mr. Greene: Mr. Speaker, perhaps I might be permitted to point out, in reply to my hon. friend's question, that we were very careful in this regard. This matter was raised in several of the commentaries of members opposite.

[Mr. Thompson.]

The levy on exports is not in the form of government payments; it is a levy from the producer. They are in fact getting 85 cents in producers subsidy, and the 10 cent levy is taken from their money. If the hon. member will look very carefully at the statement, he will note that if there is any money left at the end of the year as a result of that levy, it goes to the producer. This is not an export subsidy by the government; this is producers' money.

Mr. Harkness: As a supplementary question may I ask whether it is a fact that the 10 cent levy is subtracted from the subsidy being paid by the government to the producers?

Mr. Speaker: This is exactly what I had in mind a moment ago when I thought we might get into a debate. This is not the type of question that should be asked now.

[*Later:*]

Mr. H. A. Olson (Medicine Hat): Mr. Speaker, I should like to ask the Minister of Agriculture a question arising out of the statement he made today. Has the minister or his department calculated the increased price per pound of butterfat to the wholesalers so that there will be no additional increase in price to the consumer over and above this change in the wholesale price?

Mr. Greene: Mr. Speaker, I am not just certain of the purport of the question, but as the hon. member knows, the price has been increased 2 cents, as was stated in the announcement, and I think this portion of the increase will be passed on to the consumer.

Mr. Olson: With the withdrawal of the 10.9 cents per pound subsidy on butterfat, I am wondering if this will affect the wholesale price of butter.

Mr. Greene: In our view, Mr. Speaker, only to the extent of 2 cents, which is the increase that we have put on; because the extra subsidy goes into the 85 cents that we are paying under the new program.

PUBLIC SERVICE

REQUEST FOR POLICY ANNOUNCEMENT ON BILINGUALISM

On the orders of the day:

Hon. Michael Starr (Ontario): Mr. Speaker, I wish to address a question to the right hon. Prime Minister. In view of my understanding that he is to meet later this afternoon with

representatives of the civil service associations, can he say whether this means that the government has made a decision on bilingualism in the public service, and can he indicate when an announcement regarding this matter will be made to the house?

Right Hon. L. B. Pearson (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, the meeting this afternoon is for the purpose of receiving the views of officers of civil service organizations in respect of this very important matter.

Mr. Starr: I have a supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Will the Prime Minister answer the latter part of my question? Has the government made a decision on bilingualism and when will an announcement be made in this regard to the house?

Mr. Pearson: Mr. Speaker, no final decision will be made until we have received and considered the views of these representatives. When a decision is made it will be announced to the house.

LABOUR CONDITIONS

REPORTED LAY-OFFS IN MACHINE TOOL INDUSTRY

On the orders of the day:

Mr. W. B. Nesbitt (Oxford): Mr. Speaker, I should like to direct a question to the Minister of Industry. Has the minister's attention been directed to the fact that within the last two weeks there have been substantial lay-offs of skilled and semi-skilled workmen in branches of Canada's machine tool industry which up to now have been manufacturing automobile parts?

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. I do not think it is proper to ask whether this type of information has been brought to the attention of the minister. Certainly that is not the type of question which should be asked at this time.

[*Later:*]

Mr. Nesbitt: Mr. Speaker, I wish to direct a question to the Minister of Industry. Has he instructed officials of his department to look into the causes of and remedies for the recent lay-offs in the automobile parts industry in Canada?

Hon. C. M. Drury (Minister of Industry): They have been engaged in this task for the past three weeks, Mr. Speaker.

HATE LITERATURE

INQUIRY AS TO COMMISSION REPORT

On the orders of the day:

Mr. David Lewis (York South): Mr. Speaker, I should like to direct my question to the Prime Minister. On Monday last I asked him about the report of the Maxwell Cohen committee on legislation concerning a possible amendment to the Criminal Code dealing with hate literature, and whether he was considering tabling copies of that report even though the printing had not been completed. The hon. gentleman was good enough to say that he would look into the matter and reply "tomorrow or the next day". That "tomorrow" was yesterday and the "next day" is today. I wonder whether the right hon. Prime Minister can give us a reply at this time?

Right Hon. L. B. Pearson (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, I have not as yet had an opportunity to read the full text of the report, and I wonder whether in the circumstances my hon. friend will allow me to say again that I will reply tomorrow or the next day.

Mr. Lewis: What alternative have I?

INQUIRY OF THE MINISTRY

On the orders of the day:

Mr. H. W. Herridge (Kootenay West): Mr. Speaker, I wish to address an unprecedented double-barrelled question to the right hon. Prime Minister and the right hon. leader of the official opposition.

In view of the suggestion which appeared in today's *Gazette,* that the Prime Minister would respectfully propose to His Excellency the Governor General that the member for Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Knowles) should be asked to form a coalition government, would the right hon. gentlemen care to make some remarks on this unique proposal?

Right Hon. L. B. Pearson (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, while this question I know is out of order, perhaps you will allow me to say this. I am sure my hon. friend has asked this question in very good faith and is undoubtedly interested in this kind of change, because it is the only kind of change which could ever permit him to serve in a government.

Inquiries of the Ministry

[*Translation*]

CANADIAN BROADCASTING CORPORATION

INQUIRY AS TO CONSIDERATION BY HOUSE COMMITTEE

On the orders of the day:

Mr. Gilles Grégoire (Lapointe): Mr. Speaker, I should like to direct a question to the Secretary of State.

Could the minister tell us when she intends to call the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation before the committee on broadcasting, films and assistance to the arts?

Hon. Judy V. LaMarsh (Secretary of State): Soon, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Grégoire: Mr. Speaker, since the Secretary of State of this Liberal government has been telling us for two years it will be "soon", could we know whether this means at this session?

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Sherbrooke.

CAPITAL PUNISHMENT

PROCEDURE IN CONSIDERING LEGISLATION ON ORDER PAPER

On the orders of the day:

Mr. Maurice Allard (Sherbrooke): Mr. Speaker, I should like to put a question to the government house leader—

Mr. David Lewis (York South): He is not here, he is gone.

Mr. Allard: —or to the Prime Minister.

It has to do with notice of motion No. 66, which will be called this afternoon.

Would the Prime Minister or the government leader consider the possibility of calling separate votes on Parts I and II of the resolution, as well as on Part III? As a matter of fact, parts "a" and "b" of the resolution—

Mr. Speaker: Order. I point out to the hon. member that this is a point of procedure that he might raise during the debate, but which cannot form the subject of a question at this time.

[*English*]

Right Hon. J. G. Diefenbaker (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, my question relates to the resolution coming before the house this afternoon, which is of transcendant importance and of great consequence. I wonder whether the Prime Minister intends to place before the house and country his considered views on this question, based upon his experience as Prime Minister for some three years, having had a large number of cases come before him for consideration? Whatever the outcome of the free vote on this resolution, will the Prime Minister give consideration to submitting this question of the abolition of capital punishment to a committee of the house in order that the fullest possible evidence might be taken in connection therewith and so that this house can be made fully aware of the various commissions which have dealt with this question in the United Kingdom and elsewhere, before a final decision is made?

Right Hon. L. B. Pearson (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, so far as the first part of the question is concerned, let me say that I am a member of this house at this stage and would prefer to listen to the views of other members before deciding what my own responsibility is in regard to participation in the debate. So far as the second part of the question is concerned, I think we should discuss the resolution on the order paper and the right hon. gentleman's suggestion can be considered while we are discussing it.

[*Later:*]

Mr. Robert McCleave (Halifax): Mr. Speaker, I have a supplementary question for the Prime Minister. Will the fate by commutation or otherwise of those now under sentence of death be determined by the cabinet in the light of existing law and practice or await the outcome of the debate which will commence shortly?

Mr. Pearson: Surely this is an improper question, Mr. Speaker, as it deals with the royal prerogative.

HARBOURS

VANCOUVER—INQUIRY AS TO PROPOSED WHARF DEVELOPMENT

On the orders of the day:

Mr. Grant Deachman (Vancouver Quadra): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Transport. In view of statements appearing in the press following his visit to Vancouver, can he inform the house what plans are being considered for a National Harbours Board wharf development in Vancouver between Centennial pier and C.P.R. piers B and C?

Mr. Speaker: It is difficult to judge just how urgent this question may be, but I am sure it can be properly placed on the order paper.

Mr. Deachman: I wish to debate it at ten o'clock.

HIGHWAY SAFETY

NEW YORK REQUEST FOR ASSISTANCE IN BUILDING SAFETY CAR

On the orders of the day:

Mr. Heward Grafftey (Brome-Missisquoi): Mr. Speaker, my question, directed to the Minister of Industry, is based on reports published today showing that in 1965 there was a 13 per cent increase in road deaths in the province of Ontario alone. I should like to ask the minister whether in his attempt to bring the automobile under the rule of law he is actively considering a request from the state of New York for Canadian assistance in the building of the New York prototype safety car, and might we expect an announcement in this regard fairly soon?

Hon. C. M. Drury (Minister of Industry): Mr. Speaker, we are looking earnestly and diligently at the suggestion of the state of New York for the construction of a safety car and hope to reach a conclusion in the near future.

Mr. Grafftey: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Has the minister arranged a meeting in Ottawa next Monday with Mr. Ronald Todgham, president of Chrysler Corporation and president of the Canadian Automobile Manufacturers Association, and will automobile safety be on the agenda for discussion?

Mr. Drury: Automobile safety is not the principal purpose of the meeting, but undoubtedly I shall be discussing it with Mr. Todgham.

INQUIRY AS TO TIME DEVOTED BY C.B.C.

On the orders of the day:

Mr. P. V. Noble (Grey North): Mr. Speaker, I should like to direct this question to the Secretary of State. Since the C.B.C. deficits are considered to be partially justifiable on the basis of public service, I should like to ask the minister how much time has been allocated by C.B.C. radio and C.B.C. television to matters of highway safety which contain Canadian material?

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. This question might be placed on the order paper.

INDIAN AFFAIRS

GRANT TO AID CANNERY ON QUEEN CHARLOTTE ISLANDS

On the orders of the day:

Mr. Frank Howard (Skeena): Mr. Speaker, I should like to direct a question to the right hon. Prime Minister and ask whether he has received a telegram from the United Fishermen and Allied Workers Union in British Columbia occasioned, I think, by the reluctance or inability of the Indian affairs branch to provide a grant in aid to a particular cannery on the Queen Charlotte islands. If the Prime Minister has received that telegram, which I understand proposes a certain course of action, could he indicate to the house what his response has been?

Right Hon. L. B. Pearson (Prime Minister): I have received that telegram, Mr. Speaker. The matter is under consideration.

INDUSTRY

DOSCO—REQUEST FOR STATEMENT ON FUTURE PROSPECTS

On the orders of the day:

Mr. Robert Muir (Cape Breton North and Victoria): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Industry. May I ask him whether he is in a position today to make a statement that will allay the fears that have arisen throughout the province of Nova Scotia within recent days in regard to the future of the steel industry at Sydney?

Hon. C. M. Drury (Minister of Industry): Mr. Speaker, I think the circumstances which gave rise to the most recent apprehension about the steel industry were fully explained yesterday.

[*Later:*]

Mr. Donald MacInnis (Cape Breton South): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Industry. I would ask him whether he is aware of the union side of the question with respect to the steel operation in Sydney, wherein the union claims that there has been a 50 per cent reduction in the work force. Since the minister referred to the explanation given yesterday, I would ask him to explain just what is meant by "an increase in employment of from nine to 12 man years."

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. That question is argumentative and cannot be accepted.

Inquiries of the Ministry

Mr. MacInnis (Cape Breton South): I do not propose to put forward an argument, Mr. Speaker, and I cannot understand why a question directed to the minister in respect of what he said yesterday is argumentative. I asked him to explain what he meant by—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. A ruling has been made.

Mr. MacInnis (Cape Breton South): I should like to ask the Prime Minister if he would interest himself in the union side of the question of the reduction in work at the Sydney steel operation, as opposed to the minister's interest on the company side.

LABOUR CONDITIONS

ATLANTIC REGION—STEPS TO IMPROVE UNEMPLOYMENT SITUATION

On the orders of the day:

Mr. Robert C. Coates (Cumberland): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Finance. Does the Minister of Finance intend to bring forward any fiscal policies which will be specifically designed to offset the effect of his tight money policy in the Atlantic area, which at the present time has an unemployment rate of 10.9 per cent?

Mr. Speaker: Order.

COMBINES

INVESTIGATION OF ALLEGED PRICE FIXING BY OIL COMPANIES

On the orders of the day:

Mr. Barry Mather (New Westminster): Mr. Speaker, I have a question that I was going to direct to the Minister of Justice, but on reflection I think I should bring it to the attention of the President of the Privy Council in his remaining capacities in the legal field. The question is this: Having in mind the announcement today in British Columbia that a royal commission has recommended complete divorcement of the jobber and retailer marketing of gasoline products and an end to consignment selling. I wonder whether the minister can say when the federal government will announce its decision in regard to the very long-standing recommendations of the restrictive trade practices commission in this respect?

Hon. Guy Favreau (President of the Privy Council): Mr. Speaker, the hon. member's notice of intention to ask this question was sent to the Minister of Justice and has been referred to me. I thank the hon. member for that notice. Hon. members will be aware that, as I have told the house on previous occasions, the question of implementing the T.B.A. report is being given very serious and careful study. I will say frankly that one of our most difficult problems in this respect is to see how the recommendations in the report should they be accepted by the government, can be translated into law with any hope of giving effective relief to the retail gasoline dealers.

We are also required to consider whether it would not be preferable to undertake a more far-reaching review of the anti-combines legislation, of which the T.B.A. report would form a part. It is these considerations that have caused us to be deliberate rather than hasty in our consideration of the matter and, of course, we have felt obliged to await the outcome of the case recently decided by the Supreme Court of Canada in which the constitutional aspect of a part of the act was in issue.

I can assure hon. members, however, that we are giving earnest attention to the whole matter and I hope to be able to make known the position of the government before very long.

EXTERNAL AFFAIRS

REQUEST FOR FURTHER STATEMENT ON FOOD AID

On the orders of the day:

Mr. Reid Scott (Danforth): Mr. Speaker, I wish to address a question to the Secretary of State for External Affairs. Recently a question was put to the minister regarding food aid for India and the government food aid plan generally. In the course of his short, concise answer the minister said he might expand on it at a later date. I wonder if he is in a position to do so today.

Hon. Paul Martin (Secretary of State for External Affairs): Mr. Speaker, the government proposes to provide to India during the current calendar year approximately one million tons of food, principally in wheat and flour, worth about $15 million during the first quarter and $56 million in the remainder of the calendar year. Out of the basic aid program and the progressive increase fore-shadowed in the Speech from the Throne, it is also intended to provide substantial help to other developing countries now experiencing serious food situations, such as Pakistan, which was mentioned the other day by the hon. member for Medicine Hat, and Ghana, where early assistance is badly needed. The

government's intention is that the total food aid program for the coming fiscal year should be raised to about $75 million.

Mr. R. N. Thompson (Red Deer): May I ask a supplementary question of the Secretary of State for External Affairs regarding Canadian food aid to Pakistan. I wonder if the minister has noted that today the Pakistan government announced the purchase of tanks and military aircraft from red China?

Mr. Speaker: Order, please; the hon. member cannot ask if a minister has noted a report. The question is not properly put.

FOOD AND DRUGS

INQUIRY AS TO MEETING OF SPECIAL COMMITTEE

On the orders of the day:

Mr. William Dean Howe (Hamilton South): In the absence of the Minister of Public Works I should like to ask the Prime Minister if he can tell the house when the first meeting of the special committee on food and drugs will be held?

Right Hon. L. B. Pearson (Prime Minister): I cannot, but I will make inquiries.

HARBOURS

MONTREAL—REFUSAL OF PERMISSION TO HANDLE FOREIGN GRAIN

On the orders of the day:

Hon. Théogène Ricard (Saint Hyacinthe-Bagot): I should like to direct a question to the Minister of Finance. In view of the widespread protest against regulations laid down by the Winnipeg Grain Exchange under which the port of Montreal is not allowed to handle grain grown outside the country, will the minister assure the house that the government will permit representatives of the port of Montreal to contest such regulations?

Hon. Mitchell Sharp (Minister of Finance): I can inform the hon. gentleman and the house that I am already making arrangements to meet early in April with Montreal port authorities, and all the other interested bodies.

CRIMINAL CODE

PROPOSED AMENDMENT REGARDING CAPITAL PUNISHMENT

Messrs. Byrne, Nugent, Scott (Danforth) and Stanbury moved:

Resolved, that it is expedient to introduce a measure to amend the Criminal Code for the purposes of

(a) abolishing the death penalty in respect of all offences under that act;

(b) substituting a mandatory sentence of life imprisonment in those cases where the death penalty is now mandatory; and

(c) providing that no person upon whom a mandatory sentence of life imprisonment is imposed shall be released from imprisonment without the prior approval of the Governor in Council.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Maurice Allard (Sherbrooke): Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order before the start of the debate on this interesting resolution. May I ask the four movers if they would agree to divide their resolution in two parts for the purpose of the vote. Paragraphs (a) and (b) are directed especially to people who favour abolishing the death penalty, if paragraph (c) was separated from the other two, this would allow hon members who favour abolishing the death penalty as well as those who want it retained to vote for that third paragraph.

I would ask the movers of that resolution whether they would allow the house to vote separately on paragraphs (a) and (b) which are quite clear in one way or the other and on paragraph (c). Several hon. members who will probably vote for the retention of the death penalty will be glad to see that a sentence of life imprisonment cannot be mitigated without the approval of the governor in council.

I would like a ruling to be made on my point of order before the debate starts.

Mr. Gilles Grégoire (Lapointe): Mr. Speaker, with regard to the point of order—

Mr. Speaker: Order. Before considering the point of order, I would say to the hon. member that the chair had recognized the hon. member for Edmonton-Strathcona (Mr. Nugent). The hon. member for Sherbrooke has moved an amendment without really doing so. I do not believe it is possible at this time to discuss the matter in that way. The hon. member could move an amendment to that effect and the chair would rule whether it is in order.

The hon. member is now asking a hypothetical question that could be considered by the members who introduced the resolution. For the time being, the movers of that resolution must be given an opportunity to express their views.

Mr. Grégoire: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. There was a precedent in this house. At that time, it was incumbent on the Speaker to divide such a resolution in two. Since paragraph (c) is inconsistent with

paragraph (b), and some of us are being asked to vote on contradictory matters might it not behove Your Honour, by virtue of the standing orders, to divide the resolution? This occurred two years ago, I believe, at the time of the debate on the Canadian flag and even before the debate started, the member for Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Knowles) had made observations. The chair decided later on, even before the debate started, to divide the proposed resolution.

Mr. Speaker: I shall be pleased to consider the suggestion, but I must say to the hon. member that, at first sight, it seems to me circumstances are now totally different from those he alluded to.

I expect the hon. member has based his proposal on the stipulations of citation 200, paragraph (4) of Beauchesne's Parliamentary Rules and Forms, which states:

> A motion which contains two or more distinct propositions may be divided so that the sense of the house may be taken on each separately.

As I have just said, at first sight, there does not seem to be separate propositions, but only different interpretations of the same proposition.

At any rate, I shall be pleased to look into the hon. member's suggestion, at the first opportunity.

Mr. Grégoire: Mr. Speaker, can we conclude, that you will take this into consideration and give a ruling later?

Mr. Speaker: I must say to the hon. member that I have almost made up my mind on a ruling, but that I shall nevertheless study the suggestion he has just made.

[*English*]

Mr. Terence Nugent (Edmonton-Strathcona): Mr. Speaker, I think I should say a word with regard to the interjections made by hon. gentlemen who spoke to the point of order. I cannot see any difficulty in the manner in which the resolution is before the house. I do not believe the separate sections are contradictory, but rather that they are complementary. It is, to all intents and purposes, one resolution which would carry out one thought if voted upon as it is.

I should like to commence my remarks in this debate, Mr. Speaker, by thanking my co-sponsors on this motion, the hon. members for Kootenay East (Mr. Byrne); York-Scarborough (Mr. Stanbury) and Danforth (Mr. Scott) for their co-operation in bringing about this resolution as a means of having the debate. I should like to go further than calling it co-operation, sir, because it is indeed generosity. I feel those three hon. members have shown a particularly selfless interest in bringing this debate before the house.

• (4:10 p.m.)

They had all sponsored bills on the order paper. I am sure that each one of them was anxious to have the honour that I now have of introducing this subject, and I know that each one has a very valuable contribution to make toward the debate. I, sir, have the honour of speaking first only because of the generosity of the other three members who allowed a draw to be held, which I won. Therefore I have the privilege of speaking on my own behalf first.

I think I would speak for every member of the house too when I express satisfaction that the government is making available these three days for the consideration of this problem. It is a problem that has been before the house on previous occasions. It is one on which many hon. members intend to speak, I know, and the subject has aroused the interest, indeed in some cases the excitement, of people in Canada generally. It is one that has stirred the conscience and the consciousness of every member of this house and is a subject that we as members must deal with.

I think that most of us who were in this house in 1960 will remember that we had a most informative debate on a bill sponsored by the previous member for York-Scarborough, Mr. Frank McGee. Unfortunately that debate did not last long enough to allow the house to come to any conclusion, but many valuable contributions were made which I think had much to do with the subsequent forward step of the government in dividing murder into capital and non-capital murder.

The hon. member for Vancouver East (Mr. Winch) has previously introduced in this house a bill to abolish capital punishment. The present Premier of the province of Saskatchewan has also brought this problem before the house on other occasions. There have been many important changes made, I think, as well as much progress in the consideration of the question of sentencing all people found guilty of murder.

I have mentioned in my remarks the co-operation received from my fellow sponsors of this resolution, which is a good introduction to the fact that the resolution is presented to the house as one which we are asking

the members of the house to consider on a non-political basis. The duty of each member, I think, is not one of considering which way his party is going to vote. We who sponsor it belong to different parties. We who have had something to do with arranging for this debate have approached the question on a strictly non-political basis. The arrangements have been made with the co-operation of the government and on the basis that each member shall have the chance to debate the matter in the most practical manner so that the question may be given the fullest consideration. Each member may say what he wants to say and can listen to other views which may be of assistance to him in arriving at his own decision on the disposition of this resolution, a decision which each member will have to make entirely on his own.

It goes without saying, sir, that no matter on which side of the debate one speaks or on which side one will eventually vote, whether for the abolition or for the retention of capital punishment, I think there is general agreement in the house that those who speak on either side are speaking with absolute sincerity. This is a problem which raises honest doubts in the minds of those who have to consider it. An argument which is sufficient to convince one man may not be seen by another man in quite the same light, and there does exist what I consider to be a very honest difference of opinion in the method of arriving at the same solution which we all seek. I think one thing we all have in common, whether we are in favour of abolition or retention of the death penalty, is the protection of society.

This is the first point I should like to make on my own behalf, since I am asking for the abolition of the death penalty. It is my considered opinion that the removal of the death penalty in accordance with the terms of this resolution does nothing to weaken the defences of society against potential murderers.

It is my second proposition that one sign of advanced civilization is that the more civilized a country becomes the more reluctant is the society of that country to take the life of any person. It is therefore a double-barrelled suggestion which I make. I seek the full protection of the people in this country without seeking to weaken any protection they presently enjoy from the law, and the remedy I seek will I think enhance the reputation and stature of this country as a civilized country.

It is my considered opinion that the sentence of life imprisonment is just as much a deterrent as the death penalty. I think that when Arthur Maloney of Toronto spoke in the house on this subject, he spoke with a measure of calmness, logic and sincerity which certainly excited the admiration and respect of every member who heard him. I should like to read just two paragraphs which illustrate both the tone of his speech and the argument he used in 1960, to be found at page 1198 of *Hansard* for February 18 of that year. Here are the two paragraphs which impressed me both as to content and as to the manner and tone with which Mr. Maloney dealt with this question:

> There is no question of revenge or retribution, I am sure, that enters into the thinking of any of us in this house, and certainly not into the thinking of anyone who favours the retention of the penalty of death. To me the sole question to be determined and the only question we are called upon to decide is this: Is the penalty of death the only effective deterrent available to stamp out the crime of murder or is there another alternative penalty that is equally effective and less drastic?
>
> There is a wealth of incontrovertible evidence, to some of which you have already been referred, to which you can look in your search for an answer to this question. This evidence demonstrates to the point of moral sureness and certainty that the penalty of death is not the only effective deterrent to the crime of murder and that a sentence of imprisonment for life has proven, where these experiments have been made, to be equally effective.

It is on that basis that I make my argument. I, as a citizen of this country, feel that the only excuse society has for taking the life of any person is if it is proven necessary to do so for the protection of our society and our way of life. In order to prove that it is necessary, obviously, to prove that no other means will avail. I cannot follow the logic of reasoning that if it is wrong for one person to take a life then it is right for a group of us to take a life. Our rules and our laws reflect the opinion of the majority of the people, who have expressed their opinion in the formation of the government. But, after all, it is only the opinion of the majority of the people. Even if that opinion were unanimously held by my fellows, I would not think it right to take a life. But, as I say, it is only a majority opinion and the majority can only be justified if it is proven that no other method can be found to protect our society.

I can certainly understand the concern of those who believe that the death penalty is the most effective deterrent.

• (4:20 p.m.)

Certainly, those of us who have great respect for human life and who abhor crimes of violence, feel this might not be a very powerful deterrent. If we look back on history we will find that the attitude of government and of society has always shown this great belief in the deterrent power of the death penalty. We need only look back in British history 100 years or so to find that there were between 100 and 200 crimes for which people could be put to death. There was such faith in the power of the death penalty as a deterrent that on each occasion when an attempt was made to remove it as a punishment for one offence or another, the cry went up: Crime will increase.

I should like to quote from an argument put forward by Mr. G. Arthur Martin, Q.C. of Toronto who used to be a believer in the death penalty but who came to think, after studying the question, that capital punishment was unnecessary in our society. He tells us that in 1810 Sir Samuel Romilly introduced a bill into the House of Commons to abolish capital punishment for the theft of five shillings or over from a shop. Mr. Martin reminds us that this is what Chief Justice Lord Ellenborough said when that bill was discussed in the House of Lords:

> I trust your lordships will pause before you assent to an experiment pregnant with danger to the security of property, and before you repeal a statute which has so long been held necessary for public security. I am convinced, with the rest of the Judges, public expediency requires there should be no remission of the terror denounced against this description of offenders. Such will be the consequences of the repeal of this statute that I am certain depredations to an unlimited extent would be immediately committed.

Later in the debate the Chief Justice of that day continued:

> My Lords, if we suffer his Bill to pass we shall not know where to stand; we shall not know whether we are upon our heads or our feet. Repeal this law and see the constrast—no man can trust himself for an hour out of doors without the most alarming apprehensions that, on his return, every vestige of his property will be swept off by the hardened robber.

This is consistent argument. It is perfectly true that capital punishment is a deterrent. Often we shall hear people say when discussing this subject that it is not a deterrent. They say this loosely, meaning that it is not a greater deterrent than, for example, life imprisonment. I do not think any of us who ask for the abolition of capital punishment deny it is a deterrent. We simply say that other deterrents are just as effective.

[Mr. Nugent.]

Throughout the history of England, and indeed the history of Canada, as time went on and as the death penalty was removed from more and more offences, the same cry was raised—that crime would increase and offences be encouraged. This represents a consistent feeling throughout society. Not just in Great Britain or in Canada but throughout the world, there is this belief in the efficacy of capital punishment as a necessary stem to wrongdoing.

What we should do, I suggest, is consider what happened as we removed various offences from this category. In no case has there been that great increase in the number of those offences which was so direly predicted. We have come a long way. I submit we have come almost to the point where we are a completely civilized society—that we might reflect, as we ask the would-be murder to do, on the sanctity of human life which is, to me, so sacrosanct that society itself does not have the right to take it away.

The question again hinges on this: Are we now at that stage where we can once again consider the argument whether capital punishment is still a necessary deterrent and whether, if that deterrent is taken away, there would be an increase in the number of murders, or increased encouragement to commit murder? Again, Mr. Martin has summed up this situation in reasoning which I think illustrates the type of thinking we must bring to bear on this problem. The arguments are well known. Familiar arguments are put to us many times; we hear them and hear them again. But occasionally something clicks or makes a special appeal to us, and we see things in a new light. I have never found anything which is as effective as the manner of putting the argument which Mr. Martin uses. He expresses it this way:

> Those who favour the retention of the death penalty sometimes ask "Can it be proved that capital punishment in no case deterred a person contemplating murder who would not have been deterred by the threat of life imprisonment?"
>
> I think a frank answer to this question must be in the negative. It is by its very nature a proposition incapable of proof, but it may be confidently asserted that such instances must be very rare. The question, no doubt, has its origin in the mental processes of a normal person who brings his mind to bear upon the problem in the abstract. He asks himself, "If I were contemplating murder would I be more deterred by the penalty of death than the prospect of life imprisonment" and he feels that he would. If he explored the problem fully in his mind he would also find that he would also be sufficiently deterred by the prospect of life imprisonment. The question presupposes a man normal enough to contemplate

murder and the possibility of being put to death for it and as a result being deterred, but sufficiently abnormal that he is not deterred by the prospect of life imprisonment. Such a delicately balanced kind of abnormality must be rare. Moreover, does anyone think that a person contemplating murder goes through this process?

The logic of this argument appeals to me. Certainly if we are to consider the death penalty as a necessary deterrent we have to face this situation—that we as normal people approach the suggestion of murder with a normal mind. We are trying to find a device to influence a person with an abnormal mind who can nevertheless plot and premeditate the death of a human being. Then we put ourselves in the position of saying: It would make a difference to me if I were going to hang or not, supposing I were contemplating committing this crime. Surely a man abnormal enough to contemplate murder will not have the same respect for the differences in the penalty as we have. If he is abnormal enough to consider the crime, or to run the risk of being caught, then he does not have our type of mind and is unlikely to make this clear distinction. If he did make such a clear distinction then perhaps it would not mean as much to him; some would prefer to be put to death.

I have indicated that the important question in the mind of anyone who intends to plot or contrive a murder is the risk of apprehension. This is his one and only thought, I am sure. My experience in the law is not as great as that of some hon. members of this house, though it has been considerable. And I have not yet found a criminal who ever plotted a crime and guided his conduct on the basis of the length of the punishment which would be awarded for such an offence. There is only one thought in the minds of those who commit these offences: They feel they will not be caught.

• (4:30 p.m.)

Some of the safeguards we could put up, instead of capital punishment, have been dealt with in various ways. We find from a study that the causes of murder itself are some of the social evils of our age, and I suggest that we should try to correct those.

I have as much compassion, as has any man in this house who wants to hang a murderer, for the family of the deceased. I do not want to mollycoddle criminals, but I do not see how hanging a man is going to bring someone back to life. I know some good arguments will be presented on this and I want to thank the house for its attention and for the privilege of being allowed to lead off this debate.

Mr. J. A. Byrne (Kootenay East): Mr. Speaker, I am proud to have been able to associate my name with those of three distinguished members of parliament in presenting this motion. I am also pleased that so many members of the house are interested in this measure, and deeply pleased that a former member, Hon. Frank McGee, who showed such great concern about this question during his parliamentary life, is in the gallery today.

I believe that capital punishment casts a shadow upon the social structure of twentieth century civilization. To me, carrying out the death sentence is nothing less than an act of vengeance perpetrated by the state on behalf of the people. I believe it is some form of hangover of a barbaric method of retribution that should hold no place in the enlightened society of our age.

Since I appear to feel so strongly about this matter hon. members may well ask why I have not raised the question in the house previously and introduced amendments to the Criminal Code, which is the only way to remedy the situation. Well, Mr. Speaker, from my long experience in this house, observing its procedures, I held no illusions that it would be possible to introduce a bill and conclude discussion on such a controversial subject in the one hour that is allotted for private members' business each day. However, now that the government—and I commend the Prime Minister (Mr. Pearson) for his decision—has agreed to provide time normally allotted to government business for a discussion of and a conclusion in this matter, I believe the time is opportune. I sincerely hope this measure, calling for total and complete abolition, will receive majority support of the house.

I personally am unalterably opposed to the taking of the life of any creature, either by an individual or by the state, except unavoidably in self defence, or to fulfil a need. I have concluded therefore that the people I represent in this house would not expect me to sacrifice my conscience to their opinions. To me the question of abolition of capital punishment is a moral one, affecting the nation's social attitudes toward human life. Each member must come to a conclusion which squares with his own conscience and not the will of his constituents or of his political party, and of course this has been amply

demonstrated by the way in which the motion was introduced.

The Prime Minister, the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Diefenbaker), and indeed the leaders of all parties represented in this house have recognized the special character of this measure. Only a very small percentage of the public can possibly acquaint itself fully with the rational aspects of this issue. For the most part the uninformed will have had their minds made up, based on their personal emotions.

It is important, therefore, that all members who propose to vote on this motion listen attentively to all of the debates, and to peruse carefully all of the evidence presented by hon. members on both sides of the question. If we then do not come to the conclusion that the taking of human life under any pretext, save in self-defence, is wrong, we justify retention of capital punishment for its deterrent value or, in reality, for the natural human reaction, the love of vengeance.

Thus far my studies and research have not produced anything like conclusive evidence that fear of the death sentence is an effective deterrent to murder. Nor does the example set by carrying out the death sentence contribute significantly to the deterrence of other murders. In fact the statistical studies of Thorsten Sellin and other renowned sociologists lead one to believe that it has no deterrent value whatsoever. However, it is not my intention to argue the utility of this institution, and I will leave that to other hon. members. I am sure the statistical reviews will prove this point.

While it is ofttimes said that "vengeance is sweet," the Christian and twentieth century approach to modern penology rejects such a proposition. Indeed it should be the determination of the state and its legislators to stress the value and the sacredness of human existence.

In this regard I wish to quote very briefly from an eighteenth century radical Liberal politician, John Bright, a member of parliament for Durham who spent some time in Gladstone's Cabinet. He had this to say:

> A deep reverence for human life is worth more than a thousand executions; and is, in fact, the great security of human life. The law of capital punishment, whist pretending to support this reverence does in fact tend to destroy it.

It is my opinion that a national re-evaluation of human existence cannot help but influence international attitudes. A nation which debases the value of human life by its extinction cannot hope to lead in the area of preventive diplomacy. In a scientific age when the mere pressing of a button might herald the complete destruction of all living creatures on this earth, we must seek to create respect for human life. Such a pursuit should be a paramount consideration for legislators and diplomats alike.

But desire for revenge is a powerful human motivation. The urge to kill, or at least to take some pleasure from the misfortune of others, is a basic human trait which this barbaric institution simply serves to abet.

Hon. members may say these strong words are unduly critical of our fellow men, but let us just take a look at some examples of human behavior which bear evidence to the truth of what I am saying. My purpose in producing such evidence is not to be critical but to show that none of us can escape these human instincts.

Psychiatrists inform us that there is often a very thin line between sanity and insanity. Many of us from time to time momentarily approach this boundary in fits of temper or other uncontrollable passions. Our official attitude therefore toward the value of human life may well condition the thinking of borderline citizens.

Is it not true that men and women, indeed even mothers, will pay fantastic sums for the privilege of obtaining ringside seats at a professional prizefight? What do they go there to see? Surely it is not entirely to watch the manly art of self defence but rather to see two human beings pummel one another, at times into insensibility and even to death.

Again, huge crowds will gather in the countryside to watch a sky diving demonstration by local acrobats. What do they go out to see? Only to thrill, I suppose, at the sight of a highly trained parachute jumper floating gracefully to earth. From whence comes the thrill at the dexterity of the trapeze artist? Is it pleasure for the deftness and the precision of such performances? No, the real thrill is derived from the knowledge that each contestant participates at the risk of life and limb.

• (4:40 p.m.)

Was there ever a sight more degrading, at least to me, than that of a mother clutching the ropes of the prize fight or wrestling ring and shouting advice to her favourite, very often with the phrase "Kill him, kill him". Was there ever a thought more disgusting

than that of sightseers being permitted to watch an execution by hanging or otherwise.

Just a few weeks ago I was startled to learn that an African ruler in one of the emerging nations arranged, through the due process of an act of parliament, the execution of a political or revolutionary murderer, and arranged that this execution take place in full view of the bereaved survivors for his and their satisfaction.

Yes, we of a more mature civilization have progressed more rapidly and further in this so-called process of evolution and can only look upon such savagery with nothing but horror and revulsion. Yet we retain the institution itself, with only those directly concerned with the mechanics of the operation participating in the inhuman act. Surely it is our duty as legislators, commonly regarded as leading citizens, to take the initiative, and in this sense I simply infer that we should lead by example. Perhaps this proposed bill could be the first step toward eliminating the ills within our social structure which cause such derangement of human minds as results in the crimes of murder, homicide, rape, or worse.

For those who seriously contend—and they are legion—that capital punishment is a valuable deterrent, let me say that to accept such a premise is abjectly to admit the failure on the part of society to alleviate the causes of murder. True, we may deter for all time the possibility of one individual ever again committing the crime of murder. We have not, however, taken a meaningful step to remove the cause. We simply have managed to bury forever the evidence of this one single failure on the part of society.

The emotionally disturbed persons—that is, persons of unbalanced minds, often caused by the stresses of poverty, broken homes, sexual frustrations and drunkenness—are the ones most frequently involved in the crime of murder. While society appears to be making some progress against the scourge of poverty, usually associated with incompetence due to lack of education, we now are faced with a new problem, a problem arising from rapidly developing automation and technological change.

I would like to quote Professor Reid, Professor of Economics at York University, who said:

"During the 1950's the new technologoy of automation began to cleave society, particularly its younger members, into the two clearly distinguishable classes. Today one class is made up of the undereducated most of whom, because they are undereducated are chronically unemployed or work only sporadically and who, because they are unemployed, live in deprivation, poverty or destitution."

Our new technology may very well cement those conditions in our society which tend to perpetuate the sons and daughters of the poor staying poor and to perpetuate the sons and daughters of the middle and wealthy classes staying middle class and wealthy. In Professor Reid's opinion, the educational system of our time fails lamentably in eradicating a long standing social evil.

Let us not then take the negative approach which may satisfy our conscience simply by hanging or imprisoning for life the product of this social condition. Let us do something practical; yes, more productive. Let us do so by mounting an all-out assault on the economic barrier against the obtainment of higher or even secondary education.

Sexual frustrations resulting in criminal perversion, I believe, may be traced to the serious lack of education in respect of such matters in our schools and homes. The dissemination of the knowledge of sex, the most powerful, indeed the most necessary of all human passions, is to all intents and purposes left to murals and hieroglyphics on toilet walls; in some cases it is left to the incoherent jargon of minds already rendered unwholesome by the system and by the vicious pornographic peddlers of our time. No wonder perversion with all its consequences develops among young and mature alike.

Is any real progress being made to rehabilitate unbalanced minds resulting from these social ills? *Maclean's* magazine, a reputable non-fiction periodical, in a recent article informed us there are one and a half million sure, and perhaps a million more, emotionally disturbed children in Canada today. Author Sheila Keirn says that authorities estimate there are 30,000 children whose disturbance is so severe that they require institutional care. Yet there are facilities for treating fewer than 500 children in Canada.

Now, may I address a few words to my colleagues who are members of my own Catholic faith. Surely in a matter such as this we should give equal if not prior consideration to the teaching of the New Testament rather than conform to the Old Testament. If Christ's admonition to turn the other cheek and his often quoted prayer for his own executioners, "O Father forgive them, for they know not what they do" have any real meaning, it categorically rejects the barbaric practice of retribution.

If we are prepared to accept this fact of Christianity, then the only logical reason for retention is its deterrent value. There is no logic, nor real reasoning power, in a mind so demented by one or other of the overpowering human passions, that it would contemplate the taking of another's life. Even the prospect of eternal damnation in hell's fires, an infinitely greater punishment than early death by execution, serves no deterrent to the mentally deranged.

I ask hon. members just for a moment to pause for an examination of their own conscience. I implore hon. members, having insight, perhaps possessing better than average intellect, having knowledge of the weaknesses and passions which govern human behaviour, to ponder with me these thoughts. Perhaps only an accident of birth, or even fate, has guided you along the road to this exalted chamber where you may enact laws made necesary because of human weaknesses. May I respectfully urge hon. members to contemplate this humble admonition, as I so often have done when others have pointed with scorn at some horrible example of human dereliction: There but for the grace of God go I.

As I said earlier, it is not my intention in the few minutes at my disposal to argue the unitarian aspect of this institution; rather I wish only to make two main points: First, the taking of human life is evil, degrading, unjustified and unnecessary; second, the right of all members to vote his own conscience.

• (4:50 p.m.)

It is my hope hon. members will have come to the conclusion that capital punishment by the state perpetuates the natural human instinct for revenge and devaluates the work of human existence to a point where greed, the other more powerful human passion, may lead to all-out war between nations. For this important matter of conscience every member must tear himself away from the political pressures of his decision. I believe a member's right to freedom of action in deciding this question can best be illustrated by reference to the oft-quoted Edmund Burke speaking to his constituents on the responsibility of a member of parliament. This quotation may be found in Beauchesne's third edition of rules and forms at page 12. Mr. Burke said in speaking about these responsibilites of hon. members:

> It is his duty to sacrifice his repose, his pleasures, his satisfactions, to theirs; and above all, ever and in all cases, to prefer their interests to his own. But, his unbiased opinion, his mature judgment, his enlightened conscience, he ought not to sacrifice to you, to any man, or to any set of men living. These he does not derive from your pleasure; no, nor from the law and the constitution. They are a trust from Providence, for the abuse of which he is deeply answerable. Your representative owes you, not his industry only, but his judgment; and he berays, instead of serving you, if he sacrifices it to your opinion.
>
> My worthy colleague says—

He was speaking of his opposing colleague.

> —his will ought to be subservient to yours. If that be all, the thing is innocent: If government were a matter of will upon my side, yours, without question ought to be superior. But government and legislation are matters of reason and judgment, and not of inclination; and what sort of reason is that, in which the determination precedes the discussion; in which one set of men deliberate, and another decide; and where those who form the conclusion are perhaps 300 miles distant from those who hear the arguments?

We may well say 3,000 miles distant from those who hear the arguments.

Hon. members, it is you who will be thoughtfully deliberating this vital question. It is you who will be carefully perusing all the evidence before you. It is you, not another, who must decide. I pray God that your decision at least will favour the principle of this motion.

Mr. Andrew Brewin (Greenwood): Mr. Speaker, anyone who proposes to take part in this debate must necessarily do so with a very great sense of responsibility. It is true that only a relatively few people are likely to be directly affected by the abolition or retention of capital punishment. But, Mr. Speaker, because it is a matter of life or death, it goes to the root of our administration of justice. There is no responsibility which we in this house have to fulfil in all our law-making duties more significant than the decision which now faces us.

I believe that every one of us in this house regards as fundamental to our consideration of this question before us a deep conviction of the value and the sanctity of human life. Those who support the death penalty for murder do so, I believe, largely because they believe no crime is more shocking, more deserving of punishment and more necessary to be deterred than the wanton taking of the life of another human being.

But, Mr. Speaker, those who, like myself, believe that the great weight of evidence establishes that the death penalty is not the only, indeed is no the most effective deterrent, believe that the sanctity of human life requires that the state itself should not impose or sanction the deliberate killing of human beings.

It is my view, Mr. Speaker, that the basic issue which we all have to consider and solve is whether or not the retention of the death penalty is necessary for the protection of society and in order to deter potential murderers. It is my conviction after consideration of all the evidence I have been able to find that the conclusion reached by Mr. W. T. McGrath, in his book "Should Canada Abolish the Gallows and the Lash", is a correct one. He states:

> The conclusion to be reached after a thorough study of the statistics relating to murder in those countries that have abolished capital punishment is that they provide conclusive evidence that the death penalty does not deter potential murderers and has no effect on the murder rate.

I say quite frankly to you and this house, Mr. Speaker, that if I and others who take the same view I take were convinced that capital punishment was shown to be the most effective deterrent to murder, no matter how repulsive it might be to us we would be compelled to support the continuation of capital punishment; but all the evidence points in another direction.

Others in this debate will expand and develop this point. For myself, I am content to put my view on this aspect of the matter in the words of a very great man, the great spiritual leader Archbishop Temple, who wrote this:

> I believe that the example of the state taking life, even when it does so in return for a life already taken, does more to lower the value of human life in the mind of its citizens than the deterrent influence of this penalty can do to protect the lives of its citizens. In this way, I believe that the main influence of the retention of the death penalty is rather to increase than diminish the number of murders.

If you agree with me and what Archbishop Temple has said then you can only resolve this problem in one way. But, the argument against the retention of capital punishment, to which I wish to direct the attention of this house, is on a different point and it is this. The administration of justice, being a human institution, is bound sometimes to make mistakes. Although these cases of error may be few, it is I think repulsive to our moral sense that the state should execute innocent people so as to make rectification of the mistakes impossible.

I do not make this argument to condemn our courts or our judiciary. I do, however, underline the fallibility of human judgment and human procedures, and I urge upon members of this house that it would be a monstrous injustice if, through the legal processes of the state, however well-intentioned, the life of an innocent person should be taken away. I assert that it is no figment of the imagination to say that even the most mature systems of the administration of justice can be mistaken, even in such solemn matters as capital cases.

Professor Borchard of Yale University, in a book called "*Convicting the Innocent*", has collected 68 cases from England and the United States in which innocent persons have been convicted of crimes, and 25 of these cases involved murder.

In Koestler's "*Reflections on Hanging*", the evidence of Sir Fitzroy Kelly to a royal commission in 1864, is summarized as follows—and I may say that Sir Fitzroy Kelly was the attorney general and solicitor general of the British government. The summary states:

> After careful consideration and examination, he has come to the conclusion that it is not in any way reasonable to be doubted that in many instances innocent men have been capitally convicted, and in certain numbers of instances, few of course but yet formidable numbers have been actually executed. Well remembers that there were, between the years 1802 and 1840, 22 cases of capital convictions, seven of which resulted in the execution of the convicts, and in the rest of which the sentence was mitigated or a pardon granted. But in the whole of the 22 cases the innocence of these persons was established or at least established satisfactorily to those who investigated the matter, and in most of the cases to the satisfaction of the advisers of the Crown.

Mr. Speaker, I propose to confine myself to three more recent cases which have taken place in jurisdictions where, admittedly, the administration of justice has reached high levels of fairness and efficiency. I refer to England, the United States and Canada.

• (5:00 p.m.)

There is the well known case in England of Timothy Evans who was hanged in 1954 for the murder of his daughter known as Geraldine Evans. Lord Birkett, a very famous judge who may be known to some hon. members, said this in discussing the case in the *Observer* newspaper on January 15, 1961:

> The case against Evans at his trial on the facts as they were then known was quite overwhelming. There was no failure in the administrative machinery of the criminal law. No human skill could have prevented the conviction and no human judicial system, whatever its checks and safeguards, can ever provide complete security against the exceedingly rare and utterly exceptional case such as that of Evans.

The accused Evans made what was said to be a free and voluntary confession. One of

the main witnesses for the crown was a man named Christie, who occupied a flat in the same house, who said that he heard sounds that fitted in with the idea that Evans was guilty of the murder not only of his daughter but of his wife. After Evans had been executed a new tenant moved into Christie's flat and found hidden behind a wall, not one but three human bodies. All three had been strangled. Under the floor a fourth body was found, and out in the yard two more bodies were found. All these women had been strangled.

At the trial of Christie the defence that was set up was insanity. Christie went into the witness box and admitted that he had murdered not only his wife but all the other women whose bodies were found on the premises, including Beryl Evans. He denied that he had killed the child, but it was perfectly obvious that the person who had killed the wife had also killed the child. This, therefore, is a well-authenticated case in Great Britain, which some of us call the home of justice, wherein the administration of justice made an error; but it was too late to bring Evans back to life and make restitution to him.

As recently as 1965, Mr. Arthur Martin, who has already been mentioned in this debate and who, as most members know, is a very distinguished criminal lawyer, spoke at a panel discussion to some members of this house. He referred to a recent case in New York of a coloured boy of 19 who was accused of murder and from whom a confession was secured. Mr. Arthur Martin said:

> Only this year in New York an innocent man by the name of George Whitmore narrowly escaped execution for the murder of two young women when the actual murderer was apprehended for another crime and confessed to the killing.

To show that even the most efficient prosecutors can be mistaken I wish to read what a member of the district attorney's staff said:

> I was one of those who was absolutely sure that Whitmore had killed the girls. There was no shadow of doubt in my mind—reasonable, beyond a shadow or any other kind. Now I am satisfied Whitmore is innocent. If this had not been a celebrated case, if this case had not aroused the tremendous publicity it did, if this were what we call a run-of-the-mill murder, Whitmore might well have slipped into the electric chair for something he did not do.

Now I want to come to a case that is closer to home and indeed is on the minds and lips of many members of this house. I refer to the case of Steven Truscott. Many members in this house will have read Mrs. LeBourdais' detailed and thoughtful analysis of this case and of the trial. Some of the members of the house have even visited Steven Truscott and have talked with him. Even at this moment the government and the Solicitor General (Mr. Pennell) have undertaken a review of this case to determine whether, as the book requests, a royal commission should be arranged to inquire into it.

Different minds will no doubt receive different impressions from the facts of this particular case. It would no doubt be premature to arrive at any final conclusion as to the guilt or innocence of Steven Truscott without a searching examination not only of the evidence at the hearing but of the facts and arguments outlined in Mrs. LeBourdais' excellent book, and other facts and circumstances that may now be available. Notwithstanding this—I say this in all seriousness —I and a good many others who have read the book, and some of whom have read the evidence at the trial and studied the case in detail, as well as Mrs. LeBourdais, have come to the conviction that a grave error was in fact made.

I do not want to review the facts of this case in great detail. Steven Truscott, for those who have not read the book, was a boy of 14 years of age who was convicted at Goderich in 1959 of a particularly horrible sexual murder of a small girl 12 years of age. There was no direct evidence of his being connected with or guilty of the murder. The chief evidence that purported to link him with the crime was medical evidence as to the hour of the girl's death, which was deducted from an analysis some days later of the contents of her stomach. By fixing through these deductions the time of death as being shortly after the boy was admittedly in the company of the girl, he was linked with the commission of the crime.

The jury appear to have overlooked damaging cross-examination as to the correctness of this medical evidence and very little attention seems to have been paid to the evidence of a medical expert for the defence who, although not as well known locally, had very considerable experience. His evidence pointed out the grave danger of making deductions as to the time of death from such an analysis made some time later. I may say that the evidence of this medical witness for the defence is fully supported by numerous medical authorities.

There was the further evidence of this doctor for the defence that upon his deductions the girl died two or three hours later than the time fixed by the crown's medical evidence, at a time when Truscott had a clear and watertight alibi. Other medical evidence was introduced as to injuries on the body of Truscott himself. This evidence was at the very best equivocal, and indeed was contradicted by the medical testimony for the defence.

Other boys gave evidence which, if believed, clearly corroborated Truscott's own story that he had left the girl at a crossroad and returned alone. It was suggested by the Crown that these boys were lying. But if this is so, it is strange that they gave their story at once before Truscott was charged or any suspicion at all was attached to him. One is the striking features of this case is its psychological aspects. If the crown's view, and the view that prevailed, was correct and Truscott in fact committed this crime, he was a most abnormal and extraordinary youth. He not only committed, on a very hot summer's day, a sadistic, almost ritualistic crime but he was able to appear very shortly thereafter perfectly calm and collected, in no way disarranged in manner or dress, and carry on the normal activities of a boy, and then under persistent questioning and with remarkable consistency tell precisely the same story that he is telling to this day.

That story is of his having taken the girl to the crossroads in question, well away from the alleged scene of the crime, and having returned alone. As I said, Mr. Speaker, the boy must have been of an extremely abnormal type to have done these things if the crime was committed by him. But in all respects, both before and after the event he appears to have been a normal boy. There are many other aspects of the evidence which in my view would justify a conclusion that a mistake has been made. Some of you may ask, how could such a mistake be made? I think the answer lies in the atmosphere created by the fact of such a horrible crime and the publication of crown evidence given at the preliminary inquiry which certainly seemed to point in the direction of Truscott's guilt.

Mrs. LeBourdais in her book quotes the editor of the Goderich newspaper as saying in answer to a question as to whether everyone in Goderich thought the boy to be guilty before his trial, "I never met anyone who didn't". I should like to make it clear that I do not refer to this case, or wish to refer to it, as indicating that the administration of justice in Ontario or elsewhere in Canada is either corrupt, inefficient or callous. It is not. I do believe however that this case indicates something that those familiar with the administration of justice well know from their own experience, namely that it is fallible and that mistakes can be made, particularly in the atmosphere created by the commission of horrible and detestable crimes.

• (5:10 p.m.)

I was myself involved in a case in which twice a jury returned a verdict and the third time a judge came to the same conclusion. It was not until the fourth trial that it was clearly proven and accepted by another judge that the whole evidence upon which those decisions had been based, the decisions of two judges and a jury, consisted of fabrication, perjury and was part of a deliberate plan of extortion. I have been through that experience and I know it is possible, in the best of good faith, for errors to be made.

The relevance of the Truscott case to this debate should be obvious. Truscott was condemned to death, and this boy of 14 years of age heard these fateful words:

> That you be taken from here to the place from whence you came and kept in close confinement until Tuesday, the 8th day of December, 1959, and upon that day and date you be taken to the place of execution and that you shall be hanged by the neck until you are dead. And may the Lord have mercy on your soul. Remove the prisoner.

Mr. Winkler: Will the hon. member permit a question? Is it possible, under the law as it stands today, for such a person to be hanged?

Mr. Brewin: No, I believe not. I think there was an amendment in 1961 that made it impossible to hang a youth of this age. However, I feel the hon. member will grasp my point when I go a little farther. Although it is quite true that a boy of this age could not have been condemned to death under the law as amended in 1961, nevertheless the point I am about to make remains.

By reason of his youth, Truscott's sentence was commuted to life imprisonment. Mrs. LeBourdais, and many others who have read her book, are doing their very best to have this case reviewed. But had Truscott been an older man, he would have been hanged by the neck until he was dead and there would be no way of reversing this irreversible verdict.

I think I am able to speak with some degree of experience about the fallibility of

human justice because I have spent a great deal of my life working in the courts and engaged in the administration of justice. This experience has convinced me that the rules of the law and their application by an independent judiciary, is one of the greatest achievements of civilization and one of which we are justly proud. But, Mr. Speaker, it has equally convinced me that like other human institutions, it can go wrong and make serious errors.

Human beings are not free from blindness and prejudice—

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order. I must advise the hon. member that the time allotted to him has expired.

Some hon. Members: Continue.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: There has been no request from the hon. member to continue.

Mr. Brewin: I only have two or three minutes more, and I crave the indulgence of the house.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Does the house give unanimous consent to the hon. member for Greenwood to continue?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Mr. Brewin: I wanted to add a very few words to what I have already said.

Human beings are not free from blindness and prejudice merely because they are chosen to serve on juries, nor are lawyers, just because they are appointed judges, infallible. Should we not all shrink from any authorization of the retention of the death sentence or from any responsibility for authorizing it when, through the inevitable fallibility of all human justice, the sentence of death may be executed on innocent people? There may not be many of these cases, Mr. Speaker, but there should not be any.

So, amongst the other reasons I urge the house to consider for deciding in favour of this resolution, I urge this ground, the ground of the established fallibility of human justice. I urge the members of this house to take an important step forward by passing this resolution. I urge them to take this important step forward to what I believe is a more civilized, more humane approach. Many nations in the free world have abolished capital punishment without ill effects. They are among the leading, the most civilized countries in the world.

[Mr. Brewin.]

I recognize, Mr. Speaker, that many murders which are committed arouse natural instinctive horror and indignation. In those cases, capital punishment may appear to some to be the appropriate remedy. I suggest however that in these matters, perhaps as in all matters, a combination of compassion and cool and practical calculation of the evidence is the best guide, and not human indignation.

Mr. Howard Johnston (Okanagan-Revelstoke): At the outset, I should like to express my appreciation of the opportunity of participating in this debate on this very important subject. I should like to have it clearly understood that the opinions I express in this debate are my own and the responsibility for them is mine.

A few years ago I visited the Tower of London, that ancient institution, and came upon a huge black block, attached to which was a large axe. This instrument had been used on many occasions for execution. I was struck by another visitor to the tower, a young, attractive woman who had a small and very lovely daughter with her. The woman brought her daughter to the block and showed it to her. She spoke of it in awe-inspired tones and took particular pains to point out to the small girl that this was the axe. I wondered at the time whether the small girl would have nightmares. I watched her reaction and decided she was too young to understand what was being pointed out to her, so she would sleep well that night. Whether or not she was brought back to the tower to look again at that grisly instrument, I do not know.

However, I do know that when I left the Tower of London and stood outside once more, I felt I had returned to a different age, a different time. I do not know whether I was right because, here we are, four years later debating whether or not we should abolish capital punishment. I am sure that there would be a public outcry in Canada today if we put on public display the instruments we use now. I do not believe we would tolerate a museum for the instruments of capital punishment. Times are changing and the children who are coming along today are changing more rapidly than we did as children or our ancestors did.

I should like to read the words of a present-day prophet who happens to be a prophet from our own country and therefore may or may not be without honour. He is speaking of the rapidity of the change in the

generation that is growing up today. The article appeared in the *Canadian Forum* of January, 1964 and is rather aptly titled, "Murder by Television". The prophet is Marshall McLuhan. He is speaking of the difference between children who learn by reading print and those who learn by seeing television. I quote:

> Print does not permit the involvement that the T.V. image demands. The confusion of these forms is indicated . . . . more in the clash of attitudes toward the curriculum and the learning process. There is a great drop in motivation. The T.V. child cannot see ahead.

Then, there is a sentence here which I think is very important to the people who speak about the deterrence of capital punishment.

• (5:20 p.m.)

> It is meaningless to a deeply involved person to explain that he should look ahead as a means of orienting his behaviour. Involvement, whether of the artist, the saint, or the roué, forbids concern with the price of groceries, or the looking ahead to envision the consequences of present action.

I think I can interpolate along with the other catalogue, "the murderer", in the list of people for whom it is impossible to look ahead to envision the consequences of present action.

Then in concluding his essay he says something which I think is particularly significant to us in this chamber this afternoon:

> The effect of T.V., therefore, psychically and socially, has been as little heeded or understood as the effects of phonetic literacy and typography. Today it is absolutely necessary to understand these effects since their consequences upon our traditional ways and perceptions do not occur gradually and mechanically, but develop at electric speeds. We have a huge stake in habits of civilized detachment and analytic objectivity. In short, our civilized values are by no means the same as the new habits of total involvement of all men in all men. Such total involvement may well seem utopian to conventional, literate people. In point of fact, it has actually happened to us. We are living far ahead of our thinking. As wakeful, rational beings, responsible for a vast heritage, it behoves us to note the dissolving pressures exerted on this heritage by electric technology. Having noted this, we can make a free choice about whether or not to persist in the present patterns of technology. To ignore these patterns and pressures, by merely reacting to them, puts us in the role of automata carrying out automated mandates.

We should think very seriously about that as we examine the question, which has a great deal to do with tradition. The arguments have a great deal to do with our being rational human beings, and the response can either be one of reaction, or it can be a logical response. We do not have to be automata in the present circumstance.

I should like to turn, Mr. Speaker, to another of the very many declarations on both sides which have dropped on my desk during these last few weeks. I turn to this one for several reasons. It contrasts, in some ways, with what I have just read, not in thought or idea but in time. It was a declaration made originally several hundred years ago and is a Christian declaration on capital punishment which was put out by the general conference of the Mennonite church. I think it speaks, for some of those people who would insist that if we take a Christian attitude toward capital punishment today there is only one attitude to take, and that is the one of very stern rebuke and retributive action, as laid out in the early chapters of the Old Testament.

The Mennonite church makes this statement of position:

> Since Christ through His redemptive work has fulfilled the requirement of the death penalty, and has given the church a ministry of reconciliation, and in view of the injustice and ineffectiveness of capital punishment as a means for the achievement of the purpose of government we express our conviction that its use should be discontinued.

I have seen no other statement which has managed to combine the theological and the practical with such clarity and shortness. These people cannot be accused of being intellectuals who have no practical responsibility. They cannot be accused of being modern, because in the sixteenth century one of the charges laid against Felix Manz, the first Anabaptist martyr, was that he had rejected capital punishment. Menno Simons argued that if the transgressor should truly repent, for such a one to be hanged would look strange and unbecoming. If he remained impenitent and his life be taken, one would unmercifully rob him of the time of repentance.

Nor can these people be accused of having been soft, because the mere fact they have survived to this day and endured all sorts of persecutions is an indication that they were stern, practical and simple people.

Quite a bit more about their position has been said, but one thing they did which appealed to me was to go on beyond that statement and to include a resolution which was adopted by the 63rd session of the conference of Mennonites in Canada, held at Clearbrook, British Columbia, from July 2 to July 6, 1965. I hope that all statements emanating from those who live in that great

province will always be as sincere as is this one.

The conference pointed out that things can be done to deter crime. These involve working in the home, working with the individual, working with the offender, encouraging and assisting qualified young people to train for vocations and services in which the offender can be helped, such as prison chaplaincy, social work, probation and parole positions, teaching and psychiatry. Not for the offender but for society as a whole we need to encourage our young people to move into the type of occupation which will have service to humanity as its main concern.

They also urged continuing—

> —study of the problem of crime in our midst, the needs of the offender and his family, awakening our own consciences and those of the public with every means proper within our own power, including the printed page, sermons, radio and T.V. literature,

There we get the tie-in between the first of the quotations I cited and this one, because these people too have realized the significance of the technological age in which we live.

I think that one could suggest that we are ready for a sort of total response to the question of capital punishment; that perhaps we should make a crusade out of this, something like a holy year in which no murder would be committed. Perhaps the centennial year would be a good year for such a project. But, Mr. Speaker, you know why this will not be done and why we do not do it. It is because we now live in a period since the development of psychology as a science. We are living after people like Freud and Jung have spoken. While we may not always believe what they have said, we cannot deny that they have said it, and our response to the actions of human beings can never again be as primitive as it was a few years ago.

We know, Mr. Speaker, that if we direct that sort of attention to the question of capital punishment, one of the results might well be an increase in the number of murders which are committed. That is one of the most telling arguments against capital punishment—that it may in some ways even encourage the very thing it is supposed to deter.

When we have debated this resolution I hope the house will proceed to pass it in its present form unamended in any way. Let us not amend it to allow capital punishment for treason, because we know that one century's treason is another century's patriotism. How much easier the present history of Canada might have been had that great western radical, Louis Riel, not been hanged; had the government of that day been in the position of being unable to hang him. Let us not allow exceptions in the case of the murder of prison guards, because we all know that it will be inevitable within a year or two that someone will be slain and we will be back once more to this whole agonizing business. It is just as possible within the confines of a prison as anywhere else in our society to find extenuating circumstances.

• (5:30 p.m.)

The resolution or amendment before this house would solve that particular problem. And let us not provide for exceptions in cases where children are murdered. Surely these crimes are committed by those whose minds are not normal and, therefore, they fall outside the scope of capital punishment as set up at the present time.

Let us not amend the law for a trial period, either. If we close this episode in the history of Canada let us keep it closed. If we do not, then inevitably at the end of the trial period, five years or ten years, whatever it may be, we shall have in effect encouraged a group of particularly desperate murderers, because those who commit them as the trial period ends will bring themselves into the full glare of publicity. I believe the experience of other countries shows the question will come back to us with an almost overwhelming demand that we should return to something which we ought to abandon and forget forevermore.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Alcide Simard (Lac-Saint-Jean): Mr. Speaker, the state cannot be denied the punitive power—stripping that word of the disparaging meaning it has acquired through usage—that is the power to punish those who break the laws enacted for the good of society. That goes for any just law, and all the more for laws which are only stating the most fundamental requirements of natural law, such as respect for any innocent life.

If the problem is limited to the death penalty, it is necessary to make a distinction between the right of the state to impose that punishment, on the one hand, and the opportunity to exercise that right in concrete circumstances of time and place, on the other hand. Among those who advocate most strongly the abolition of the death penalty, many admit the right of the state, in theory, to inflict that punishment, but deny the existence today of the conditions which make it

legal or appropriate to exercise it, at least in some countries; conversely, among those who favour maintaining the death penalty, many admit that some day circumstances might make it possible to recommend its abolition but they feel that those conditions do not yet prevail.

The right itself is denied by some or, on the contrary, claimed under a concept of the state which makes it an end in itself and makes it independent from any higher authority, that is divine authority. In a theistic and Christian concept of the world, it must be possible to prove that right, if it exists, by theological and philosophical arguments, but the opportunity to exercise that right depends mostly on sociological factors and, in the last analysis, on political wisdom.

We will see to what extent the problem is complex and why, consequently, differences of opinion can exist even among Catholics who try to study the problem seriously, objectively.

There is no doubt that the application of the death penalty has led to many abuses which could be gathered under three headings:

First, the number of crimes punishable by death. Thus, in England, in 1770, 350 various offences were liable to bring about the death penalty. Around 1825, 220 offences; and children over 14 hanged regularly, whereas children over 7 were hanged also "if there was strong evidence of malice".

In France, 115 crimes were punishable by death under the ordinance of 1670; 36, under the penal code of 1810; 16, in 1848.

Second, the execution method, sometimes rather inhuman, without taking into account torture or ill-treatment which the condemned sometimes had to undergo before execution. Without taking into account also, in some cases, the long waiting period as experienced by Caryl Chessman, executed on May 2, 1960, after 12 years of legal battles, trials and reprieves, which stirred up indignation throughout the world.

Third, the feelings of those who pass sentence of death or who execute it. Very low motives based on hatred, vengeance, have often dictated acts which, to be legitimate, should always be inspired by justice and accompanied by love.

Yes, there has been much abuse. But that abuse does not necessarily prove the law should be abolished. The law must be studied first of all, and then if it is well grounded and if we feel it is expedient to apply it, let us do so with the utmost respect for human dignity, excluding all forms of subtle tortures, and in a true spirit of justice.

Now, Mr. Speaker, here is what Pope Pius XII thought about the matter.

In his numerous speeches to jurists, Pope Pius XII never discussed capital punishment officially. But in his speech to the members of the first international convention on the histopathology of the nervous system, on September 14, 1952, pointing out that the state has no direct power over human life, Pope Pius XII spoke the following enlightening words:

> Even when carrying out a capital sentence, the state does not hold a right over the individual's life. It then rests with the public powers to deprive the condemned person from the gift of life, in atonement for his sin, as his very crime already deprived him of the right to live.

Just like, by imprisoning a man guilty of robbery, the state does not deprive him of his right to freedom, but denies him the weal of freedom to which, because of his crime, he has lost his right.

In the principle thus laid down by Pius XII, G. Ermecke sees the only argument on which capital punishment can be philosophically based. One may wonder, however, whether in the mind of Pius XII, the loss of the right to live is consecutive to crime as such, or consecutive to crime inasmuch as it is expiable by the death penalty in some countries. But anyway, it is difficult not to see here an affirmation of the theoretical legitimacy of the death penalty, an affirmation of the right itself.

Rationality of the death penalty.

1. The reasons that can be given in favour of the legitimacy of the death penalty, that is in order to prove the right itself, may be summarized as follows: compensation, redress or expiation, safety and exemplariness. The former directly concern the offence and the guilty person with a view to satisfying justice; the latter have to do with the commonweal and the protection of the state.

It is easy to raise objections against each of the reasons taken separately. If the death penalty is considered only as a compensation, then it can be said to be nothing but the application of the lex talionis.

If one wants to refer to redress within the strict meaning of the word, it is obvious that the death of the guilty redresses nothing, since it cannot bring the victim back to life.

On the higher level of atonement, it must be said that punishment only has this moral value in so far as it is accepted; atonement must undoubtedly be reflected in an exterior act whenever possible. But it is above all a spiritual attitude. Why should such an expiation through capital punishment be necessary without another being sufficient?

Will it be suggested that the security of the state requires the dealth penalty as a protection against the murderer himself? Of course, this is not a decisive reason, since life imprisonment—in spite of possible escapes—still provides theoretically a protection just as effective.

Finally, the exemplarity motive raises problems when considered in itself. Were even the fear of capital punishment more effective than the fear of life imprisonment to dissuade possible criminals from their homicidal designs, what should we think about a procedure directed against someone in order to prevent others from doing wrong? A human being, even guilty, is not only a simple means to an end, however commendable it may be.

• (5:40 p.m.)

We feel that both aspects cannot be considered separately: punishment of the crime and security of the state. Of course, no innocent person should be sacrificed for the common weal, (or to put it more clearly, the true commonweal forbids us to put to death innocent people even though they are involuntarily harmful to the common weal); but, on the other hand, the punishment of any real crime must be based on the common weal. Referring to the principle laid down by Pope Pius XII, we would say that through his crime, the criminal has lost his right to live. But the state can only deprive him of the gift of life if this extreme form of punishment is necessary or at least very beneficial to the public weal.

This raises the question which seems actually most significant: is capital punishment more effective than life imprisonment to protect society by preventing murders? We will talk about it later.

2. The opposite reasons, against the very principle of capital punishment are also open to major objections:

God, it is said, is sole master of life. True. And that is why any legitimation of the death penalty has to be related to God. But He who willed society also willed the requirements for the good of society. If then this good truly requires the death penalty, then the will of God is to be seen in the right of life and death as a delegation from God to the state of the right to dispose of human life under specific conditions.

Man has a basic right to live. It is true. But how can it be established that the culprit does not, through his crime, jeopardize his right and that the state is not then empowered to deprive him of a right to which he is no longer entitled? Human dignity is an absolute value that must be respected, even in the culprit. But life is not an absolute good.

A penalty must be remedial. Capital punishment cannot be, since the culprit is eliminated. To this the defenders of legalized capital punishment reply: True, a penalty must generally be remedial, first for the culprit (it is the obvious meaning of the statement) but also in a wider sense, for society as a whole. Yet, when the importance of the crime and the requirement of the common weal agree on the need for capital punishment, how can injustice be proven by the single fact that the penalty cannot be remedial in the strictest sense of the word?

Because a miscarriage of justice is always possible, the state has no right to impose an irrevocable penalty. To this, one may reply: Emprisonment is also irrevocable, since no one can alter the fact that the time spent in jail has been an undeserved deprivation of freedom. And one may add: From this not unfounded objection it must be concluded that death penalty must be decreed unless the crime has been proven; and the few mistakes still possible are the ransom of all human justice which cannot have God's omniscience. Let us, however, admit that this may be at least another reason, if not against the right, at least against the advisability of preserving capital punishment.

Finally, some people deny any legitimate basis for capital punishment because, they maintain, all criminals obey some irresistable impulses or are even, for the most part, mentally ill. And of the crimes which public opinion finds most vile, sadistic murder is precisely the one in which the irrational impulse is strongest. To this one must answer: it may and should be admitted that many crimes are committed by psychopaths or people in whom an extremely strong impulse greatly diminishes or even suppresses responsibility. But it cannot be said that a criminal is not responsible for his crime. Again, this may be another reason for the

advisability of abolishing capital punishment. But one cannot accept the presumption which would deny the right: the irresponsibility of all criminals.

But, they say, society is the one that is responsible, for it did not know how to make the criminal avoid his crime. True, society is partly responsible when it does not give its members the means to fulfil themselves, which would deter them from committing crimes, but this cannot possibly suppress all individual responsibility.

Can we invoke universal consent, as all theologians have done, as an argument to show that the death penalty is legitimate? We believe that this consent is in itself less a proof than a certain indication or, if you prefer, a confirmation. In our view, it is rooted in the right itself recognized by the more or less spontaneous conscience of people since the beginning of time. But today, is it still possible to speak of universal consent? Surely not as regards the advisability of maintaining the death penalty; perhaps not even with respect to the right itself, although public opinion is not too concerned with this particular aspect.

As a matter of fact, the most controversial question is that of the death penalty's value as a deterrent. That is the point which ultimately determines the legislators' action. It surpasses all other means as a strong deterrent, according to Professor Bouzat, of Rennes, as quoted in *Études*, No. 315, 1962, page 204.

[*English*]

Statistical findings and case studies converge to disprove the claim that the death penalty has any special deterrent value.

[*Translation*]

Those who uphold the death penalty bring forth psychological reasons to prove its deterrent value: the instinct of preservation, the natural desire to live. And when statistics are quoted against that, they reply that if capital punishment does not always have the deterrent effect they say it has; this is due to the very conditions under which it is applied and which render it more or less efficient: the slowness of proceedings, the very small number of executions, etc.

On the other hand, those who are in favour of abolition emphasize the importance of statistics which, it must be admitted, seem to carry a lot of weight. Here are a few examples.

They always refer to British statistics compiled in 1910 and which revealed that out of 250 persons who had gone to the gallows, 170 had been hanged in public.

In Germany: in 1947 and 1948, 68 crimes; abolition in 1949; in 1950 and 1951, 51 crimes.

If the death penalty was a real deterrent, there should be practically no murders in the 41 American states which electrocute their murderers—or which hang them, or put them to death in gas chambers—and the nine states which have abolished the death penalty should be hot-beds of murderers. As a matter of fact, the opposite is true.

A full and complete study of these statistics should no doubt take many factors into consideration. But it must be admitted that there is food for thought in this. Abolitionists conclude from that that for the protection of citizens in general, and of policemen in particular—

Mr. Speaker: I regret to interrupt the hon. member, but his time is up.

• (5:50 p.m.)

[*English*]

Perhaps before I call on the hon. member for Swift Current-Maple Creek (Mr. McIntosh) to take the floor, I might refer to the discussion which was initiated earlier this afternoon in respect of which I indicated later on I would give an opinion and judgment.

[*Translation*]

This afternoon, the hon. members for Sherbrooke and Lapointe (Messrs. Allard and Grégoire) suggested that I should take the initiative and divide the resolution which is under consideration now. Since then, I had the opportunity to study the suggestions made by the hon. members and to read attentively the remarks they made during their interventions.

I do not think that I can change the opinion I gave this afternoon, to the effect that this resolution is not of the kind which the Speaker would be justified to deal with in the way suggested by the hon. members. In my opinion, there is only one proposition before the house, which deals with the abolition of the death penalty, and the other aspects of the question are rather of a secondary nature and could not, in the circumstances, be separated from the initial proposition and made into separate resolutions. It is only in exceptional circumstances and when there is little doubt about it that the Speaker can intervene and, of his own initiative, amend the resolution proposed by an hon. member.

In this case, as I said, I do not think that I would be justified to take this initiative.

[*English*]

The hon. member for Swift Current-Maple Creek.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Simard: Mr. Speaker, with the consent of the house, could I finish my remarks?

[*English*]

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Mr. Speaker: Is it agreed that the hon. member might close his remarks? The house may allow the hon. member to go to six o'clock and allow the hon. member for Swift Current-Maple Creek to call it six o'clock.

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Simard: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

For abolitionists, this seems to prove that for the protection of citizens in general and of policemen in particular, life inprisonment is just as effective, if not more. It seems that it is not the seriousness of the penalty which is the decisive factor on this point, but the likelihood of its application.

It is really too simple to brush aside any discussion on the death penalty by suggesting it is a primitive law of retaliation or a medieval institution, or by presuming that all those in favour of maintaining capital punishment are merely prompted by inconscious motives of aggressiveness or revenge. And let not be introduced as proof things which prove little to many a sincere and lucid mind not to allow emotions to overwhelm the reasoning process is not the exclusive privilege of one given group of thinkers. And it must be admitted that the two inquiries, in England and in Canada, have been seriously held, as were others elsewhere.

The question of capital punishment, as we said, must be studied with detachment under the dual considerations of legality and the expedient administration of the law in the present, concrete circumstances. This double-barreled problem is not without difficulties.

Is it true that there is apparently no Roman Catholic doctrine on capital punishment? Such an unqualified statement is rather surprising. The following statements seem much more balanced.

The Church declares that the state does not exceed its powers in wielding the temporal sword. It also asserts that this weapon should be used not only with justice, but also, and always, with prudence. The Church goes much further and proclaims its own abhorrence of blood, which does not permit acceptance of capital punishment in its own code.

Beyond this, the Church leaves to penal codes and political institutions their controversies and their fluctuations always subject to circumstances and to events.

It then seems that the Church cannot have a firm attitude on capital punishment since application of the penalty is mostly a question of policy on crime.

That the right itself is a legitimate one can be proved rather easily by theological arguments. Revelation leaves no doubt as to the licit nature, in principle, of the death penalty. The holy scriptures, the teachings of the church and the unanimous doctrine of Catholic theologians and most Protestant authors are quite clear on that.

On this question of fact, there is room for differences of opinion. The Church itself has taken no stand. But it may be felt that in present circumstances capital punishment is unnecessary. At any rate, the abolitionist idea is constantly gaining ground.

I should like to add two comments underlined by several thinkers who have medidated on the various aspects of the abolition of the death penalty.

Abolition of the death penalty must not result in too lenient an application of penal justice. Since it is claimed that confinement can adequately protect society, let that penalty be applied in such a way that society will be adequately protected. That does not preclude, on the contrary, the use of every modern method of the rehabilitation of convicts.

While granting that many criminals may not be entirely responsible or even, in a few cases, not responsible at all, the campaign against capital punishment should not spread the conviction that all guilty people are robots or sick people. That would be casting on the greatness of man a reflection of the utmost gravity.

[*English*]

Mr. McIntosh: Mr. Speaker, may I call it six o'clock.

At six o'clock the house adjourned, without question put, pursuant to standing order.

HOUSE OF COMMONS

Thursday, March 24, 1966

The house met at 2.30 p.m.

LIBRARY OF PARLIAMENT

REPORT OF JOINT COMMITTEE RESPECTING SALARY REVISIONS

Mr. Speaker: Order. I have the honour to inform the house that a report has been received from the committee of both houses on the library of parliament with regard to certain revisions of rates of pay of employees of the library of parliament.

INCOME TAX

IMPLEMENTATION OF AGREEMENT BETWEEN CANADA AND UNITED KINGDOM

Hon. Mitchell Sharp (Minister of Finance) moved for leave to introduce Bill No. C-154, to implement an agreement between Canada and the United Kingdom for the avoidance of double taxation on certain classes of income and to implement a supplementary income tax agreement between Canada and Sweden.

Some hon. Members: Explain.

Hon. Mitchell Sharp (Minister of Finance): Mr. Speaker, this bill will approve the tax agreements which have been negotiated between Canada and the United Kingdom.

Motion agreed to and bill read the first time.

• (2:40 p.m.)

JUDGES ACT

AMENDMENTS TO PROVIDE FOR ADDITIONAL JUDGES

Hon. L. T. Pennell (for the Minister of Justice) moved that the house go into committee of the whole at its next sitting to consider the following proposed resolution, which has been recommended to the house by His Excellency:

That it is expedient to introduce a measure to amend the Judges Act to provide salaries for two additional judges of the Supreme Court of Ontario, three additional judges of the Superior Court of Quebec, one additional judge of the Supreme Court of New Brunswick, one additional judge of the county court of Ontario, and one additional judge of the district court of Alberta.

Motion agreed to.

ADMIRALTY ACT

AMENDMENTS RESPECTING DEPUTY JUDGES, ADMINISTRATION, ETC.

Hon. L. T. Pennell (for the Minister of Justice) moved that the house go into committee of the whole at its next sitting to consider the following proposed resolution, which has been recommended to the house by His Excellency:

That it is expedient to introduce a measure to amend the Admiralty Act to authorize the appointment of not more than three deputy judges for each admiralty district and to provide for a certain change in the administration of the act.

Motion agreed to.

CANADIAN NATIONAL RAILWAYS

AUTHORIZATION FOR CONSTRUCTION OF LINE IN NORTHWESTERN ONTARIO

Hon. J. W. Pickersgill (Minister of Transport) moved that the house go into committee of the whole at its next sitting to consider the following proposed resolution, which has been recommended to the house by His Excellency:

That it is expedient to introduce a measure to authorize and to provide for the construction of a line of railway in the province of Ontario by Canadian National Railway Company from the vicinity of Amesdale on the Redditt subdivision of the Canadian National Railway in a north northwesterly direction for a distance of approximately 68 miles to a point in the vicinity of Bruce Lake, in the district of Kenora, at a total estimated expenditure of $11,100,000, not to be exceeded by more than 15 per cent.

Motion agreed to.

TRANSPORT

ST. LAWRENCE SEAWAY—REPORTED APPROVAL OF INCREASED TOLLS

On the orders of the day:

Right Hon. J. G. Diefenbaker (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, my question relates to two departments, so I presume I should address it to the Prime Minister. It has to do with the report that the government plans to approve an increase in tolls on the St. Lawrence Seaway from 90 cents to $1 per net ton on manufactured goods, and from 40 cents to 45 cents per net ton on bulk cargo, and that there is also to be an increase in the Welland canal tolls. If that is so, has any

consideration been given by the government to the potentially adverse additional effect this will have on our exports?

Hon. J. W. Pickersgill (Minister of Transport): Mr. Speaker, as I indicated in response to a question a day or two ago, and as is required under the agreement with the United States, the St. Lawrence Seaway authority has been carrying on discussions with the St. Lawrence Corporation, the United States entity, with regard to a possible revision of the existing tolls. I understand that the parties to this discussion now feel they are fairly close to agreement as to what they will be prepared to recommend to the two governments. So far no agreed recommendation has been made. If an agreed recommendation is made there will be public hearings in both countries before any final decision is made; and at those public hearings, of course, I expect that all considerations, including the ones referred to by the right hon. gentleman, will be gone into.

INDIAN AFFAIRS

COURT DECISION RESPECTING PROVISION OF MEDICAL CARE

On the orders of the day:

Mr. T. C. Douglas (Burnaby-Coquitlam): Mr. Speaker, I should like to direct a question to the Minister of National Health and Welfare, the urgency of which will be apparent when I point out that I have in my hand a letter from the solicitor representing the native population who are concerned about the decision of the Saskatchewan appeal court on the medicine chest case.

The problem is that they must make an appeal within a given number of days, and in view of the answer the minister gave on March 18 to my colleague the hon. member for Skeena, as to whether the government would be prepared to supply medical and hospital services to the Indians and thereby make the appeal unnecessary, it is fairly important that an answer be given fairly soon so the native population and their representatives will know whether to proceed with an appeal or whether they can safely drop the matter.

I want to ask the minister whether he can give the house his decision in respect of this matter at this time.

Hon. A. J. MacEachen (Minister of National Health and Welfare): Mr. Speaker, the consideration of this matter has not been completed, but I hope to be able to give an answer to my hon. friend tomorrow or Monday.

[Mr. Diefenbaker.]

Mr. Douglas: I have a supplementary question. May I ask the minister whether, if it is not possible to make an affirmative decision, he will give some thought to supplying the necessary funds to cover the appeal against the decision of the court?

Mr. MacEachen: Yes, Mr. Speaker.

[*Later:*]

Mr. G. W. Baldwin (Peace River): Mr. Speaker, I wish to ask a question of the Minister of National Health and Welfare which is related to the one asked earlier in regard to the Indian medicine chest case.

In view of the serious nature of the charges, which involve allegations of bad faith against the government and people of Canada, will the minister consider discussing this matter with his colleague the Minister of Northern Affairs and National Resources so that before the Indian claims commission legislation is brought down, adequate remedies may be provided in that legislation and this matter may be settled by legislation rather than litigation.

Mr. MacEachen: Yes, Mr. Speaker, I shall be glad to consider that suggestion.

[*Translation*]

NATIONAL SECURITY

REPORTED ADMITTANCE TO CANADA OF VIET CONG SYMPATHIZER

On the orders of the day:

Mr. Réal Caouette (Villeneuve): Mr. Speaker, I should like to direct a question to the Minister of Citizenship and Immigration.

Yesterday I asked him questions concerning a certain Mr. Ramsey, a professional revolutionary, who has entered Canada.

Today I should like the minister to tell me if his department is now conducting or has asked the R.C.M.P. to conduct an inquiry into the case of Mr. Ramsey, who is seeking political asylum in our country, and what action the minister intends to take concerning that man?

Hon. Jean Marchand (Minister of Citizenship and Immigration): Mr. Speaker, since yesterday I have received some information concerning Mr. Ramsey that was addressed to the Prime Minister.

Should Mr. Ramsey make a regular immigrant application, we shall examine it on its merits and determine what action to take.

Now, if Mr. Ramsey remains in Canada we shall attempt to ascertain whether he is here merely as a visitor or has other interests. We would then ask him certain questions.

Mr. Gilles Grégoire (Lapointe): Mr. Speaker, I should like to put a supplementary question.

Can the minister tell us whether it is normal for an immigrant to come to Canada first and then request immigrant status or whether he should not, under the regulations, request immigrant status while still in his own country?

Mr. Speaker: Order. The question is out of order. The hon. member is asking for an interpretation of the departmental regulations or of the act. This type of question cannot be answered.

[*English*]

CANADIAN CONSTITUTION

CHANGES IN AMENDMENT FORMULA SUGGESTED BY QUEBEC GOVERNMENT

On the orders of the day:

Hon. E. D. Fulton (Kamloops): Mr. Speaker, on Tuesday of this week I asked the Prime Minister if he had yet made inquiry of the province of Quebec whether that government would indicate the changes they felt should be made before reconvening a constitutional amendment conference. The right hon. gentleman assured me that he had made inquiries but he wanted to be precise in his recollection—which I understand—before answering.

Could I ask the right hon. Prime Minister whether he has received an answer to those inquiries, and if so what the answer is?

Right Hon. L. B. Pearson (Prime Minister): Yes, Mr. Speaker. Pursuant to my hon. friend's request, made first I think on March 4, I should first tell him that I received a reply from the Premier of Quebec on this matter of constitutional amendment procedure dated February 17. With the leave of the house I should be glad to table that particular communication with the Premier of Quebec.

In further reply to the question I would say that since the date of this letter views have been exchanged informally with the government of Quebec, and the federal and provincial governments are reviewing recent developments in this field of constitutional amendment in order to be in a position to resume consideration of the question at a future meeting of the federal-provincial conference of the Prime Minister and premiers.

I have been informed that the government of Quebec is not yet ready to indicate any definitive position in this matter of procedure regarding constitutional amendment. While I regret that I cannot be more specific on this aspect of the matter at this stage, I want to assure the house that it remains an immediate objective of the policy of the federal government to provide that the constitution of Canada may be amended in Canada.

Mr. Fulton: Mr. Speaker, as a supplementary question, in view of his reply may I ask the Prime Minister whether he is able to throw any light on the statement made by the premier of Quebec yesterday when, in response to a question asked in that legislature, he said:

[*Translation*]

Mr. Jean Lesage replied that there was no correspondence other than that which he had tabled on the question.

Mr. Johnson: Should we draw the conclusion that Mr. Pearson was referring to the last letter?

Mr. Lesage: I have no conclusion to draw, I have seen nothing, I am aware of nothing, I am saying nothing.

[*English*]

Can the Prime Minister comment upon that statement which appears quite extraordinary in the light of the reply he has just made?

Mr. Pearson: No, Mr. Speaker. I shall have to look into that statement, which I had not heard until my hon. friend brought it to my attention.

[*Later:*]

Mr. Speaker, I desire to lay on the table of the house the correspondence to which I referred in answering a previous question.

Mr. Fulton: Mr. Speaker, if the Prime Minister is agreeable, may I request approval of the house that this correspondence be printed as an appendix to *Hansard?*

Mr. Pearson: I would be quite agreeable.

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

[*Editor's note: For text of letter referred to above, see appendix.*]

Inquiries of the Ministry

EXTERNAL AFFAIRS

NATO—REPORTED INTENTION OF PORTUGAL TO WITHDRAW

On the orders of the day:

Mr. W. B. Nesbitt (Oxford): Mr. Speaker, I should like to direct a question to the Secretary of State for External Affairs. Has the minister or our representative to the North Atlantic Treaty Organization in Paris received any communication concerning the reported withdrawal of Portugal from NATO?

Hon. Paul Martin (Secretary of State for External Affairs): No, Mr. Speaker.

FINANCE

REPORTED DISCRIMINATION BY BANKS IN GRANTING LOANS TO WOMEN

On the orders of the day:

Mr. H. W. Herridge (Kootenay West): I wish to address a question the the Minister of Finance as one who is intellectually opposed to discrimination on the basis of sex. Has the minister's attention been drawn to press reports to the effect that loans to women have been refused by the Industrial Development Bank and other banks, simply on the grounds that they were women? Would the minister make inquiries of the Industrial Development Bank and other banks to determine their practice in this respect?

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. I invite the hon. member to place his question on the order paper.

U.S. GUIDE LINES—EFFECT ON BALANCE OF PAYMENTS DEFICIT

On the orders of the day:

Hon. J. W. Monteith (Perth): I have a question for the Minister of Finance. In view of the sharp increase in the deficit balance of payments from $433 million in 1964 to $1,136 million in 1965, largely attributed by the Dominion Bureau of Statistics to an increased deficit with the United States, does the Canadian government plan to take further steps to counteract the effect of the United States guide lines in so far as direct investment is concerned?

Hon. Mitchell Sharp (Minister of Finance): I doubt very much whether United States guide lines have anything to do with this particular problem. I do share the concern of the hon. member about a deficit in our balance of payments, particularly if it showed signs of becoming excessive. It is related directly, of course, to the prosperity in our country because Canada has a tendency to import, particularly machinery, in a period of very rapid expansion such as the one through which we are proceeding.

In my budget I intend to have something to say about this matter. I think the measures I will be proposing then will do something to improve our balance of payments situation.

Mr. Monteith: May I ask a supplementary question. Can the minister say what was the reason for the sharply diminished merchandise trade balance with other countries, down to $101 million from $700 million in 1964?

Mr. Speaker: Order. I suggest the hon. member is inviting a debate now, and that is a question which cannot be considered.

[*Later:*]

Mr. Robert Muir (Cape Breton North and Victoria): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Finance. A few moments ago, in reply to a question, he referred to the great prosperity in this country. May I ask him whether he has read the recent report on poverty in Canada in general, and in particular with reference to—

Mr. Speaker: Order. This is a question for the order paper.

BREAD

GOVERNMENT ACTION FOLLOWING PRICE INCREASE

On the orders of the day:

Right Hon. J. G. Diefenbaker (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, on February 14 I directed the following question to the Prime Minister:

> In view of the very steep increases in the price of bread, what does the government intend to do in that connection? Has there been any investigation made by the appropriate department as to whether the concerted increases are justified, and does the government consider that the explanation given in today's press, to the effect that the pension plan and minimum wage plan are costing money and that the result of those increases in taxation is an exaction, together with the increases in the costs of fats and powdered milk, justifies this very heavy, further imposition on the people?

The Prime Minister replied as follows:

> Without accepting the reasons given for the increase, I shall be glad to make inquiries and make a statement in due course.

The events of the last few days again emphasize the need for a statement. I wonder if, after more than a month, the Prime

Minister is in a position to say what the government is doing in this regard.

Right Hon. L. B. Pearson (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, I am sorry to have been so long in dealing with this question. I ask my right hon. friend if he will give me a few more hours. I may be able to make a statement about it tomorrow. It was my impression that I had said something about this since that time, but I should like to look into it.

TRANSPORT

MOVEMENT OF GRAIN AND COAL TO WEST COAST

On the orders of the day:

Mr. Eldon M. Woolliams (Bow River): I should like to direct a question to the Minister of Transport which relates to Canada's reputation as a reliable grain exporter. I believe the minister said they had set up a Pacific grain transportation committee to investigate why grain was not moving off the prairies to Vancouver. I wonder if he can now give us the report on what that committee ascertained.

Hon. J. W. Pickersgill (Minister of Transport): This committee was not conducting an inquest into what had or had not happened, but was to expedite the movement of grain through Vancouver. The figures for the last two months show they have been extraordinarily successful in doing that. I have a report on my desk upstairs, and I will be glad to give more details to the hon. member.

Mr. Woolliams: May I ask a supplementary question. In view of the minister's statement would he now have the committee look into the question of the export of coal? Are we losing our coal markets as we lost our grain markets?

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

Mr. Woolliams: May I put this supplementary question. Will this committee look into the question of the transportation and export of coal from Alberta?

Mr. Pickersgill: No, Mr. Speaker, but the minister will.

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE

LEGISLATION ON ORDER PAPER BEFORE EASTER

On the orders of the day:

Mr. Stanley Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Mr. Speaker, may I direct a question to the Prime Minister. Will any legislation which the government proposes to place before parliament regarding pensions, the Canada Assistance Plan and medicare be on the order paper before Easter?

Right Hon. L. B. Pearson (Prime Minister): I cannot answer that question specifically at the moment, Mr. Speaker. I would hope that would be the case, but I cannot give any more specific answer than that.

Mr. Knowles: A supplementary question. Will the Prime Minister try to give an answer within the next few days?

Mr. Pearson: I will do my very best.

[*Translation*]

PUBLIC SERVICE

REQUEST FOR POLICY ANNOUNCEMENT ON BILINGUALISM

On the orders of the day:

Mr. Maurice Allard (Sherbrooke): Mr. Speaker, I should like to direct a question to the Prime Minister.

Further to his meeting with representatives of federal civil servants yesterday with respect to a bonus for bilingualism, is the Prime Minister in a position to make a statement this afternoon?

[*English*]

Right Hon. L. B. Pearson (Prime Minister): No, Mr. Speaker, I think the hon. gentleman's description of the meeting was somewhat inaccurate. It was a meeting with the representatives of the civil service organizations to discuss with them the question of bilingualism in the civil service. All I can say in regard to that meeting is that we had a most useful, and I thought constructive, exchange of views which will help the government in the policies which it will be putting forward to the house shortly in regard to this matter.

Mr. Allard: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Does the Prime Minister consider that there will also be an opportunity to offer the bonus to leaders of political parties, to members of this house and of the other place—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

HOUSING

LOANS TO TECHNICAL INSTITUTIONS FOR RESIDENCE CONSTRUCTION

On the orders of the day:

Hon. Michael Starr (Ontario): Mr. Speaker, I wish to address a question to the Minister

of Labour. In view of the pressing need is he preparing legislation which will be placed on the order paper prior to Easter to amend the National Housing Act in order to allow technical institutions to borrow money under that act for residence buildings in the same way as universities, which already have that privilege?

Hon. J. R. Nicholson (Minister of Labour): The short answer is no, Mr. Speaker. I might say, however, that a number of proposed amendments to the National Housing Act are under consideration by the government. We have had preliminary discussions with some of the provincial governments which are also interested in the problems, but it is not likely that there will be any such legislation on the parliamentary timetable before Easter.

Mr. Reid Scott (Danforth): A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Can the minister say whether during this session of parliament we can expect legislation to carry out the election promise of the Liberal party that N.H.A. lending would be extended to older homes?

Mr. Speaker: Order.

[*Translation*]

WINTER WORKS

REQUEST FOR EXTENSION OF PERIOD

On the orders of the day:

Hon. Martial Asselin (Charlevoix): Mr. Speaker, I wish to put a question to the hon. Minister of Citizenship and Immigration.

As the unemployment rate is still very high in the so-called designated areas, is the minister considering the extension of the winter works program beyond the deadline in order to help our unemployed?

Hon. Jean Marchand (Minister of Citizenship and Immigration): Mr. Speaker, the winter works program is constantly being studied and revised but, unfortunately, I am not in a position to say whether the present deadline will be changed.

Mr. Asselin (Charlevoix): Mr. Speaker, I wish to put a supplementary question to the hon. minister.

Would he at least agree to study the matter and give us an answer later?

Mr. Marchand: Mr. Speaker, I agree to study the whole winter works program, and if the hon. member wants to ask other questions about it, I shall be pleased to answer them in due course.

[Mr. Starr.]

Mr. Gilles Grégoire (Lapointe): Mr. Speaker, I should like to put a supplementary question.

Have representations been made to the minister by certain municipalities requesting an extension of the period of time allowed, in view of the fact that they would be unable to complete their winter works due to a severe winter?

Mr. Marchand: Mr. Speaker, I remember that some municipalities have asked for an extension of the winter works program, but I do not recall whether it was for the reasons mentioned by the hon. member for Lapointe. However, I shall check and advise him.

[*English*]

WATER RESOURCES

GREAT LAKES—INQUIRY AS TO ANTI-POLLUTION MEASURES

On the orders of the day:

Hon. E. D. Fulton (Kamloops): Mr. Speaker, I should like to ask the Minister of Mines and Technical Surveys whether he has completed the second round of discussions with representatives of the government of Ontario on the problem of pollution of the waters of the great lakes, and if so whether he would be in a position to make a brief statement to the house reporting on this conference, perhaps tomorrow.

Hon. Jean-Luc Pepin (Minister of Mines and Technical Surveys): Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the hon. member for his constant interest in my activities. We had a meeting on Monday last with officials of the government of Ontario on this subject. They presented us with a report of their activities in this field of pollution, particularly in the great lakes, which was most impressive. We agreed that a statement on this subject should be made jointly by the government of Canada and the government of Ontario, and this is presently in preparation.

Mr. H. W. Herridge (Kootenay West): Mr. Speaker, if I might say a word or two here, might I ask the minister as a supplementary question whether he has received any request from the government of British Columbia for discussion of the increasing pollution of the Columbia and Kootenay rivers.

Mr. Pepin: Not as of now, Mr. Speaker.

Hon. Michael Starr (Ontario): Mr. Speaker, as a supplementary question I should like to ask the minister whether any thought is

being given to extending to the International Joint Commission a mandatory power so that sewage disposal plants could be built under this mandate of the commission—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. I do not think this is the type of question which can be asked. This is of a very general nature, not seeking information, which can be sought at this time.

HEALTH AND WELFARE

CONTROL OF IMPORTATION OF MISLABELLED FOREIGN DRUGS

On the orders of the day:

Mr. P. B. Rynard (Simcoe East): Mr. Speaker, I should like to direct a question to the Minister of National Health and Welfare of which I have given him notice. I want to congratulate him on the efficiency of his food and drug directorate in picking up 1,000 capsules of a dangerously mislabelled antibiotic in a Vancouver pharmacy. I refer to capsules of chlarmaphericol imported from Hong Kong and incorrectly labelled and coloured to represent the antibiotic tetrecylin.

My question is this. Is the minister satisfied that adequate steps are taken by customs authorities to stop the importation of dangerously mislabelled foreign drugs? Also, is it a fact that the importer of those drugs has been approved by the government as a supplier to Canada's armed forces?

Hon. A. J. MacEachen (Minister of National Health and Welfare): Mr. Speaker, officials of the food and drug directorate have taken every possible step to take into possession any known quantities of the particular drug referred to by my hon. friend. As I understand it, the difficulty arose in the importing factory in Canada. It was only because of careful inspection by officials of the food and drug directorate that it was possible to detect the mislabelling at an early date.

With respect to the second part of the question, it is very likely that this particular importer is so listed. We are checking further into this, and if any steps are necessary to bring about a delisting, they will be taken.

REPORTED INCREASE IN INCIDENCE OF TUBERCULOSIS

On the orders of the day:

Mr. Howard Johnston (Okanagan-Revelstoke): Mr. Speaker, I wish to direct a question to the Minister of National Health and Welfare. Considering the increased incidence of tuberculosis over the last two years, as announced a few days ago by Dr. Gregoire when speaking to the College of General Practitioners, has his department any plans for re-establishing effective control over this disease?

Mr. Speaker: Order. This question should be placed on the order paper.

SHIPPING

REQUEST FOR REGULATIONS RESPECTING MANNING REQUIREMENTS

On the orders of the day:

Mr. Frank Howard (Skeena): Mr. Speaker, I should like to direct a question to the responsible member of the administration and ask him whether in view of the judgment in the formal investigation into a collision between two ships in British Columbia, one owned by Shell Oil and the other by Island Tug and Barge, which found that the collision resulted from the undermanning of the ships, this will provoke the government into early action in developing regulations with respect to ship manning requirements in Canada.

Hon. J. W. Pickersgill (Minister of Transport): Mr. Speaker, due and full note will be taken of the report.

Mr. Howard: I have a supplementary question to ask of the Minister of Transport, Mr. Speaker. Is the minister aware that this report was made last October?

Mr. Pickersgill: Yes, sir.

AIR TRANSPORT

REPORTED REDUCTION IN INTERCITY SERVICE IN WEST

On the orders of the day:

Right Hon. J. G. Diefenbaker (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, a few days ago the hon. member for Moose Jaw-Lake Centre, the hon. member for Regina and I brought to the attention of the Minister of Transport the threatened termination of air services in various parts of Saskatchewan, including Moose Jaw, Regina, Saskatoon, Prince Albert, and so on. At that time the minister said the matter was under consideration, as to keeping up these services or providing alternative service. I would ask him now whether he is in a position to say what is the present position of this question, as it is of great importance to those several places I have mentioned in addition to others unmentioned.

Inquiries of the Ministry

Hon. J. W. Pickersgill (Minister of Transport): Mr. Speaker, I welcome this question. There does seem to be some misunderstanding about the situation.

TransAir have asked to be allowed to discontinue certain services in the prairie provinces. In the case of one service, from Yorkton to Saskatoon, that appeared to the Air Transport Board to be so clear cut that they permitted the service to be discontinued. I think perhaps it has already been discontinued, although I have not checked.

With respect to the rest, the board has prescribed that there shall be public hearings and that all the other services must continue until these public hearings have been held and the board has given a decision on the application. Therefore, in so far as any of the services of TransAir now being performed are concerned, they will go on indefinitely until the public hearings have been held and the board has made a decision. Of course what that decision will be it would be wrong for me to attempt at this stage to forecast.

Mr. Diefenbaker: Thank you. I should like to ask a supplementary question. Has the minister knowledge as to when these sittings will begin? Is there any definiteness at this time, so that the people in those places, particularly the chambers of commerce and the interested travel community may have some information about this?

Mr. Pickersgill: I am speaking from recollection but I think my recollection is right, and I understand that the board has invited any persons who wish to appear at the hearing to inform the Board before April 1. The hearings are scheduled, I think, for April 16 or thereabouts. I presume they will take some days.

It may be that this information is not too widely known. I imagine that the board would feel, if there were a number of people who would want to make representations but who would not have had time to do so by April 1, it would be open to people in such a position to ask the board for a small extension of time.

Mr. K. H. More (Regina City): A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. May I ask the Minister of Transport if hearings will be held in Regina?

Mr. Pickersgill: I am not absolutely sure whether the hearings are to be in Regina or Winnipeg, though I think they are to be in Regina. I could find out definitely.

[Mr. Diefenbaker.]

[*Translation*]

MINES AND TECHNICAL SURVEYS

NORTHWESTERN QUEBEC—ASSISTANCE TO GOLD MINES

On the orders of the day:

Mr. Réal Caouette (Villeneuve): Mr. Speaker, I wish to direct a question to the Minister of Mines and Technical Surveys.

To follow up a request I made in the house the other day, has the minister talked with officials of the Quebec Department of Mines about subsidies granted to gold mines in northwestern Quebec?

Hon. Jean-Luc Pepin (Minister of Mines and Technical Surveys): I was asked the other day to call an important official in Quebec city. I did, but unfortunately the man I was calling was out. He is supposed to call me back any time now.

[*English*]

INDIAN AFFAIRS

GRANT TO AID CANNERY ON QUEEN CHARLOTTE ISLANDS

On the orders of the day:

Mr. G. L. Chatterton (Esquimalt-Saanich): Mr. Speaker, in the absence of the Minister of Northern Affairs and National Resources may I ask the right hon. Prime Minister whether he can now advise what his government proposes to do to assist some 1,400 people, mostly natives, who are severely affected by the closing of the Masset cannery on the Queen Charlotte islands in British Columbia?

Right Hon. L. B. Pearson (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, I shall be glad to take notice of that question. I believe it has been brought up in the house already this week, but I shall look into it.

Mr. Chatterton: As a supplementary question, when the matter is being looked into would the government consider using some part of the $112 million program announced by the minister last Thursday to assist the Haida Indians on those islands?

Mr. Pearson: I shall discuss that matter with the minister although I do believe the program referred to by the hon. member is for another purpose.

[*Translation*]

CAPITAL PUNISHMENT

PROCEDURE IN CONSIDERING RESOLUTION ON ORDER PAPER

On the orders of the day:

Mr. Auguste Choquette (Lotbinière): Mr. Speaker, I wish to direct a question to the Minister of Public Works in his capacity as house leader and take this opportunity to state a grievance.

In view of the fact that yesterday in the debate on capital punishment we heard abolitionists, would it not be possible to come to an agreement so that the order of speakers will take into account the distribution of those in favour and those against, rather than the parties in the house?

[*English*]

Hon. G. J. McIlraith (Minister of Public Works): Mr. Speaker, the recognition of hon. members who wish to speak is a matter for the Chair, and I do not believe it would be proper for the house leader to interfere in that matter. I would feel very reluctant to do so.

COAL

ATTENDANCE OF MINISTERS AT HALIFAX CONFERENCE

On the orders of the day:

Mr. Donald MacInnis (Cape Breton South): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of National Health and Welfare. I want to ask him if at the coming coal conference in Halifax, which is also going to cover the subject of steel, it is his intention to invite both the coal union, the steel union, and management.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. It is difficult for the Chair to judge about this question, but I am wondering whether it is asked of the minister in his capacity as Minister of National Health and Welfare.

Mr. MacInnis (Cape Breton South): Well, Mr. Speaker, with all due respect maybe I can assist. These questions have been ruled out of order before, but I wish to quote the Minister of National Health and Welfare, if need be on a question of privilege, as recorded at page 2146 of *Hansard* for March 3:

> It has been an accepted tradition in the past that the Nova Scotian minister involves himself very deeply in coal policy. That, of course, was characteristic of my immediate predecessors, the late Hon. George Nowlan and Hon. R. H. Winters.

That is a practice that has been going on here for the last decade, but we are being denied the right to ask these questions.

Mr. Speaker: Order. If the hon. member cares to read the rules and precedents he will see it has not been recognized practice to ask questions of ministers other than in their capacities as ministers of the crown.

Mr. MacInnis (Cape Breton South): Mr. Speaker, I would call attention to the fact—

Mr. Speaker: Order.

Mr. MacInnis (Cape Breton South): —that when this statement was made the minister wasn't called out of order.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. The hon. member will please resume his seat.

[*Later:*]

Mr. H. Russell MacEwan (Pictou): Mr. Speaker, I wish to ask the Minister of National Health and Welfare whether he intends to attend the coal conference in Nova Scotia next week, along with the Minister of Mines and Technical Surveys?

Hon. A. J. MacEachen (Minister of National Health and Welfare): Mr. Speaker, I wanted to rise earlier on a question of privilege in connection with the question raised by the hon. member for Cape Breton South.

In so far as I am personally concerned I have no objection whatsoever to reporting to the house on any meetings or conferences that I may attend with respect to public matters in the province of Nova Scotia, but at the same time there has been a ruling by the Chair that it is improper for a minister to answer in the house for matters outside his immediate administrative responsibilities as a minister.

I simply wish to declare that I intend to abide by the ruling of the Chair, but I refuse to be placed in the false position in which I have been placed in recent days by questions that have been asked with the suggestion that there has been a fear or a refusal to answer. The reason for my not answering is that I wish to abide by the ruling made by the Chair, and so long as that ruling is maintained I do not intend to go beyond my responsibilities.

Mr. MacEwan: Mr. Speaker, I think this is a reasonable question. I wish to ask the minister whether he intends to attend this conference in Nova Scotia next week along with the Minister of Mines and Technical Surveys.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. This question transgresses the ruling.

Hon. Marcel Lambert (Edmonton West): On the point of privilege—

Mr. Speaker: I would like to refer hon. members to May's seventeenth edition, page 350:

> Questions addressed to ministers should relate to the public affairs with which they are officially connected—

This, of course, is only one of many citations, and I suggest to the hon. member that the question he is asking at this time is out of order.

Mr. Lambert: On the point of privilege, Mr. Speaker—

Mr. MacEwan: Then on a supplementary question may I ask the Minister of Mines and Technical Surveys if the Minister of National Health and Welfare will accompany him to the conference next week.

Hon. Jean-Luc Pepin (Minister of Mines and Technical Surveys): Mr. Speaker, I will have this tremendous honour.

Mr. Lambert: On the point of privilege that was raised, Mr. Speaker, it may be observed as well that if ministers are not to acknowledge responsibility for matters outside their ministries, then they should not make announcements with regard to their provinces.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Lambert: And may I also say, Mr. Speaker, that so far as I can remember under my predecessor, and during my own tenure of the honourable office you hold—

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh.

Mr. Lambert: A lot of the juniors may not remember.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh.

Mr. Lambert: —it was a recognized principle that ministers could make announcements with regard to their particular regions, and they were questioned in this regard. The late hon. member for Digby-Annapolis-Kings was regularly questioned in this manner by hon. members of the present ministry who were then in opposition, and this was quite readily accepted.

Right Hon. J. G. Diefenbaker (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, if I may speak to this point, in view of the ruling you have made I would point out this fact; that an announcement having to do only with the Department of Transport was put out in a press release under the title of the Department of Transport, and it stated that the Minister of National Health and Welfare and the Minister of Transport made the announcement. Certainly, sir, although the rule ordinarily applies, if ministers are going to play that game then they have to answer in the house.

Mr. Herridge: Mr. Speaker—

Mr. MacInnis (Cape Breton South): Mr. Speaker, on a question of privilege—

Mr. Speaker: Order. I understand the hon. member for Kootenay West is addressing the Chair on the same question of privilege.

Mr. H. W. Herridge (Kootenay West): Yes, Your Honour. On a point of order, as a member who has been in the house for a considerable number of years I want to support, somewhat reluctantly, the Leader of the Opposition. In British Columbia ministers holding certain portfolios have made announcements on questions that related to other ministers' responsiblities. This has been a practice throughout the years here, and I do think the hon. member was quite correct in asking this question of the Minister of National Health and Welfare.

Mr. MacEachen: Mr. Speaker, may I just make a point on the—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. The hon. member for Cape Breton South on the same point of order.

Mr. MacInnis (Cape Breton South): Further on the question of privilege, I have referred to precedents here, and I will once again quote the minister's own words when he referred to the fact that this was a practice followed by the late Hon. George Nowlan, and by the present Minister of Trade and Commerce.

He himself referred to this as a practice. He himself was not called out of order at the time, and the Leader of the Opposition has already referred to the fact that the Minister of National Health and Welfare, in the Cape Breton and Nova Scotia area, has been putting out press releases concerning departments other than his own.

I would call again on a precedent established here when the Minister of Mines and Technical Surveys was absent from the house

through an arrangement with the house leader, and the house leader can substantiate this statement. He came behind the curtains to inform me that he had arranged to have the Minister of National Health and Welfare answer questions on the estimates of the Department of Mines and Technical Surveys or else they would not go through.

Despite the fact that the Minister of National Health and Welfare is going to recognize the ruling of the Chair, he completely ignored it on that occasion when we forced him to do so through the arrangement with the house leader.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. The Chair has heard—

Mr. MacEachen: Mr. Speaker, I think this is a very important point. The arrangement made in a previous sitting of the committee of the house was that in the absence of the Minister of Mines and Technical Surveys, who was absent from Canada in Washington, I agreed to deal with matters affecting the coal industry of Nova Scotia. That was an arrangement made informally and it has nothing to do with rulings in the house.

What we are talking about here is a ruling made by the Chair with regard to the entitlement of ministers to answer questions, but Your Honour has ruled that a minister is not entitled to answer beyond his own administrative responsibilities. Had the Chair ruled otherwise, I would have welcomed an opportunity to answer these questions. There would be a great publicity advantage in Nova Scotia.

However, while I accept the rulings of the Chair in these matters I do not intend to have the rulings of the Chair interpreted by the Leader of the Opposition to include what proper public relations the minister ought to follow outside the house. That is a ridiculous proposition.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

Mr. Pickersgill: Mr. Speaker, since my name was brought in, I wonder whether I might assist Your Honour by a couple of references—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. I should like to be given an opportunity to once again state the position taken by the Chair which is based on long precedent, in spite of what may have been said in the course of this short debate. I quoted a moment ago from May's seventeenth edition. I should like now to quote from the *Journals* of the House of Commons, volume, 105, 1959, page 336

In citation 178 in his fourth edition, Beauchesne comments on this rule as follows: "Questions addressed to ministers should relate to the public affairs with which they are officially connected, to proceedings pending in parliament, or to any matter of administration for which the minister is responsible."

In other words, there is no doubt whatever in my mind that questions can be asked of ministers only in their official capacity. I appreciate that it may cause difficulty if ministers take the liberty of issuing press statements in a capacity other than their official capacity, but that does not change the rule.

I must bring to the attention of hon. members that the question period has now expired.

CRIMINAL CODE

PROPOSED AMENDMENT REGARDING CAPITAL PUNISHMENT

The house resumed, from Wednesday, March 23, consideration of the motion of Messrs. Byrne, Nugent, Scott (Danforth) and Stanbury:

Resolved, that it is expedient to introduce a measure to amend the Criminal Code for the purpose of

(a) abolishing the death penalty in respect of all offences under that act;

(b) substituting a mandatory sentence of life imprisonment in those cases where the death penalty is now mandatory; and

(c) providing that no person upon whom a mandatory sentence of life imprisonment is imposed shall be released from imprisonment without the prior approval of the governor in council.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Auguste Choquette (Lotbinière): Mr. Speaker, on a question of privilege.

Following the answer I was given by the government house leader, I would like to submit to you a grievance which constitutes at the same time a question of privilege.

Up to now, only the abolitionists seem to have had the opportunity to express their views. However, I wonder if it could not be arranged by you—

Mr. Speaker: Order. I would suggest to the hon. member to listen first to the hon. member for Swift Current-Maple Creek (Mr. McIntosh). If he still thinks that he has a question of privilege afterwards, he can raise it.

Mr. Choquette: That does not answer my question of privilege.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member has no question of privilege.

[*English*]

Mr. Jack McIntosh (Swift Current-Maple Creek): Mr. Speaker, as this debate is to be conducted on a non-partisan basis I trust the house will not accuse me of putting in a plug for the Young Progressive Conservative organization of Canada when I say that I agree wholeheartedly with the resolution they passed at their recent meeting in Ottawa. The resolution reads:

Be it resolved that capital punishment be retained for the following crimes:
(i) Treason.
(ii) The murder of law enforcement officer(s).
(iii) Premeditated murder.
(iv) Murder committed by a person already convicted of murder.

Because I support that resolution, Mr. Speaker, I cannot support the resolution before us today. Although I should like to comment on some of the parts of the resolution I am prohibited from doing so because of paragraph (a) which reads:

(a) abolishing the death penalty is respect of all offences under that Act;

Before I go into my reasons for supporting the Young Progressive Conservatives' resolution I want to say that I was very impressed yesterday by the remarks made by my colleague, the hon. member for Edmonton-Strathcona (Mr. Nugent). As I say, I was very impressed, but I was not convinced by his remarks. I should like to refer to a few of his remarks and say to him that I do not believe he is an abolitionist at all but a qualified retentionist because he said, as found on page 3096 of *Hansard*:

I, as a citizen for this country, feel that the only excuse society has for taking the life of any person is if it is proven necessary to do so for the protection of our society and our way of life.

I hope we can prove that it is so. I will go further and quote a few more of his remarks. The reason I am taking the retentionists' side is that I do not believe the premise he laid down. He said:

I cannot follow the logic of reasoning that if it is wrong for one person to take a life then it is right for a group of us to take a life.

I would say that our responsibility—and I include all members of the house—is on a little different basis from that of the individual in Canada. I say that because we are part of the parliament of Canada, part of the government of Canada. I will have more to say on this point in a few moments.

[Mr. Choquette.]

While I am dealing with this subject I should like to refer to another remark he made, and I should like to emphasize this. He said:

I do not think any of us who ask for the abolition of capital punishment deny it is a deterrent.

He also said near the end of his speech:

...I do not see how hanging a man is going to bring someone back to life.

I would say in respect of that last remark that it will prevent the criminal from repeating the offence he has committed. I should like to refer also to a press article which appeared in today's *Globe and Mail*. It refers to the remarks of the hon. member for Edmonton-Strathcona and goes on to say:

• (3:30 p.m.)

Capital punishment can be justified only if it can be shown to be the only effective deterrent to the crime of murder, and thus necessary for the protection of society, Mr. Nugent declared.

I hope that we are able to show that it is justified. However, the hon. member contradicted himself when he stated, later, as reported in the same article:

—It is perfectly true that capital punishment is a deterrent—

That statement was made by my colleague, the hon. member for Edmonton-Strathcona.

The article refers to the hon. member as having made reference to the history of capital punishment in Great Britain and reports him as having said:

The fears have proven groundless every single time, he said, "Not in one case has there been an increase in the numbers of those offences so direly predicted."

Mr. Nugent: Would the hon. member permit a question?

Mr. McIntosh: Yes.

Mr. Nugent: I noticed that the hon. member began by quoting words from *Hansard* and then switched to a newspaper article to find an apparent contradiction. I certainly cannot remember saying what has been attributed to me according to the hon. member. Perhaps the hon. member will refer to *Hansard* to straighten out what is said in the newspaper article.

Mr. McIntosh: Mr. Speaker, I am sure the words I referred to are contained in *Hansard*. I read the words I had marked in the newspaper article and I head the hon. member's speech in *Hansard* and I have the impression

that the hon. member is correctly reported. In dealing with this matter he referred to the situation in Great Britain.

Not long ago I wrote to the British press and asked them if they had any recent articles on the situation in regard to crime and particularly in regard to murder. I received a reply from the *Daily Express* of London. They sent me a copy of an article that appeared in their December 30, 1965 edition. I do not intend to read it all but I should like to say that this article indicates that the hon. member is not correct. In part the article reads as follows:

> Crime figures for 1965 will shock those who supported the abolition of capital punishment in Britain. Murders have soared over the 200 mark, according to Home Office returns now nearing completion. A *Daily Express* count puts the figure as high as 235—53 more than last year.
>
> That is the highest total ever recorded in Britain. Last year there were 182 murders; in 1963 there were 159.

Later the article states:

> More and more M.P.'s are becoming convinced that the removal of the fear of hanging has led to a free and easy attitude toward killing among the professional criminal classes.

It is my understanding that hon. members will make some reference to the House of Lords during this debate.

Mr. Lewis: May I ask the hon. member a question?

Mr. McIntosh: I should like to put this quotation on the record. My time is limited and I have quite a bit to say on this subject so I will ask the hon. member to defer his questions until I have finished, at which time I will be glad to answer them. I wish to say something on another subject about which I am sure you will have some questions.

Lord Dilhorne had this to say, and I will only read a portion of it:

> You cannot abolish the death sentence without running serious risks and innocent lives being lost. I have always been in favour of abolishing hanging if it could be done without risking lives. These figures confirm that this is not possible.

Lord Kilmuir the former Lord Chancellor and Home Secretary, is reported as having said:

> I have always believed that fear of a death sentence is a deterrent. I think we took an enormous risk by abolishing hanging.

I said that the hon. member for Edmonton-Strathcona was a qualified retentionist. I make the same statement about the hon. member for Kootenay East (Mr. Byrne), particularly if the quotation of his remarks appearing in the newspaper is correct. He is reported in the *Globe and Mail of* March 24 as follows:

> The Liberal M.P. declared himself unalterably opposed to the taking of life of any living creature unless done in self-defence or because of need.

That qualification means that he is a qualified retentionist.

The hon. member is reported as having made another statement with which I agree. He is reported in the same article as follows:

> The Liberal abolitionist said that execution of murderers by the state only indicates the failure of society to determine the causes of murder.

I think we must admit that, and until we can determine the cause or the reason for the compulsion, if you wish to call it that, to murder we must retain capital punishment. I think that is the issue in this debate. If we could determine the cause or what lies behind the compulsion of certain people to commit murder, then perhaps we would not have to discuss this matter at all.

I have been very impressed by the number of letters I have received about this subject from individuals and church groups. I have been impressed with them all except one which I received this morning in the form of a brief from the Communist party of Canada. I shall not read from it but I want to say that the Communist party is opposed to capital punishment. That party is opposed also to our way of life and to the divine law. I have a good idea of what would happen to a person committing the crime of treason in any country with a Communist government. I am certain they would not be sentenced to life imprisonment.

The first decision I had to make on this issue was whether capital punishment was contrary to the divine law because, as I say, I have received a great many letters and briefs from church groups. I have been concerned mainly with the opinions expressed by young people belonging to these church groups. They have been told by their pastors, ministers and priests that capital punishment is contrary to the teachings of either the divine law, Jesus Christ or God. I had to decide whether that was a false premise and I feel that such a decision on my part is necessary in view of the many letters and briefs I have received.

The conclusion I have reached is that the divine authority has laid down two sets of laws, one for the individual and one for the state. That is why I said earlier that I

cannot agree with the hon. member for Edmonton-Strathcona. We have one duty as individuals and, because we are members of parliament, we have another duty so far as the state and its laws are concerned for we are members of that state. If such an interpretation is not correct, then in my view there is no Christian justification for pride in being a member of the armed services and no Christian justification for asking anyone to join the armed services. As an individual you cannot kill, but if you are a member of the armed forces of the government you must repel an aggressor.

If my premise is not correct, then I cannot find any Christian justification for the words many of us heard during 1939 to 1945 from the padres of our services before we went into action. Many of us have heard the words of padres of all denominations, Catholic, Jewish and Protestant, who told us that what we were doing we were doing on behalf of our government and not as individuals. If we do not believe in the two bases I have suggested there can be no Christian justification for supporting any of the defence expenditures of the government. We must believe as I do in this case and we must as members of this house consider this issue in the light of what is government responsibility rather than what is the responsibility of the individual.

• (3:40 p.m.)

The whole function of government is to protect and advance the common good, in other words, the welfare of the community. The government has a right and a duty to define the law and defend the civil community from aggression in time of war. Likewise the government has a right and duty to define the law and defend the civil community from treason and murder within our land. In my view a murder is an unjust aggression against the community because a murderer in taking into his own hands the unlawful execution or murder of another human being and is thereby attacking the life of the community itself. Our responsibility as members of this house in such circumstances is to protect the community to the greatest possible degree against the crime of murder.

I agree with the writer who stated that in his opinion the case for or against capital punishment stands or falls on its being or not being an adequate deterrent against the crime of murder. We in this parliament must decide whether we are more concerned with the welfare of the country as a whole than the possible reformation of a person who may have been found guilty of murder. I would suggest that we must be strong defensively as a country to deter those who commit aggressions against us. Our laws must be strong to prevent a murderer taking the life of any one of our citizens.

I do not believe it is of much value to appeal to statistics to try to show the effectiveness or ineffectiveness of the death penalty. There are too many variables involved. A great deal has been said by both the abolitionists and by those who favour capital punishment about the death sentence as a deterrent to murder. In arguments or debates on any situation there is one factor that has often been cited in regard to statistics. Depending upon where you start and how you use statistics you can make them favour almost any position you want to hold. On this subject authorities have produced statistics to prove that capital punishment is not a deterrent to crime. Other people take exactly the same statistics and set them up in such a way that they prove conclusively that capital punishment is a strong deterrent to crime.

The increase or decrease in the murder rate is influenced by a great many factors entirely apart from the existence or nonexistence of capital punishment. For example, it is affected by the period of history that is under observation. It is also affected by economic conditions which have a great deal to do with the murder rate. Depression or prosperity will change the rate. The effectiveness of the police force will change the rate. The ultimate proof that capital punishment is a deterrent to crime is one that it would be impossible to bring forth unless you could induce those who had been deterred from crime by the thought of death to come forward and so testify.

I suggest to hon. members that we should consider this point in the light of something that we understand. If we have a fear of the law it is understood that we will be afraid to commit a crime. I would give hon. members an example in this connection. If you drive down the highway and a police car passes you, your eyes automatically look at your speedometer to see whether you are exceeding the speed limit, or if you see a police car coming and you are exceeding the speed limit, you automatically drop down to the speed limit. I suggest that if we consider this question in that light we will have a better appreciation of it.

Life is the sweetest thing we have and it is the hardest thing to lose. If we are to consider the death sentence as a deterrent at all, we must look at this question as individuals. If we can prove that taking one convicted murderer's life has prevented one innocent person from being murdered, then of course capital punishment is a sufficient deterrent to murder to warrant sustaining it in any country. If it saves one innocent girl, if it saves one guard or policeman, the maintenance of capital punishment is warranted.

Murder by the state is one charge that is brought forth by those who oppose capital punishment. Far from being murder, I contend that the exaction of the death penalty is simply the legitimate exercise of civil authority by the government in the interests of the defence of the community. Arguments are put forward about the miscarriage of justice because the accused cannot afford the services of a highly qualified and experienced lawyer. This terrific moral burden affects other professions as well, as we all know. There are still those who die because they cannot afford the best medical specialist, nor can they afford transportation to the hospital with the best equipment in case of surgery.

I suggest that such people are more worthy of consideration by this house because they have not committed a crime against society. I suggest that we should be more concerned about a person who is losing his life because of illness than a murderer who is losing his life because he has committed a crime.

Some contend that murder is a social disease, that it is a result of maladjustment because of circumstances for which our society is responsible. If the view were accepted that a murderer is automatically ill, the medical profession would so diagnose and the person could then be treated and a cure achieved. However, history reveals that specialists in the medical profession have testified on many occasions, as we all know, that the murderer was not ill as they interpret the term "illness". I admit that some people who are mentally ill commit serious crimes, even murder. Such people are not criminals in my interpretation of the meaning of "criminal". But those who are not mentally deficient and knowingly commit murder are criminals according to the laws of our society.

It has been said that whatever treatment or punishment is given to the criminal the ultimate goal should be rehabilitation. I would like it to be that way. However, in my opinion there are insurmountable obstacles in the case of convicted murderers. I ask: Who is qualified to state at what time a convicted murderer is ready to go back into society again? Second, I ask: Who has the knowledge to say that a person who has murdered will never kill again? Third: Who could give the assurance to society that the convicted murderer would not repeat his crime, regardless of how remote the area to which the authorities agreed to banish him? Even if the area was not densely populated the people in the area would run the risk of being murdered. No one could give such an assurance. If at this time our society cannot successfully integrate men—

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order. The time allotted for the speech of the hon. member has expired.

Some hon. Members: Carry on.

Mr. McIntosh: I shall be only a few more minutes, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Does the house give unanimous consent to the hon. member continuing?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Mr. McIntosh: If at this time our society cannot successfully integrate men of different races, what hope is there at present for integrating a man who has proved to society that he cannot and will not subscribe to the laws of society? In addition to the assumption that crime is a disease that can be treated and cured, the abolitionists usually argue that crime is a disease which is a result of poor environment. In other words, they say that when a person murders someone else it is not the one who has taken the live who is at fault but society is the criminal.

In defence of the murderer the abolitionist states that such a man has lived in the slums or is now living in the slums, that he is suffering from a broken home, poverty, divorce, lack of opportunity and lack of education. They say he is not really responsible for his actions because these things have been foisted upon him, and because of this the end result can be nothing but the creation of a murderer.

They state that because our society permits these slum conditions we are responsible for the murder. I cannot accept this argument because facts reveal that a very small percentage of murderers come from slum areas or have ever lived in slum areas. Another fact is that an overwhelming percentage of

people who have lived in slums have become useful citizens and professional people. They have become leaders in the social field, they have even become leaders in politics, they have become leaders in commerce.

In my opinion environment is not the basic cause or the answer but rather there is something in the heart or mind of man that influences his actions and makes the basic difference in a person choosing the right or wrong way of life. Heredity is the other element that is usually linked with bad environment and blamed for criminal activity. It has been suggested that some murderers coming from a slum environment also come from an undesirable family. It is said they have criminal blood in their veins and this combination of environment and heredity produces the criminal.

If we accept this premise, Mr. Speaker, have we not also the right to ask why it is that on a number of occasions two brothers from exactly the same home, raised under the same conditions, go in two absolutely different directions. Two brothers can have the same blood flowing through their veins, the same mother and father, can have lived in the same home, eaten the same meals, lived in the same atmosphere, associated with the same people, attended the same schools, had the same teachers, and yet go in completely different directions. The solution to our problem could possibly be achieved if we had the answer to what makes two brothers go different ways, one right and the other wrong, in spite of the same environment, the same conditions, the same blood and the same background. I therefore cannot support the claim that it is environment or heredity that produces murderers.

• (3:50 p.m.)

I do not believe that any two people really have the same environment. No two people have exactly the same kind of heredity, nor can it be acquired. Brothers have different faces, different physiques and other important personal characteristics in spite of having many common factors. I do not believe that the two factors of environment and heredity have any part in the compulsion or unknown cause which makes a person commit murder. Until this unknown cause is found and a treatment is devised I feel it is our duty as members of this house to support the retention of capital punishment, at least for a second offender.

[Mr. McIntosh.]

Finally, I wish to say that the execution of a murderer must be a horrible spectacle. However, we must not forget that murder is more horrid. The supreme penalty should be exacted only after guilt is established beyond the shadow of a doubt and only for wanton, wilful, premeditated murder.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Gérard Pelletier (Hochelaga): Mr. Speaker, I think that we are all fully conscious in this house of the exceptional importance and seriousness of the matter under consideration today.

That is why I would like to point out at the outset of my intervention the need to enter the debate in the right frame of mind. By that I mean that it is our duty to consider the question of the death penalty with all the coolness we can; we must avoid using too many emotional arguments; we must give up using alarmist pleas, building on the fear of the citizens to inspire to the latter thoughts of vengeance against murderers; we must also forgo any gruesome retelling of executions meant to exploit the sensibility of people in favour of those sentenced to die and against the death penalty.

What is most important in such a debate, and in the vote which will follow, is that the parliament of this country should prove up to the task, that each one of us should base his choice between abolition and retention, whatever that choice may be, not on prejudice, not on fear, not on hate, not on vengefulness, even less on easy emotionalism or on the taste for novelty, but rather on reason, on the teachings of history and on the data which science places at our disposal in this field.

Another mistake which could be very serious would be to approach that problem in a perspective which is too narrow, to treat it as if it were a simple police matter when it is in fact a problem of civilization.

Finally, just as parliament has understood the need to remove all party considerations from this debate, so each one of us must understand that emotivity cannot be a reliable guide in such a matter and that only the arguments based on reason have their place here if we want to reach a fair decision.

That is why, Mr. Speaker, I deplore the fact that some politicians outside this house felt it necessary, during the last months, to multiply the public interventions against the very idea of this debate, turning beforehand the citizens against the results of the work we had not yet undertaken. I also deplore the

fact that those men chose to speak so loud and to inform so little. I finally deplore the fact that they worked to raise doubts about the authority of the federal parliament in this regard.

I feel it is important, Mr. Speaker, to stress the fact that, in matters of criminal law, the federal authority is beyond question and that only complete ignorance of the constitution could explain any doubt about that. I find it passing strange, therefore, to see a provincial minister who is jealous, and rightly so, of provincial prerogatives, take it upon himself to question publicly the power held by this house to amend the criminal code.

That power certainly entails one of the most awesome responsibilities we have to bear as members of the House of Commons. In my opinion, that responsibility is the second most important among all those that are handed to us, since I do not believe it is surpassed by any other except the even more awe-inspiring power to declare war and make peace. But it is obvious, even beyond question, that this is our responsibility and I find the time quite ill-chosen to question it just when the house is getting ready to assume all the risks of a difficult choice.

Far be it from me, Mr. Speaker, to question anyone's right to voice his opinion on capital punishment. In passing, I wish to thank all those who took the trouble to inform me of their position during the weeks preceding this debate.

But I consider it improper for a provincial minister to forget the limitations of the duties assigned to him and state publicly his own opinions without making the necessary distinctions. Indeed, in this field as in any other, we are doing a disservice to the citizens of this country each time one of us, whether he be a private member or a minister, at the provincial or at the federal level, goes beyond his jurisdiction to encroach upon that of another authority.

Having said that, Mr. Speaker, I would now like to examine two aspects of the question: first of all, and briefly, I would like to review some of the most widespread opinions on the problem of capital punishment; then, and mainly, I would like to develop what I feel is a fundamental argument in favour of abolition, that is social progress.

I will admit right now, Mr. Speaker, that most of the traditional arguments in favour of capital punishment seem obsolete to me today. The exemplary value of that punishment and its alleged effectiveness as a deterrent for the eventual murderers are reasons—and other speakers will prove this better than I can—which do not bear up under scrutiny. In fact, if statistics prove anything, they prove precisely that maintaining or abolishing the death penalty has very little influence on the number of murders, so little in fact that it cannot be clearly established whether it increases or decreases the frequency of such crimes.

And it will take more than the statistics given by the hon. member for Swift Current-Maple Creek (Mr. McIntosh) to change my mind, because I think that covering such a short period of the world's history, they cannot lead to any valid conclusion.

It is not a matter of believing or disbelieving the effectiveness of the punishment; it is not a matter of faith or impressions. If the deterrent effect existed, it could be measured and proved, which is something no one has succeeded in doing satisfactorily so far. Claiming that one believes in the deterrent effect of the rope does not make sense, unless one can prove with figures what one is saying.

I also find it strange that some are still trying hard today to convince us that the victims' blood is crying for vengeance and that society, by putting the murderer to death, is doing its duty with regard to the survivors of the victim.

We know very well, Mr. Speaker, that such revenge is useless, that the wrong committed by a murderer is irreparable and that the execution of the murderer will never bring the victim back to life. Recently, a Quebec labourer whose young daughter was the victim, several years ago, of the most odious crime we have ever witnessed, said simply in reply to some newspapermen who, after the trial, asked him if he wanted his child's murderer to hang: "That will not bring my little girl back." And this comment, to me, is more eloquent than all the speeches in the world.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, I am amazed that even today the Christian doctrine is called upon in the defence of capital punishment. Yet, it is common knowledge that most religious authorities have expressed views favouring abolition, while the rest were satisfied to say that the matter was a political problem about which Christians remained

free to take the stand they deemed most reasonable.

Furthermore, it is not true that the church, as is so often claimed, has always favoured capital punishment, nor that this punishment was an integral part of the Christian tradition. St. Augustine stated, as early as the 5th century, when addressing the imperial commissary: I appeal to your faith in Jesus Christ; in the name of his divine mercy, we do not want the sufferings of God's servants to be avenged by the *lex talionis*—On the contrary, we want the men, without losing their life, to be brought back to their senses.

Of course, it is not enough to show the weakness of arguments brought forward to favour retention. I favour abolition of the death penalty for positive reasons, of which the most outstanding is related to the notion of social progress.

• (4:00 p.m.)

To my mind, it is beyond dispute, Mr. Speaker—and I see few members in this house prepared to question it—that abolition of the death penalty constitutes in itself social progress. Indeed, the way of civilization has always been marked by a progressive abandonment of killing one's fellow-man.

Most primitive men, living as wandering tribes, killed without any distinction unproductive aged, madmen and violent criminals alike.

There was no alternative as long as the old people were jeopardizing the precarious economy of the tribe by consuming without producing; the mentally ill as well as the criminals were a constant menace to everyone, since the tribes' continuous treks made it impossible to incarcerate them. Of necessity, these people had to be gotten rid of; their elimination was required for the common safety.

But there is no doubt that giving up killing has always been considered a progress by the majority of men, since every society generally developed along these lines as it gradually emerged from its savage state.

Once it settled down on richer land, the tribe stopped killing the aged. Then, as the means became available, what would be called today the required social capital, the society abandoned the killing of the mentally ill, even the most dangerous of them. Originally, they were put away in asylums where they died a slow death; later, much later, they were taken care of and cured.

[Mr. Pelletier.]

As for the death penalty, society gave it up by degree. We all know that barely 150 years ago, hanging was the penalty for shop-lifting, for the slightest burglary, for things we consider today as minor crimes or simple misdemeanours. This, Mr. Speaker, is nothing new. The evolution toward final abolition was initiated centuries ago. We are not being asked, today, to break new ground, but quite the opposite, only to terminate what our fathers, our grandfathers and our great-grandfathers started a long, long time ago.

I submit that we are all ready for this last stage, psychologically as well as from a material viewpoint.

Let us admit first of all that, consciously or not, we are all ashamed of putting such a responsibility into the hands of some of our fellow-countrymen who are thereby compelled to kill their neighbour, this time not in the heat of battle or moved by passion, but deliberately and in cold blood. It is not by accident that we now hide from all eyes this capital punishment that we used to display on the public square. Better still, we hide the name of the executioner. We keep it as an official secret, and no wonder. Indeed, which one of us would like his son to take on that job? Which one of us would even be willing to admit that his father or brother performed that task? Is there but one member in this house who would be proud to have a hangman among his relatives? And when, to justify it, we compare the death penalty to war, we generally forget to note that military feats of valour inspire the greatest of pride, not to mention the most intolerable boasting, whereas the occupation of executioner is as shameful as a vice.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, the point is this: have we reached that degree of civilization which enables a community to protect itself against murderers by other means than the death penalty? Is capital punishment really the one and only possible method of prevention? For it is obvious that the community must defend itself against criminals, just like it must protect itself against mentally ill persons that are dangerous. Nobody is suggesting that either of them should be left free when they threaten people's lives. But once revenge is discarded, once the scant effectiveness of capital punishment as a deterrent to potential murderers is understood, one realizes that capital punishment is no longer an indispensible protection against murderers, no more than it is against dangerous psychopaths.

Is it not possible to take the last step in this direction and, just as we do not kill madmen in spite of the equal danger which they represent, likewise stop sentencing murderers to death? I am not, you will note, speaking of sparing criminals; I am only speaking of sparing ourselves an action which we are all ashamed of and which, moreover, contradicts all our convictions and all our feelings about the sanctity of human life. I am simply speaking of completing this last stage on the road to progress in a field which can truly be called vital.

Do we have the means to do it? I say yes, Mr. Speaker. If we can protect ourselves from the mentally ill without doing away with them, we can also, through modern penitentiaries, protect ourselves from all criminals. If we are rich enough to feed and care for dangerous psychopaths, we are also rich enough to respect the life of murderers and try to rehabilitate them.

[*English*]

Some might say that we could not abolish capital punishment without running a risk. But what progress, social or otherwise, what evolution or advancement has ever been achieved without any risk involved? In 1810—this fact was mentioned in the house yesterday—when it was proposed that the death penalty be abolished for shoplifting to the value of five shillings, the Lord Chief Justice of England expressed the view that such an experiment was pregnant with danger to the security of property. He went on in these words:

> Such will be the consequences of the repeal of this statute that I am certain that depredations to an unlimited extent would immediately be committed.

Such was the view of that enlightened gentleman on that matter, and the abolition of the death penalty is no exception in this regard. Social progress under all forms has always met with that kind of resistance.

When European parliaments were faced with the problem of child labour, for instance, toward the middle of the nineteenth century, and legislation was debated in order to bar children under 12 from the coal mines, many a noble lord and many a French bourgeois politician of the time fought the measure to the end, deeply convinced that such an initiative would inevitably bring about the collapse of the coal industry.

When the right to strike was being discussed, hundreds of politicians voted against it because in their view, and their most sincere view, I should think, it meant the very end of law and order, and the reign of chaos in modern societies.

Again, when universal suffrage or schooling for the working class came up for debate, innumerable politicians were frightened to death. And it was quite normal for them to be afraid because those measures, which to us after more than a century appear as harmless as bread and butter, were incomparably more consequential and far reaching than the one we are considering today. Of course there is a risk involved, Mr. Speaker, but I suggest that it is a normal and calculated risk, the kind of risk which can only be avoided by doing nothing at all.

Finally, although I am not a lawyer or a jurist by any means, I should like to put forward one argument dealing with the juridical aspect of capital punishment, an argument which I borrow from Professor André Richard, former dean of the free law faculty in Paris, who had this to say in concluding a lecture delivered in Toulouse a year ago:

• (4:10 p.m.)

> We can define as follows the positive aspect of abolition: do away with capital punishment and you strengthen justice in its war on crime.
>
> A judicial system without the death penalty does not mean that there no longer exists a form of capital punishment. It only means that a penal system is established based on a gradual scale of sanctions leading up to a maximum penalty. But the latter no longer differs in nature from the other sanctions; it only differs in degree of intensity and duration.
>
> The immeasurable abyss which presently separates penalties imposed on the living from that extreme punishment of destroying a man's life, would no longer be there to create anguish in jurors and judges. They could therefore make their decisions more calmly in the light of their conscience and reason.

He concludes:

> The death penalty is the neurosis of our judicial system.

The case now is whether we want to cure it.

Mr. R. Gordon L. Fairweather (Royal): Mr. Speaker—

Mr. Choquette: May I ask a question of the hon. member who has just spoken?

Mr. Fairweather: I should be only too glad to allow the hon. member to ask his question.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order, please.

Mr. Fairweather: I have just listened to one of the most moving speeches we have had for a long time.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: The time allotted to the hon. member who has just finished his remarks has expired. The hon. member for Royal.

Mr. Fairweather: Mr. Speaker, I want to take a minute to deal with something said by an hon. member. In fact, it is the hon. gentleman who sits in front of me, the hon. member for Swift Current-Maple Creek. I am going to comment on only one aspect of his remarks. He quoted the London *Daily Express* for some statistics to bolster his retentionist point of view. I think any of us who are interested in the abolition of capital punishment know that one of the severest advocates of retention is the London *Daily Express,* a very powerful newspaper whose opinions, very often not backed by anything but prejudice, spread all over England.

My hon. friend should have checked the London *Daily Express* a little farther, because there was a subsequent correction of the London *Daily Express's* comments on the murder statistics of England. I am quoting from a despatch from London by Martin Dewey of the Victoria *Times* of January 17, 1966, in which he says among many other things:

> The newspaper errors occurred when the editors of the *Daily Express* and the *Sunday Times* failed to distinguish between the first murder totals released by the Home Office each year, listing deaths "provisionally" recorded as murder, and the much smaller subsequent list of deaths "finally" recorded as murder after police investigations have been completed.
>
> Mistakenly equating last year's provisional total, tentatively set at 235 murders, with the previous year's final total, 158 murders, both papers proclaimed in black headlines that the murder rate had soared by more than 40 per cent since hanging was suspended.

The hon. member for Hochelaga (Mr. Pelletier) very eloquently put it to the house a minute or two ago when he said that it is futile to take statistics for a short period of time. In other words, if we only use one or two years to bolster a case it really is not very helpful to any case, be it the case of retention or abolition.

I have one other comment to make with respect to the quotation by my hon. friend from Swift Current-Maple Creek from the *Daily Express.* May I read a telegram addressed to Mr. Arthur Maloney, president of the Canadian society for the abolition of the death penalty, from Mr. Sydney Silverman, M.P., dated February 1, 1966. I quote:

> Actual figures for 1965 not yet known. Provisional figures slightly but not significantly above 1964. Since no discrimination between capital and non-capital cases figures meaningless anyhow. Variation in annual murder rate over 30 years never more than between 3.2 and 3.3 per million inhabitants whether death penalty for all some or no murders.

This, of course, is of interest to this country too. In Canada from 1926 to 1962, when there was a change in the system of reporting, there has been a very slight variation in the ratio of murders per hundred thousand of population. The poignant statistic in the middle of this long sweep of years is that the murder ratio was highest in the years 1930 and 1931 when this country was in the middle of a very serious economic crisis.

I have another comment to make about misleading information, and I refer to that contained in a Toronto newspaper, the *Telegram,* in an editorial last evening. The editorial surprised me because the newspaper had not taken the trouble to check its statistics. There has really been no significant change in Canada or no measurable change in Canada, the ratio being 1.4 murders per hundred thousand of population. New Zealand has also abolished capital punishment. It was abolished, then re-instituted and then abolished again in 1962. However, I am not here to debate the Toronto *Telegram,* fortunately for the house, and for everybody else concerned.

An hon. Member: Hear, hear.

Mr. Fairweather: I am here to comment upon what to me is really one of the most serious matters I have had anything to do with since entering parliament.

Albert Camus asks this question in "Reflections On The Guillotine":

> When the extreme penalty simply causes vomiting on the part of the respectable citizen it is supposed to protect, how can anyone maintain that it is likely, as it ought to be, to bring more peace and order into the community?

He answers thus:

> Rather, it is obviously more repulsive than the crime, and this new murder, far from making amends for harm done to the social body, adds a new blot to the first one. Indeed no one does speak directly of the ceremony.

May I add that this is borne out in this country because hangings are done at night and in private. I do not have the imagination nor the power of speech which would enable me to shock the house, even if I wanted to, with the lurid details of hangings. Neither do

I think that such an approach would be in any way helpful to a dispassionate consideration of this issue.

• (4:20 p.m.)

It often embarrasses me to use personal experience—I mean this—to attempt to rationalize my position as one who without equivocation or reservation is a committed abolitionist. It even embarrasses me somewhat to attempt to rationalize my position as a totally committed abolitionist, without equivocation or reservation. It happens that I am the son of a Supreme Court judge who, during his years on the bench, presided over several murder trials. He became a judge in 1935 at the depths of the depression when despair and despondency easily gave way to violence for the solution of man's problems.

Each member of my family shared in his or her own way our father's mounting distress during the course of a murder trial and when guilt was found and the inexorable result had to be given effect to, we shared his agony. Many wise people have told me since that my father was not cut out to be a judge, that he was a man of transcending sympathy and compassion, that trials took too much out of him, and so on. I have never agreed with this assessment, first of all because it would have meant he was somewhat different from the other people of his time and generation, and I mean that in the broadest sense of the word.

He happened to be very much part of the milieu in which we lived—tough and competitive in sport, courageous in war, reasonably firm as a parent and, like so many of his generation, one who feared God and honoured the King. In other words, he was very similar in his attitudes and outlook to many others of his time. He did, however, abhor capital punishment. He was repelled by the inherent defeat of society in its attempts to balance its accounts by a life for a life.

But one cannot simply rely on one's childhood memories and experience for considered opinion many years later and I, I hope like many others, began to study what others had to say about the subject. I read Koestler and Camus, and now Pelletier, in the philosophical area, Sellin and Gowers on the sociological aspects of the problem, Martin and Gardiner—that is J. Arthur Martin Q.C., although perhaps the Secretary of State for External Affairs (Mr. Martin) may also be added to the list of abolitionists—devastating in their legal analysis.

Camus wrote:

> —the survival of such a primitive rite has been made possible among us only by the thoughtlessness or ignorance of the public, which reacts only with the ceremonial phrases that have been drilled into it. When the imagination sleeps, words are emptied of their meaning: a deaf population absentmindedly registers the condemnation of a man.

It is our duty, Mr. Speaker, to dispel the public ignorance about this subject. Here indeed is the place for this consideration to be given because we, with our opportunities for careful study and attention to the subject —I mean no discourtesy to the public at large—we, because of the avenues available to us for a study of this subject, are surely the ones who have the ultimate responsibility to make this decision for our country whether or not our constituents are retentionists or abolitionists.

I am grateful to the newspapers and other media for their publicspirited contribution to our knowledge of the subject of capital punishment. Many churches in Canada, the Anglican, United Church, Lutherans, Mennonites, Unitarians and the Society of Friends, have added well documented statements in support of abolition. Many thoughtful Catholics, including Rev. Father Kelly, President of St. Michael's College, Toronto, who gave one of the most important speeches I have ever heard on this subject, have made their revulsion for hanging clear and unequivocal. But those who take refuge for their prejudices in finding Biblical quotations to fit their, I think, restricted point of view ignore other equally persuasive admonitions gratifying to the point of view to which I subscribe.

I do not know whether one is allowed to anticipate debate in the house. Presumably I should not refer to hon. members but I shall make a calculated guess that the Bible will be pulled out at convenient times when it suits particular prejudices, and I do the same.

> As I live, saith the Lord God, I have no pleasure in the death of the wicked; but that the wicked turn from his way and live.

That is Ezekiel, chapter 33, verse 11.

I presume we will hear excerpts from other chapters that express other points of view, but if those who look to Deuteronomy for the eye for an eye business would also read on in that chapter and list those things for which Deuteronomy gave an injunction that the death penalty be continued, including—but perhaps I had better not go into that.

Some hon. Members: Go on.

Mr. Fairweather: No, I shall let somebody else do it with more authority that I have.

St. Thomas Aquinas in Summa Theologica wrote:

> In this life punishment ought to be medicinal rather than retributive.

This exhausts my store of doctrinal statements to support my point of view but I am sure there are many other hon. members who have a much more lengthy catalogue than I.

We must not, to paraphrase Arthur Koestler "allow ourselves to be commanded by blind belief, or to instinctively recoil from any new departure as a blind experiment...".

My hon. friend from Hochelaga gave a much more eloquent exposition of this than I can.

Until 1955, in Canada the offence of rape was punishable by death. The repeal of the death penalty for rape has not led to any increase in this offence, that is, in the ratio by population, which is the only way in which we can consider any of these issues. G. Arthur Martin Q.C. put it this way in the February 1966, edition of Chitty's Law Journal:

> One would think that the death penalty would be less likely to operate as a deterrent to murder than to other offences. If the death penalty does not deter a man from stealing, is it more likely to deter a man from commiting murder?
>
> Those who favour the retention of the death penalty accuse those who favour its abolition of making society the subject of reckless experiment and thereby endangering the lives of its members. The short answer to this is that the death penalty has been abolished for murder in some 40 jurisdictions.

I say "40" in the sense of jurisdiction meaning country. There is a much wider abolition if one considers the individual states of the United States, but this particularizing does not interest me although it might interest some other members. In any event, there are 40 jurisdictions which have abolished the death penalty. I continue the quotation:

> Some of those countries are thinly populated; some thickly populated; some are agricultural; some industrial; some consist of a homogeneous population; some of a heterogeneous population; some are composed of Scandinavian people, some of Latin people; some of Slavic people; some have a culture similar to our own, as for example, New Zealand, Michigan, Wisconsin, Rhode Island.

In the United Kingdom the report of the royal commission on capital punishment, which commission sat from 1949 to 1953 and was presided over by Sir Ernest Gowers who entered upon his responsibility as a retentionist and after sifting the evidence became a convinced and eloquent abolitionist, had this to say:

> We agree with Professor Thorsten Sellin that the only conclusion which can be drawn from the figures is that there is no clear evidence of any influence of the death penalty on the homicide rates of these states and that "whether the death penalty is used or not and whether executions are frequent or not both death penalty states and abolition states show rates which suggest that these rates are conditioned by other factors than the death penalty—

Again, the royal commission report said:

> The general conclusion we have reached is that there is no clear evidence in any of the figures we have examined that the abolition of capital punishment has led to an increase in the homicide rate or that its re-introduction has led to a fall.

• (4:30 p.m.)

This is the crux of the case, Mr. Speaker. Although there are other areas which I am sure other hon. members will be pursuing, this is the basis upon which our arguments are advanced. Hanging does not prevent killing.

Let me offer another example close to my own home. The state of Maine abolished capital punishment in 1887. As a matter of fact it did so because an innocent man was hanged in that state. Maine and my province of New Brunswick share a common border for many miles. In every respect we are the same people, a mixture of Anglo-Saxon and French stock. We have common economic problems largely because of location within our respective countries. There is a healthy flow of people back and forth across the border, to which the hon. member for Charlotte (Mr. McLean), I am sure, can agree; at least, I am sure he can agree in respect of the healthy flow back and forth across the border.

The murder ratio per unit of population as between Maine and New Brunswick is not appreciably different; yet one jurisdiction has not had a hanging in 80 years and the other jurisdiction clings to the myth, based largely on emotion, that the retention of hanging will have a measurable effect on the murder rate. The state of Maine last had a hanging in 1883. In New Brunswick there were one or two, I think, in the late 1950's. I might tell you right now about the one in 1957. It occurred just before I became attorney general of the province. It disturbed me very greatly because of the situation in the jail where the hanging occurred.

The jailer who had been responsible—he and his wife, as often is the case in small

communities in this country—for the incarceration of this prisoner from the time he was accused of the murder, throughout the trial and throughout the appeal, had to participate in the supervision of the erection of a scaffold because of the way we do things in this country. After having been really very close to this prisoner, in the best sense of the word, this jailer then had to be a witness to the execution. It became my responsibility to see that this person had very extensive—I was going to say compassionate leave but people do not like the word "compassion" in this debate—sick leave because of the strain to which this particular jailer had been subjected.

As I said, my imagination does not allow me to go into what happened at that particular hanging and I do not intend to be drawn into it. All I can say is that the job, if that is the word, was not conducted efficiently.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. The hon. member's time has expired.

Some hon. Members: Go ahead.

Mr. Speaker: Has the hon. member leave of the house to continue beyond his allotted time?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Mr. Fairweather: Mr. Speaker, I am grateful to the house. As one who prefers to make short speeches I will hasten along. I repeat that the foundation upon which I build my case is that statistics do not prove that capital punishment is a deterrent.

The Canadian society for the abolition of the death penalty has worked hard to promote public understanding of the problem by means of panel discussions, talks and debates. For the most part its members are hardhearted realists although not bereft of idealism entirely. The society includes among its numbers, senators, members of parliament, university professors, lawyers, clergymen and many others. The society is not content merely to be in favour of abolition of the death penalty. It has a genuine and compassionate understanding for the families of murder victims. I am sure that as the debate develops we will hear a great deal more about this factor, that is, that we should pay a great deal more attention to the victims. Of course we should, but this really is not part of the argument about abolition.

Many members of the society favour state assistance or survivors' compensation for murder victims, but the society knows that to have sympathy for the victim does not in any way exclude its need to understand the reasons which lie behind the murder having taken place at all. This parliament must study the motivation for murder. This parliament has a duty to ameliorate the problems facing the poor and those either on the fringe of society or in the underworld, for it is from this group that most men come who kill.

I must take exception to what my hon. friend from Swift Current-Maple Creek said, because unquestionably from the disadvantaged, to use the newest sociological term for the poor, comes by far the highest ratio of murderers per population. This need not be commented upon further.

This parliament must seek excellence in the administration of justice and in an improved and expanded parole system. I know that the Solicitor General is working on this now and that we are about to have a committee which will go into this aspect of prison reform and prisoner rehabilitation. Parliament must see to it that every accused has access to an adequate defence. Earlier I spoke of how capital punishment affected a certain judge, but this agony is not confined to him alone. When the hon. member for Regina City (Mr. More) asked me about hanging in New Brunswick I spoke about the effect it had on the jailer. I know that this applies not only to the jailer but to a great many of the jurymen and so on.

Nothing in the particular episode I mentioned earlier helped the victim or helped the victim's family. Society, I suppose, felt better because a debt had been paid, an account had been balanced. As put by Caesar in "Caesar and Cleopatra": "So, to the end of history, murder shall breed murder, always in the name of right, honour and peace until the gods are tired of blood and create a race which can understand".

What gives me tremendous satisfaction about this matter of abolition is that my 15 year old son told me that when his class had been polled about abolition of capital punishment 30 out of the 31 boys were for abolition. This is a wonderful thing to think of for the future.

• (4:40 p.m.)

[*Translation*]

Mr. Alexis Caron (Hull): Mr. Speaker, I can recall the days of prohibition, in 1917, where all the good people, the devout and the religious, in an attempt to check the spread of alcoholism, took it upon themselves to

make alcoholic beverages disappear off the face of the earth. They achieved only one thing: they helped the underworld by encouraging the bootleggers. As a result of that attitude, alcoholism grew, bootleggers became rich, women took to liquor through the "hip flask" carried in one's pocket, and since that time women have grown used to liquor. We have witnessed the development of a "caponian" spirit with the murders and everything it entails. Still, the prohibitionists were seeking the welfare of the population. They were honest people, intent on helping the whole population; instead, those good people helped the gangsters in their activities.

Today, we have the same thing. Good people, gentlefolk, religious people, devout people, well-meaning and well-thinking, like in 1917, are asking for abolition of capital punishment. They are, in this, asking the same thing as the underworld, abolition of the death penalty. And yet, communists also request it. Indeed, the communist party in Canada sent me messages requesting the abolition of capital punishment. They are using the same ideas, the same arguments, that will lead them to do exactly what Karl Marx advocated in the past. Indeed, Mr. Speaker, we must not forget that requesting the abolition of capital punishment is not something new. In fact, it was requested in the 15th century, the 16th century, just like today.

In France, Voltaire and Jean-Jacques Rousseau advocated the same thing as our abolitionists do today. In Italy, Vico and Beccaria, in Germany, Savigny, Karl Marx and Kelsen, in England, Hume and Bentam, in the United States, Franklin and Payne, were all abolitionists who spent their lives campaigning in favour of abolition. Fortunately, they were not successful everywhere. On the other hand, twenty American states abolished the death penalty, but eleven restored it, because of the large increase in the number of crimes.

The same arguments are put forward everywhere. It is suggested first of all that it is a matter of conscience. Yet, as stated by the hon. member who has just resumed his seat, the Bible distinguishes clearly between the individual and society. The individual is told: Thou shalt not kill. But society is told to put to death any person guilty of killing another. Chapter IX, verse 6, of Genesis, as well as the King James' version, provide that:

> Whoso sheddeth man's blood, by man shall his blood be shed.

[Mr. Caron.]

And looking through the Bible, one finds several references to the effect that if someone strikes any man a fatal blow, he will be put to death himself.

I do not wish to delay the house, but in nine or ten instances, the Bible says that a killer is liable to the death penalty. It does not say that an individual has the right to kill; on the contrary, it admits that he does not have that right. On the other hand, it states that society not only has the right but also the duty to put a murderer to death.

If, for one, it is a question of conscience, one should rely on the Bible. Yet, certain verses are quoted from the Bible about the individual but not about society. Still, society has a responsibility in this field.

Mr. Speaker, as a second argument, it is said that this is barbaric. Well, what about the murderers who kill through sentiment? What about those who do not give their victims a chance to defend themselves? They are attacked without warning and shot through the head. The man is dead, his family suffers but the poor murderer is pitied. How unfortunate to kill another man. That, I say, is barbaric. I feel that claims of barbarism are not justified. It is also said that this is vengeance. Vengeance is an act by which evil is returned for evil. Now, there is no question of vengeance in the case of society. Society is responsible for punishment and does not commit murder in such case. It punishes and castigates the one who has committed murder. It is a responsibility of society which cannot be reneged nor avoided. It is its own responsibility. It is not something that can be called vengeance, but just retribution.

Fourth, it is claimed that it is not a deterrent. But will life imprisonment be a deterrent? Will it deter the criminal to know that he will be permitted to live freely after committing a murder? Not at all. I claim that the only sentence appropriate in the case of a murderer is the death sentence. In England, capital punishment was abolished in 1964 and the very next year, in 1965, there was a 30 per cent increase in the murder rate.

Mr. Lewis: That is not so.

Mr. Caron: That is what English newspapers reported.

Mr. Lewis: That is not so.

Mr. Caron: You can say it is not true as much as you like, but I will tell you that

your arguments are false. It is the same thing in our country. You speak of hangings in England where a judicial error was found to have been committed. Well, I claim that this is false too.

Mr. Lewis: That is a statement of fact, not of an argument.

Mr. Caron: I say that in England there has been a 30 per cent increase in the number of murders committed. In Canada, a substantial rise has been noted since our Prime Ministers and cabinet members have decided to commute death sentences to life imprisonment. Crime has increased in Ontario and everywhere. You will say that our population is increasing and that could be the reason. But I maintain that, since they do not have to fear the gallows, they have no hesitation in killing people. If they were sure to be hanged, they would be much more careful.

The death penalty, capital punishment, has a terrific effect—especially hanging—as was found in the case of Napoleon's armies, for instance. At a certain time, there was a wave of suicides. Officers everywhere were taking their own lives. Well, Napoleon decreed that anyone doing so would be hanged. That wave of suicides stopped because of the shame one's family would have suffered if one were to be hanged. And when I hear the hon. member for Hochelaga (Mr. Pelletier) talk about the executioner, well, I say that I would rather be the executioner than the murderer. The executioner has nothing to be ashamed of, because he does justice in the name of the state, while the murderer kills for his own satisfaction.

Mr. Speaker, if crime has increased in the last few years it is because we have become soft. The Prime Minister (Mr. Pearson) and the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Diefenbaker), when he was Prime Minister, commuted the death penalty a number of times. In some cases, there was not even a recommendation for mercy, neither from the judge nor the jury, but the sentence was reduced to life imprisonment just the same. The Prime Minister said yesterday that was the queen's prerogative. One knows that the queen reigns but does not rule, and that the ministers decide not the queen.

Therefore, I say that the Prime Minister and the ministers must not intervene, especially when there is no recommendation for mercy from the court.

Mr. Speaker, it is said that this is madness. It might be to a certain extent. I will admit with Alexis Carrel that whoever gets angry commits an act of madness. But is it madness which would prevent someone from recognizing the fact that those criminals were brought into court, were examined by experts and found able to stand trial. Any madness there might be here is their own because they did not want to get an education, they did not have the will power to check their passions when they were young. Today they give free rein to all their passions because they can no longer resist. But they know just the same that they are doing wrong, that they are hurting society. And what do they do? They keep on going the wrong way until they commit a murder. I say that those who walk into a bank with a gun in their hands, genuine or not, intend to commit a crime. They should be hanged also, not only sentenced to life imprisonment, but hanged because they intend to do wrong.

I claim that we do not have the right to change that system and that most people today want the death penalty retained. I have received hundreds of letters; a few were in favour of abolition but most of them were in favour of retention. I feel that is the dicision we should take. In the United States, of the 20 states who abolished the death penalty, 11 put it back into force. Why? Because they noticed that crime had increased since its abolition. I am given statistics for the state of Maine and other states that have abolished the death penalty. I suggest that statistics can be made to prove just about anything. But one thing is sure and that is that we have no right to do away rashly with this legislation.

In Montreal recently, three men were charged with murder. One of them was found guilty of manslaughter. Immediately after, the other two asked the judge, through their counsel, to have their plea changed to that of manslaughter and the crown accepted.

That shows that people are afraid of the death penalty. They are not afraid just before committing murder, because they think they are not going to be hanged. They think they can fool the community, the police and everybody else. But once they are caught though, they are afraid of the death penalty. That is why those two were glad to plead guilty of manslaughter, since it only meant life imprisonment for them.

In Montreal, there was the notorious "Santa Claus", Marcotte, who went into a

bank and then shot down two policemen as he came out. He escaped and then was captured. After a preliminary inquiry, he was brought to trial first before the court of the Queen's bench and then before the court of appeal. He was granted two appeals before the supreme court and not once was clemency recommended on his behalf. In spite of that, the cabinet commuted his death sentence to life imprisonment. That was a grave mistake and the cabinet had no right to intervene like that. No, the cabinet has no right, especially in a case where there is no recommendation for clemency on the part of the jury, to change the sentence, unless a reasonable doubt exists.

The same thing happened in Quebec. A murderer was freed. Doctors, psychiatrists considered him to be cured and he was allowed back in society. What happened? Well, he came back to society and murdered four more. He was then sentenced to death, but he probably will not be hanged.

Mr. Speaker, the matter must be studied seriously. There has been too much noisy publicity about it. The greatest evil is not capital punishment, but the banning of religious instruction in our schools. And now that we have ecumenism, it seems to me Protestants and Catholics should join in giving such religious teaching as might be acceptable to both groups, in all Catholic and Protestant schools across Canada. The existence of God and the fundamental laws to be observed by man could be taught. In my opinion, provincial authorities should agree with the religious authorities, Catholic and Protestant alike, in an effort to give all our schools across Canada acceptable religious instruction.

Indeed, as I once said in Toronto a few years ago, a bishop of the Anglican church deplores the fact that there is no longer any religious instruction in our schools. Religion is no longer taught in the schools, and Sunday school is no longer attended. What is not taught in school is not taught at all elsewhere. Without religious principles, nothing really matters; there is a willingness to abolish and destroy everything.

Mr. Speaker, I could produce innumerable documents to prove I am right, but time does not allow me to do so.

Mr. Speaker, we should stipulate that nobody be allowed to alter the sentence of any person sentenced to life imprisonment. In my opinion, this convicted murderer should work to earn money to provide for the needs of the family stricken by the murder which he committed. We could lock him up for life, not give him his freedom, and thus the stricken family would receive something. We should also sentence to life imprisonment the man who rapes a young girl of 12 or 13 years of age or less. That man should get the rope. I do not understand how this can be struck off our statute books. The same should apply to armed bandits, as I said a moment ago, and to narcotics distributors in high places who are responsible for many murders. The poor soul who makes use of those narcotics may be ill, but the man who sold them to him gets off easy.

Mr. Speaker, I gave you the main arguments. I do not wish to go further at this time because I would need at least fifteen minutes more and I know other hon. members want to speak. Mr. Speaker, we have to give serious consideration to this matter. We must not fall for the sentimentality of those who ignore the victim and the stricken family and who think only about this poor murderer before whom we should kneel down and beg forgiveness.

I say we should retain capital punishment in the best interests of society, for it is society that we must protect. We are here to protect society and it is our absolute duty to continue protecting it through the retention of capital punishment.

• (4:50 p.m.)

[*English*]

Mr. Harold E. Winch (Vancouver East): Mr. Speaker, the hon. member who has just spoken has made it very clear that he favours the retention of capital punishment.

An hon. Member: Oh, you did understand that?

Mr. Winch: At least, that was the impression I gathered. I listened most attentively to his interesting and emotional remarks. I, sir, favour the abolition of capital punishment and undoubtedly can, and perhaps will, become just as emotional. But I want to make it clear at the outset that I base my position in support of abolition not too much on emotion but on the facts which are in front of us if we have the intelligence to look at them and understand them.

I could not help noting that both the hon. member for Hull (Mr. Caron) and the hon. member for Swift Current-Maple Creek (Mr. McIntosh) began their remarks by pointing

out, thereby giving it priority, that one reason they were in favour of the retention of capital punishment was that this morning they received a letter from the Communist congress supporting abolition. I received that same letter this morning. But over the weeks I have been receiving communications from major church organizations across Canada and only this morning I received letters from priests in Montreal asking me to support the abolition of capital punishment. Am I to deny the hundreds of thousands of true Christians in Canada, am I to deny the religious organizations in Canada supporting abolition, because the Communists also support abolition? How nonsensical can those two members become in putting that forward as an argument for the retention of capital punishment?

I also could not help noting that those who have spoken in favour of retention of the death sentence have quoted from the Bible the Mosaic law, an eye for an eye and a tooth for a tooth, and those that live by the sword shall die by the sword. Yes, that is in the Bible. But the Bible also says "Thou shalt not kill", and to me this applies to society collectively as well as to members of the human race individually.

I truly appreciate the fact that as a member of the House of Commons I am present when for the first time there is to be a full debate and a free vote on this most important question of the retention or abolition of capital punishment. I first became interested in this matter approximately 30 years ago when I was a member of the British Columbia legislature.

• (5:00 p.m.)

The guards at the provincial jail got in touch with me because the week before three Indians had been hung in Oakalla. They were dropped through the trap-door at the same time. Two of the Indians were husky men and one was small. The guards told me that the small man got jammed between the other two in the drop and strangled to death. His neck was not broken. I raised this matter in the British Columbia legislature I was told by the then attorney general that in order to speak on capital punishment one must have seen a man hung. What relationship there is between the retention or abolition of capital punishment and whether or not you have seen a man hung, I do not know. However, if that was important, I would see a man hung. A few weeks later I saw a young man die by hanging.

He did not commit the actual homicide but since he was the driver of the getaway car he was guilty by association. In British Columbia, Mr. Speaker, they hang people by dropping them through a disused elevator shaft. It is something to stand four feet away when a man is dropped to his death by order of society. I was about four feet away. It is something to see that rope and hear it whanging back and forth across the trapdoor, and to hear the gurglings and sighings coming up from below. This was my second introduction to the meaning of capital punishment.

When I first came to the House of Commons I had the privilege of being named to the joint committee of the Senate and the House of Commons which dealt with corporal and capital punishment. This committee met from 1953 to 1955. I know, because I have seen press reports, that it is now being stressed that the finding of the joint committee favoured the retention of capital punishment. I was a member of that committee. I am not too greatly influenced by its decision. My reason is that the decision was made when all the members who had been sitting for two years on that committee were not present. The vote was a close one. The decision was made not on the basis of those who were there but on the basis of telephone calls to those who were not there.

I have on my desk, sir, the two volume report of that committee. There is something you will not see in these volumes because it was too grisly. I refer to a meeting of the joint committee with the official hangman of Canada. Even some of the members of the committee could not stay at the meeting all had to head for the women's and boys' rooms fast. The official hangman said he was skilful and was proud of his skill. However, he told us what had occurred at previous hangings. There was a woman from Quebec who had put on a lot of weight while she was waiting for the day of execution. When she was dropped her head was torn off. Another case was referred to in which a man was strangling to death, so when the hangman was down below with the coroner's jury he got up on a chair, put his arms around the man's waist and pulled him down so he would die more quickly. None of these things are in the report. These are some of the things we heard from the official hangman.

Yes, "thou shall not kill", but society in Canada kills. We can understand and we can speak emotionally whether we are speaking

for retention or abolition. We can understand the emotions of people who are concerned. All of us in this house understand the anguish, the misery, the tears of loved ones, relatives and friends of the victim of a homicidal maniac. Yes, we all understand that the immediate reaction is perhaps retribution and revenge.

There are also the emotions of the loved ones, relatives and friends, all innocent, of the man society kills. They too have feelings. They too are innocent victims. Should we not consider them also? They have an additional anguish in that, society being what it is, human nature being what it is, although they are absolutely innocent the finger of scorn is pointed at them because of the actions of someone related to them who has committed a murder. Yes, there are emotions whether one dies as the victim of a murderer or whether one dies by the hangman's noose.

I said I could get emotional about this subject, and I am. I want to add now that I am fundamentally opposed to capital punishment on the basis of facts. What are the facts? We, sir, maintain that capital punishment is not a deterrent to homicide, that capital punishment is not a further protection to our police forces, that capital punishment is not an added protection to the officials in our institutions, jails or penitentiaries. This morning I asked the Parliamentary Library if I could have the latest figures on the ratio of homicides throughout the world as between retentionist and abolitionist countries. I was told that the latest figures were those contained in the pamphlet which we got last year on capital punishment, issued by the Department of Justice. These figures are found on page 11 of that pamphlet and I note they are exactly the same as the figures which we received during the meetings of the joint committee of the House of Commons and Senate. These are figures compiled by the United Nations and they are the latest that can be obtained.

What do they show? They definitely show without any fear of contradiction, unless you want to say that the United Nations is wrong, that of the 11 countries that had the death penalty England and Wales had the lowest ratio, 0.5 homicides per 100,000 of population, and El Salvador had the highest with 44.3 per 100,000 of population. Of the 15 abolitionist countries the lowest ratio was that of the Netherlands, 0.4 per 100,000 of population, and the highest was the State of Colombia with 15.9 per 100,000 of population. Some of these countries have abolished capital punishment for almost a century. There is no major difference in the ratio of homicides as between abolishment and retentionist countries. We have heard a previous speaker refer to the evidence in the United States and the statistics with regard to abolitionist and retentionist states.

In so far as the protection of police forces is concerned, I know that the association of police chiefs has been bombarding us for the retention of capital punishment. I do not believe they have any evidence to back up their stand because only one survey has ever been made in relation to retention or abolition as it affects policemen. This survey was made under the direction of Professor Thorstein Sellin.

• (5:10 p.m.)

He sent a letter to every town and city in the United States with a population of 10,000 people or more, and then numerous graduate students analysed the information received. What did they find in the only study of the problem made in the history of the world? They found that there was no difference in the rate of killing of policemen per 100,000 population in states which had retained capital punishment and states which had abolished it. The final results of that study are to be found in this report and they show that an abolitionist state does not pose any greater danger to policemen than a retentionist state.

The same holds true in the case of guards. If there is a danger of guards being killed in the event capital punishment is abolished, then will somebody please tell me why the ratio of guards killed in countries which have abolished capital punishment has not increased? Surely we are not going to say that it can only happen in Canada that guards will be killed if we abolish capital punishment, that it will not happen in the other countries of the world which have not.

We who favour abolition ask those who favour retention to meet these facts. We ask not for emotional or wishful thinking but for facts which refute the facts I have given, if they can find any. In 30 years' study of this matter I have not been able to find any facts to refute the doctrine that the right, modern, Christian and civilized thing to do is to abolish the death penalty. Surely we are now at a time in our history when we no longer believe in retribution for the sake of revenge.

Some say that these people cannot be rehabilitated. There are those who should

never be let out of jail because they have committed the type of murder which indicates they are sick. Society has to be protected and if this means that these people must be kept in jail for the rest of their lives then that must be so. But the record in Canada proves that the majority of homicides are committed in the heat of passion, through fear, emotion or in trying to escape.

Many people in Canada would be amazed to know how many criminals, having served 12 or 20 years, have had their sentence commuted and are now living as responsible citizens of Canada. They have never been in trouble again and they do not get into trouble again because they are on life parole. One slip puts them back in jail until they die.

This, Mr. Speaker, is a most important matter. I know I have spoken with emotion, as I am sure will others. But I hope that when it comes to the final analysis we will deal with the problem as a Christian and civilized country. I hope we will deal with it on the basis of modern penology and on the basis of facts and the experience, going back in some cases almost a century, of other countries which have abolished the death penalty. I sincerely hope, sir, that intelligence will guide our thinking and our vote when the debate is finished.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Jean-Charles Cantin (Quebec South): Mr. Speaker, I do not intend to speak at length on this matter. I simply wish to express my views briefly, because I am one of those who believe that the old rule "To fit the punishment to the crime" has long been abandoned in favour of more modern methods providing that a sentence should fit the accused, while considering the protection of society.

It is undeniable that the theory concerning sentences has evolved. One only has to read the discussions held during conferences on criminology, such as the one held in Sweden last summer and the other held in Montreal last September, to realize the efficient work done by criminology societies, social and rehabilitation services.

After taking part in those conferences, I became aware of the rapid development indicating that some progress is being made in this field compared to the great civilizations of the past which, in other respects, could be envied by our own civilization.

The present federal program on penal and correctional reform is more advanced than in many other countries and, no doubt, the recommendations of the committee set up by the government to investigate this entire field will provide the Department of Justice with valuable information about the standards which will help to effect a more thorough reform.

However, the question of abolishing or maintaining capital punishment is a difficult one, the white paper made available to the members provides as many reasons for the retention as for the abolition of the death penalty.

When the scales are equally balanced by two sets of arguments, the member responsible for weighing them may express either his own feelings or those of his electors. In casting this vote entrusted to him by his electors, the member remains free to express a personal opinion when his electors leave him free to do so or when his conscience is deeply involved to the point where he prefers to ignore their wish.

In my case, Mr. Speaker, and without my requesting it, the voters in my riding, according to a reasonable sampling, are 97½ per cent in favor of retention of capital punishment, all the more so since this penalty no longer applies save in exceptional cases.

Consequently, I feel it is my duty to vote for the retention of capital punishment. In so doing, I shall cast my vote conscious of fulfilling my mandate in accordance with the wishes of my electors, all the more so since this vote in no way goes against my own conscience. On the whole, I am giving full play to the democratic rules I respect and under which I was elected. I should add that this expression of common sense by my electors did not fail to counterbalance the arguments of the proponents of abolition who have set up their headquarters here in Ottawa in order to influence the present debate, having failed to enlighten public opinion according to their own views.

Public opinion still feels that excessive clemency would tend to make us forget those who suffer the disastrous consequences due to the conduct of those criminals who choose their own penalty, for in Canada, those whose crime is not premeditated are already protected by law.

Social progress is not necessarily the result of excessive weakness.

Criminal Code

[*English*]

Mr. Eldon M. Woolliams (Bow River): Mr. Speaker, today we have heard some arguments by the abolitionists and also some strong arguments by the retentionists.

• (5:20 p.m.)

An hon. Member: What arguments?

Mr. Woolliams: Somebody asks, "What arguments?" This perhaps brings me straight away to the meat of what I am about to say. All arguments or points in reference to the abolition of capital punishment have for more than 100 years been brought out, studied and repeated. Hence it is very likely that nothing new will come from this debate. However, it is best to review the situation.

The question of the abolition or the retention of capital punishment, as we have seen this afternoon, is a highly emotional and controversial subject and one on which well informed and objective thinking persons disagree. If we look at the picture presented we can see how some hon. members got into the realm of emotion by simply thinking of accused awaiting trial, the time of the trial, the time spent awaiting the death penalty and so on. Men and women in society can go into an emotional frenzy when talking about this subject and we saw some of that emotion this afternoon.

No matter how monstrous a crime the accused may have committed, when some people look at the consequences of that crime they go into an emotional frenzy. When questions are asked in public about these things, these people then go into the same emotional frenzy and become as disturbed as if they were witnessing a deed which had been planned and premeditated.

Marullus referred to mass emotional psychology in the Shakespearean play, "Julius Caesar". When the people of Rome one day rejoiced over the victories of Pompey and a short time later rejoiced over the defeat of Pompey by Caesar, Shakespeare, through his character in the play, said:

> You blocks, you stones, you worse than senseless things! Oh, you hard hearts, you cruel men of Rome, knew you not Pompey?

This analogy emphasizes how quickly the reactions of people change. I am not sure that the reactions of members of parliament have not changed. One day society cries out for the death penalty and another day it demands abolition. I suppose this is not unusual but is just human behaviour.

[Mr. Cantin.]

At the outset I cannot say, as some hon. members have this afternoon, that in the past I have been a crusader for the complete abolition or retention of capital punishment. It may be that in this debate I shall become convinced that society will be as safe, as moral, and as good a place in which to live if capital punishment is abolished. It is hoped that crimes that are monstrous, that are planned and deliberate murders, will be dealt with effectively by substituting life imprisonment for the death penalty. But when we talk about life imprisonment do we mean imprisonment for life until death? I point out that life imprisonment in Canada does not mean that now. Life imprisonment in Canada may mean a term of eight, 12 15 or 20 years.

Those who are strong advocates of abolition may have to answer that question. Up to the present I am far from satisfied that the abolitionists have answered it, but I still have a searching and open mind and it may be before this debate ends I shall be able to reach some compromise. I am not suggesting that the subject is one with regard to which it is proper that there should be compromise as between those people who favour the retention of capital punishment in some form and those people who support complete abolition. It may be that there are some kinds of monstrous crimes for which capital punishment should be retained.

I listened to the hon. member for Royal (Mr. Fairweather), I listened to the very emotional speech preceding his and I listened to the hon. member for Vancouver East (Mr. Winch) for whom I have great respect. I know that he has been studying this question for some years and looking into its problems. He dealt with methods. I do not think that this is a debate to deal with methods. I should also like to say that I am not going to quote from writers because we all have the opportunity to read them and each member has only 20 minutes at his disposal.

I should like to say, however, that I have acted as senior counsel in murder cases and have had personal experience. When one does act in that regard, one is alone. When one is senior counsel defending an accused before the bar of justice and the only penalty for the crime is the death penalty unless it is commuted, then counsel is alone. Counsel must weigh any evidence that may be given by the defence. One of the most important responsibilities he has to weigh is whether in the kind of crime he is defending the accused should be called as a witness at his own trial.

It is not unusual, Mr. Speaker, for people whom I have met socially or otherwise not to understand the real principles of jurisprudence, the underlying principle of which in criminal law is that a man is innocent until proven guilty. The onus throughout is on the crown to prove beyond reasonable doubt—I emphasize the word "reasonable"—the guilt of the accused. Nor according to the law of the land, must it be mentioned to the jury that the accused has not testified, although courts of appeal may take cognizance of that fact. I just mention that to show how one is very much alone and has the worry of determining whether or not the accused person should give evidence at his own trial.

Over the years the great counsel of Great Britain, the United States and Canada—and we have produced them—have advised very strongly against calling the accused because, although the accused on trial may be as innocent of murder as anyone now in the House of Commons, the twisting of a phrase elicited by the art of cross-examination conducted by a highly skilled or intellectual counsel may result in the accused being convicted.

You have only to read the trial of the Seddon case, in which Marshall Hall, Q.C., of Great Britain begged Mr. Seddon not to go on the stand to give evidence, to appreciate the situation to which I refer. There is no doubt that the reason was the possibility to which I have alluded.

I am not one of those members of parliament who, as in the Truscott case, would upset the jury's verdict, the decision of the court of appeal of Ontario and the decision in respect of leave to appeal to the Supreme Court of Canada on the basis of a 20 or 30 minute interview. I am not one of those members of parliament. I have not their capabilities or their wisdom. Counsel who defended Truscott, had to decide whether or not to call him as a witness. May I just ask this question: If he had called him, thus making him subject to cross-examination by a very skilled agent of the Attorney General, might a phrase have been twisted against him?

The modern trend in Great Britain and even in Canada seems to be that in some cases the accused should be called. As I say, courts of appeal take cognizance of this fact. When the crown has completed its case against the accused the decision whether to call the accused rests on counsel for the defence. In making that decision counsel is very much alone. My heart is with the advocates of complete abolition. As a defence counsel this is natural. Defence counsel, just as prosecutors for the crown acquire a crown mentality, develop some kind of built-in defence mechanism as a result of their training and experience.

Though I am not convinced at the moment that complete abolition is the answer, I am glad to have had the opportunity to state my case. I, as I am sure any lawyer would, would defend a person charged with capital or non-capital murder and as in the past I would use every resource and ability at my command. However, I must measure up to my responsibility in this debate as a member of parliament. This is a separate and distinct responsibility that I share with the rest of you. We are responsible for and ought to assure the safety of society and the rule of law. This is most important. Otherwise I shall vote as my conscience and therefore my head dictates.

This is not a subject on which to play politics. The responsibility, I suggest, is as great as that devolving on the western leaders who instigated the Nuremberg trials. In my mind as a lawyer I do not think there was any justification for the action taken by the bar of international justice. However, that action was taken because of the deliberate and planned barbaric slaughter of millions of good-hearted human beings and the culprits were executed. As a lawyer I ask, was it right to put Eichmann and the nazi leaders on trial? Perhaps that is a legal question.

• (5:30 p.m.)

One thing has occurred to me, and I am very serious about this. I am convinced that today in Canada there are those living in our society, unfortunately, who have all the capacity displayed by the nazis. My own experience and personal knowledge prompt me to ask this question about the many who have been murdered. What about the women and children who have been abused and misused, first by rape and then by slaughter? It may be—this is the emotional side of the argument—your neighbour. Still worse, when you cope with your own conscience you must consider that it could be your child, your wife or you yourself.

Then there are those who may still live in our society and plot the destruction of Canada by selling secrets to our enemies. The western world spends billions of dollars

building up defences against the Communists. We train people to kill and spend billions of dollars doing it. Why? It is to protect Canada and the western world. You must always remember that society is organized for the benefit and the good of the greatest number. Laws must be made to carry out that purpose.

I was very happy today to see the Prime Minister (Mr. Pearson), who has so much responsibility, spend so many hours in the chamber. I am glad he brought this question before the House of Commons but I would point out to the country through you, Mr. Speaker, that we have had abolition already. We have had *de facto* abolition if not *de jure* abolition because all death sentences have been commuted in recent times.

Today in Canada, as in the United States, we are dealing with a new type of criminal, a new type of murderer who has syndicated his evil. Here I come to grips with my argument because this is what bothers me. Gangsters today are syndicated. Murder is their business. They plan, they plot, they premeditate. As a result we get the murder of Francois Payette and the murder of seven others, murders which are still unsolved, murders by syndicated gangsters. Maybe I am wrong, but I think this is no time to mollycoddle those vicious, corrupt, evil men whose sole purpose is to destroy Canada and society.

When we talk about a deterrent against crime I have a few things to say. The only deterrent against crime is what every police officer knows. First of all, you must have quick detection. Second, you must have swift apprehension and, third, you must have proper punishment. Having those three things in mind, let me ask these questions of the abolitionists and retentionists. Should we abolish capital punishment for treason? What about the sale of scientific information on the atomic bomb? Should we abolish capital punishment for repeaters? I am not suggesting that the Dionne case was one which was a repetition of murder but as I understand the facts the man was incarcerated for certain sex crimes and paroled. Picture those three young boys before him—someone says four —begging for their lives, but he destroyed their lives. Should we abolish capital punishment for repeaters and, if we do, when we say there must be life imprisonment does it mean imprisonment until death? What parole board or what executive can say that a man will not repeat a crime?

[Mr. Woolliams.]

I am against a statement made by the Prime Minister that we should put the matter of parole in the hands of the executive. I am not critical of that statement because he is a Liberal Prime Minister, but I have wondered about it. Some on this side of the house may agree with him, but I say it would be a very dangerous course because it would put parole in the field of politics. It puts too much responsibility on the executive because, if the Prime Minister lets somebody out on parole and that person duplicates his crime, one can see the political implications.

Should we abolish capital punishment for those who are syndicated gangsters? I know that in the place where I used to practise law before I went to Calgary and even in Calgary that kind of crime may not occur. It may not occur in smaller places, possibly because of climatic and sociological factors, but in the great metropolitan centres of this continent and Europe syndicated gangsters operate in places like Vancouver, Montreal, Chicago, New York—

Mr. Winkler: Contracted crime.

Mr. Woolliams: Somebody says "contracted crime". Their business is murder. Their business is evil. Their business is corruption. Their business is crime for material gain.

Should we abolish capital punishment for murder which is planned, which is deliberate? We have had cases where murderers have placed bombs on aircraft. Some 50 people in an aircraft have been blown up, people unconnected with the hate which the murderer felt for one person. We have had cases of the gradual but effective poisoning of a person over a period of time.

The hon. member for Vancouver East dealt with police officers. He quoted statistics. Can life imprisonment, meaning imprisonment until death, be a satisfactory substitute for the death penalty? I am sure there will be amendments to this motion. Must we when we make our decision make a statutory declaration according to our consciences that we have done the right thing and left out all political considerations?

There are political considerations because the government finds itself in the position where it has commuted a certain number of sentences and there are at present 10 or 14 people under sentence of death waiting for appeals or commutation. Are the men who have been dealt with in the last two years to get a different deal from those who are now

waiting in the death cells? That is the political implication, and that is the responsibility which the government must face.

Capital punishment was partly abolished in 1960 and 1961. All murder, except planned and deliberate murder, was made non-capital and anyone under 18 years of age could only be found guilty of non-capital murder. If the Truscott boy had been tried under that amendment to the Criminal Code no death sentence would have been passed, but it had to be passed according to the law at the time he was tried even though the sentence was commuted, and properly so, because of his age.

I believe the Criminal Code should always provide for commutation of sentences for all types of murder at all times. I do not go along with newspaper editorials which say that commutation is wrong because it is not part of our law. It is part of our law, part of our Code. Every case must stand on its own feet. Every case, as you know, Mr. Speaker, is always judged on its own circumstances. You never have two identical murderers any more than you every have two identical sets of fingerprints. It is the same thing when dealing with human behavior.

What are the arguments in favour of complete abolition? There are two main arguments. One is the possibility of judicial error, which is a serious one, and the other, which was dealt with this afternoon, is the question of the death penalty being a deterrent.

Dealing with judicial error, may I say it is easy to be a reformer. It is easy to get up and spell out the ways in which you are going to reform the world but is difficult to change and reform human behavior. Over the history of mankind man has not changed. Circumstances have changed but man's psychological behavior under those changed circumstances has not.

What about judicial mistakes? This is again very difficult to prove or disprove. During the 22 years I have been a lawyer and the 25 years I have been a student of the law —one must always be a student because if one stops one is no longer a capable lawyer—I have gained a tremendous respect for our judiciary. Judicial error, I repeat, is difficult to prove or disprove but I think that the British system of jurisprudence, which we have adopted in Canada is one of the finest in the world.

• (5:40 p.m.)

If it does not work or is not working, we are the ones who are spoiling it. It is not the rule of law which is at fault. Laws must operate for the good of the greatest number, but this is no excuse for errors. How can we minimize or eradicate errors? Let me name a few things I think we should do with regard to which we have been lax in our responsibility. We must appoint the best men to the bench. I know what the law societies have said. We must appoint men not only of intelligence and learned in the law but with patience and human understanding. The laying on of hands may make a bishop but it does not create one.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Rinfret): Order, please. I regret to interrupt the hon. member but the time allotted to him has now expired.

An hon. Member: Let him continue.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Rinfret): Does the hon. member have unanimous agreement to conclude his remarks?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Mr. Woolliams: Mr. Speaker, I will try to be very short. The best lawyers, with their skills at their intellectual fingertips, should be the men who defend those who are charged with murder or other heinous crimes. We have men like Marshall Hall of Great Britain and Clarence Darrow of the United States, and I think the Liberals might forgive me if I mention also our leader who is a very capable member of the bar.

These men were prepared to defend persons irrespective of consideration. This is not always true today. Some men are appointed by the law society who do not always have the proper experience. Courts of appeal must be prepared to declare new trials not on flimsy excuses but where there appears to be any real miscarriage of justice. Law is in the court's jurisdiction but where there has been a perverse finding of fact that in itself means that verdicts must be changed. There must be no lessening of responsibility. Proper financial assistance must come from the state so that the penniless accused can obtain as good a defence as the case against him financed by the state. Most persons charged with murder do not have the financial resources necessary to hire a good lawyer and above all to retain detectives to go out and obtain the necessary evidence to meet the crown's case. In the five murders with which I have been involved there have been few cases where the accused has had this financial ability.

If lawyers fail society legal care will creep forward as a reform, and God help us then because lawyers are the main bulwark against the encroachment of the state upon individual rights. The rules should be amended. The M'Naghten rule in respect of insanity, which is more than 100 years old, should be re-examined immediately. The test is, did the accused know the nature and quality of his act or did he know the act was wrong? That test is totally inadequate. Today we have new scientific developments and we have not kept pace with science. We know that surgeons can operate today on persons who are suffering from schizophrenia or paranoia. The rules should be changed or modernized.

Although the Criminal Code has been amended in reference to 18 year olds in so far as murder is concerned, juveniles should not be subject to the same procedure as mature people. Visualize a boy of 12 or 13 who is subjected to cross-examination. What would happen?

In dealing with this subject I say we need legal reform. Professor Jacques Barzun says in one of the books which have been referred to us:

> The failure to see that this is the great task reflects the sentimentality I spoke of earlier, that which responds chiefly to the excitement of the unusual. A writer on death and the Supreme Court is at pains to point out that when that tribunal reviews a capital case, the judges are particularly anxious and careful. What a left-handed compliment to the highest judicial conscience of the country.

We must cure judicial error. What about deterrence? I will be brief on this. I say that no one can produce an irrefutable argument to prove that capital punishment is a deterrent nor can they prove it is not. The only simple illustration I can give is that of a lighthouse on a rock. We read about the ships which ran into the rock but we do not hear about the ships which passed by safely.

We could use figures and analogies from states in the United States where there are different groups of people in different states, different climates and other different factors. You can find figures to prove any point. I do not know whether capital punishment is a deterrent. I do not think anybody in this house can prove it is or is not.

What about life imprisonment? The abolitionists now are asking for life imprisonment meaning life except at the discretion of the executive. Parole would then become a political football. You only have to read Oscar Wilde to realize that life imprisonment until death is a pretty horrible thing to face. The man who is incarcerated today for life believes there is great hope for parole and re-entry into society, but take that specific hope away from him and he is then confronted with a life with no hope. Let us not think about capital punishment in the sense in which we have heard about it today. I am not going to go into the mode of murder. Some writers have said that if men were given a choice some would answer that rather than remain in the penitentiary for life until death they would prefer death now.

Reform is always necessary. Dickens said, "The law is an ass". Shakespeare said, through Hamlet, "Long delay drives me insane". We must always have a strong and vigorous police force. Remember that the trained and skilled R.C.M.P., and the local police are the only people who stand between us and a criminal jungle.

Remember too that the rule of reasonable doubt operates more strongly and more favourably for the accused charged with capital murder, with a death penalty, than for any other offence. There will be less chance of judicial error in such cases. I should like to make this point more strongly. When a man is charged with capital murder today the jury knows—and they know it through the medium of communication—that the penalty will be death. This is an important thing. If a jury knew that person would only get imprisonment, would they exercise the kind of care and reasonable doubt which I should like to see a man have when he is faced with that particular crime?

I thought the house might appreciate some of my remarks as a lawyer but I will not go on very much longer because I know everybody wants to have a chance to speak. I would like to make two or three more points. Crown prosecutors must be trained not to be protagonists but men who know their duty is to set out the facts and not try to win cases. There are many people whom I could call as witnesses to strengthen my argument, but I do make this appeal. I hope there will be some compromise between our ideas.

This problem bothers me. No other problem has bothered me as much. I have listened to the retentionists and I have listened to the abolitionists. It is a very serious problem. A newspaperman said to me that he had not made up his mind but another man had tried to get him to make up his mind. I say it is a greater responsibility for a lawyer who has seen and felt these things. Maybe the time

will come when by education and rehabilitation we can improve the individual wherever he lives. Maybe Victor Hugo had the right idea and maybe it is now. He said this in setting forth a challenging principle:

> In the twentieth century war will be dead, the scaffold will be dead, hatred will be dead, frontier boundaries will be dead, dogmas will be dead; man will live.

That means not only the man who may have committed a crime but also all men, all children, all women.

> He will possess something higher than all these—a greater country, the whole earth and a great hope, the whole heaven.

I am very grateful to the house, Mr. Speaker, for giving me these few extra minutes to finish my speech.

• (5:50 p.m.)

[*Translation*]

PROCEEDINGS ON ADJOURNMENT MOTION

SUBJECT MATTER OF QUESTIONS TO BE DEBATED UNDER ADJOURNMENT MOTION

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Rinfret): Order. It is my duty, pursuant to provisional standing order 39A, to inform the house that the questions to be debated at the time of adjournment tonight are as follows: the hon. member for Danforth (Mr. Scott): Housing —Reported shortage of mortgage money; the hon. member for Vancouver Quadra (Mr. Deachman): Harbours—Vancouver—Proposed wharf development; the hon. member for Cumberland (Mr. Coates): Labour conditions —Atlantic region—Steps to improve unemployment situation.

CRIMINAL CODE

PROPOSED AMENDMENT REGARDING CAPITAL PUNISHMENT

The house resumed consideration of the motion of Messrs. Byrne, Nugent, Scott (Danforth) and Stanbury.

[*English*]

Mr. Hubert Badanai (Fort William): Mr. Speaker, my reason for entering this debate is that the question is a humanitarian one of great interest to the people of Canada. In addition, I have taken part in every discussion on the subject of capital punishment since the former member for York-Scarborough introduced a bill in the house in 1959 and successive bills in 1960 and 1961.

I spoke on those occasions, as I propose to speak to you now, in support of the principle of abolition of capital punishment. After each of those occasions, having expressed my views against the retention of capital punishment, I invited comments from my constituents and as a result I received a great number of letters for and against the retention of the death penalty, with the number favouring abolition on the increase every successive year.

From this experience I found that clergymen in general are against the death penalty. Most judges and policemen are for it. Women are divided, some favouring abolition on moral grounds and some favouring retention as a protection against sex crimes. But in all I discovered that people who were once for the retention of the death sentence were gradually becoming converts to the idea that the death penalty is no longer considered an effective deterrent to murder.

Undoubtedly the general feeling swinging toward abolition had the effect of influencing the previous Conservative government to introduce Bill C-92 in May, 1961, the passing of which divided murder into capital and non-capital categories. It was a step in the right direction but it did not go far enough.

The *Globe and Mail* devoted an editorial to the passage of Bill C-92 of 1961, concluding with these words:

> The new amendment will reduce the number of cases in which the government is required to exact the extreme penalty or to interfere with law, but they do not answer the moral question: Should society kill any man whatever his or her crime?

The last debate on the subject, both in this house, in the press and at public meetings, indicated quite clearly that public opinion in Canada is moving faster toward abolition than at any time in the past. A growing number of Canadians regard hanging as a barbarous relic of the past no longer necessary in the administration of justice. At this point I wish to congratulate the Prime Minister (Mr. Pearson) for facilitating a free vote on the issue enabling every member of this house to vote according to the dictates of his or her conscience in the beginning of this session and letting parliament come to an early decision.

It seems to me that the issue is between two schools of thought, one thirsting after justice, which reminds one of the persecution of Jean Val Jean in Victor Hugo's "Les Miserables", and the other urging not forgiveness but rather the rehabilitation of the criminal.

Last May I received a letter from the Royal Canadian Mounted Police Veterans' Association containing a resolution urging the retention of capital punishment. Chief constables at one of their conventions recently have gone on record favouring the retention of the death penalty. The president of the Canadian Association of Chiefs of Police in a letter to the Minister of Justice (Mr. Cardin), copies of which were received by all members of parliament, complained that death sentences imposed on three convicted murderers were commuted to life imprisonment.

In his submission the chief of the metropolitan Toronto police, who is the president of the association, pointed out that if the death penalty is not retained he expects to see a greater influx of international criminals who kill for pay. I do not wish to minimize either the danger or the effect on policemen, enforcement officers or jail guards in the discharge of their onerous duty of protecting the life and property of citizens, but I cannot sympathize with their view that only the execution of the death sentence is a deterrent to murder. I realize, of course, that by virtue of their training their attitude on this question is, not surprisingly, negative. However, I do agree that the penal code should be amended so that there will be an extension of detention to a specific number of years to give no hope of release, this being the best deterrent to murder.

Religious leaders of various denominations have gone on record as being opposed to the death penalty. As an example, the Canadian section of the Lutheran Church at one of their recent convocations passed a resolution urging the Canadian government to abolish capital punishment. The 19th general council of the United Church of Canada held in Edmonton expressed similar views, contending that the arguments advanced by those who support capital punishment as a deterrent are inconclusive. I received a petition signed by the parishioners of Broadway United Church, Fort William, expressing opposition to capital punishment and requesting my support for the abolition of the death sentence.

While I respect the views of those who hold the opinion that the death sentence is a restraining force against murder, the experience of other nations is such that it does not bear out their contention. For example, Luxembourg has had no death penalty since 1822, Belgium since 1863, Portugal since 1867, the Netherlands since 1870, and Italy since 1890. Although it was restored in Italy during the Fascist regime it was again abolished in 1948. Norway has had no death penalty since 1905, Sweden since 1921, Denmark since 1930 and Switzerland since 1942. Eleven states of the United States have abolished capital punishment and one more, Texas, is currently taking positive action to abolish it. Why? Because suddenly public opinion has swung behind abolition.

Then there is a strong horror of executing innocent persons. Representative J. Charles Whitfield of Houston, Texas, an abolitionist, has recently pointed out that six men were executed in Texas who were not guilty. Last year the Senate and Assembly of the state of New York passed a bill abolishing capital punishment for most offences, reserving the extreme penalty for a person killing a person on duty or when a life convict commits a killing in prison or while trying to escape.

Centuries ago the death penalty was imposed for many different crimes which had nothing to do with murder. We have come a long way from the days when people were hanged for stealing a loaf of bread. Following those days the death penalty as a punishment was imposed for treason, rape, murder and a few other special crimes.

• (6:00 p.m.)

In recent years we have come to adopt a more civilized attitude. I was particularly interested in reading of the stand taken for the first time against the death penalty by the United States Department of Justice, under which the F.B.I. operates. In a letter to Congress last year the deputy attorney general declared himself against the death penalty. He said:

> Modern penology with its correctional and rehabilitational skills affords far greater benefits to society than the death penalty which is inconsistent with its goals.

One other reason for a change of heart of those who once believed in capital punishment but who are being converted to the belief that capital punishment should be abolished is the tremendous influence of television programs such as "The Defenders" which has done much to educate the public as to the human errors that can occur in a trial. People are beginning to realize that an execution can occur before all the facts are known.

In 1949 a man by the name of Evans was hanged in London for the murder of his wife and child. Five years later a fellow by the name of Christie, living in an apartment in

the same house, was arrested and convicted of having murdered several women, including Mrs. Evans, for whose murder her husband was hanged five years before. This particular case was the subject of an analysis by judges and members of the bar, which was presented on a C.B.C. television program known as "Background" on April 23, 1962.

A royal commission on capital punishment was appointed by the government of Great Britain in 1949 and after four years of study it made its report to parliament in May, 1953. I wish to quote a brief extract from its report:

> Capital punishment has obviously failed as a deterrent when a murder is committed. We can number its failures. But we cannot number its successes. No one can ever know how many people have refrained from murder because of the fear of being hanged. For that we have to rely on indirect and inconclusive evidence. We have been told that the first thing a murderer says when he is arrested is often: "Shall I be hanged?" or "I did it and I am ready to swing for it", or something of that kind. What is the inference to be drawn from this? Clearly not that the death penalty is an effective deterrent, for he has not been deterred; nor that he consciously considered the risk of the death penalty and accepted; still less that the death penalty was not so effective a deterrent as some other punishment might have been. The true inference seems to us to be that there is a strong association between murder and the death penalty in the popular imagination.

In my view, Mr. Speaker, the questions to be considered are these. First, do hangings offer protection to society? This appears to be the sole reason advanced by those opposed to abolition. Second, do hangings deter other murders? This is the only logical reason for retaining the death penalty. Third, do hangings give the families of victims satisfaction? I honestly believe the answer to all these questions is no. Eminent criminologists, prominent lawyers and people dealing with rehabilitation also say no.

I am convinced now more than ever that by advocating the abolition of capital punishment I am serving the best interest of justice and the interest of humanity, and if it were possible for me to plead with greater force at this moment I would gladly do so.

This question is being treated on non-party lines and above politics, as indeed any measure of humanitarianism should be, without any partisan bickering. Last June, at a special dinner meeting in Confederation Hall attended by Members of Parliament and Senators, I heard a member of the British House of Commons conclude an eloquent address on capital punishment with a quotation from one of Bernard Shaw's plays:

> And so to the end of history murder shall breed murder, always in the name of right and honour and peace, until the gods are tired of blood and create a race that can understand.

The United Nations report of 1962 on capital punishment indicates that the great majority of criminologists, sociologists, penologists and psychologists favour abolition. The death penalty not only brutalizes society but actually promotes a disregard for human life and thereby helps create an environment which encourages further violence and crime. As someone once said, "Capital punishment, while pretending to support a reverence for life, does in fact tend to destroy it".

I cannot think of a more fitting conclusion to my remarks than to quote a paragraph from an editorial in the Ottawa *Citizen* of June 28, 1965:

> The *Citizen* stands for abolition because it does not believe capital punishment deters murder, and because it believes that executions degrade society, whereas abolition would to that extent enoble it and thereby enoble every individual member of society.

And again from the editorial page of the *Citizen* dated March 7, 1966:

> The trend in the western world is to abolish the death penalty as a barbaric relic of the past. Studies carried out in those countries where abolition has taken place show that the hangman's rope cannot be regarded as an effective deterrent to murder. A private member's bill was recently the vehicle for getting rid of capital punishment in Britain. It is to be hoped that this action is repeated in Canada.

I express the hope that after the division bells have ceased to ring next Monday night in this house a majority of members will place Canada on the list of enlightened nations by outlawing the death penalty.

• (6:10 p.m.)

[*Translation*]

Mr. Réal Caouette (Villeneuve): Mr. Speaker, the resolution now before us is a delicate matter since every member has received from all over Canada petitions, letters from organizations, personal letters, in short, letters of all kinds, some advocating or suggesting the abolition of the death penalty, others arguing that the retention of capital punishment is absolutely essential.

That resolution, in my opinion and in the opinion of many members who have spoken since yesterday, contains some very delicate aspects. Are we for or against the abolition of the death penalty?

I referred to organizations. There are some like the Canadian Students' Union, for instance, which on March 18 sent us a petition for the abolition of capital punishment. It said on page 2:

> Of recent date, abolition in Great Britain seems to be the example which best shows an enlightened public attitude toward those offenders.

Mr. Speaker, the students' union doubtless knows, as pointed out by some hon. members since yesterday, that in England, where capital punishment was abolished in 1964, there is a strong movement, and increasing pressure on the government in favour of the re-establishment of capital punishment.

The resolution that is submitted to us reads as follows:

> Resolved, that it is expedient to introduce a measure to amend the Criminal Code for the purposes of
>
> (a) abolishing the death penalty in respect of all offences under that act;
>
> (b) substituting a mandatory sentence of life imprisonment—

Mr. Speaker, I repeat the words "mandatory sentence".

I go on:

> —in those cases where the death penalty is now mandatory; and
>
> (c) providing that no person upon whom a mandatory sentence of life imprisonment is imposed shall be released from imprisonment without the prior approval of the Governor in Council.

Mr. Speaker, I submit that paragraph (b) and (c) are conflicting. On the one hand, that life imprisonment is substituted for the death penalty and, on the other hand, in paragraph (c), that the Governor in Council can change this life imprisonment and release a murderer when he so decides for one reason or another.

Mr. Speaker, I organized a referendum in my riding last year, to find out whether the people favoured the abolition of capital punishment. In all, there were 1,300 to 1,400 replies; 736 favoured retention, 595 were opposed to the death penalty and 95 had doubts and told us: Judge for yourselves.

This means, Mr. Speaker, that opinions vary greatly on this subject, at the present time.

As several members pointed out yesterday, capital murder calls for the death penalty. In the other cases, there is often commutation. Indeed, there has even been of recent date, commutation in cases of capital murder, not to say of very capital murder.

For instance, in the infamous Santa Claus case, where two Montreal policemen were killed, there was certainly murder of the very first degree.

In addition, there is the Dion case, in Quebec, where the man first raped a young girl who was crippled for life. Mr. Dion was set free under the Parole Act. As soon as he came out of jail, he killed four youths. He was arrested and condemned to be hanged. While in detention, he managed to escape and even to stab the governor of the Quebec jail.

With examples such as these, Mr. Speaker, I ask the member for Hochelaga (Mr. Pelletier), who this afternoon, praised social evolution and the progress of the society in which we live, whether he feels he could possibly educate a fellow like Dion or again a fellow like Marcotte?

And there are millions of cases like those throughout the world.

In the light of the resolution under consideration, I wonder if we should not be satisfied with the present law which stipulates that the death penalty is to be imposed in the case of a qualified murder, because we do not believe that it will ever be possible to educate people of ill will who constitute a danger for society, for our own children, for our wives, for all classes of society.

It is not a matter here of one person's revenge upon another. Not at all. As pointed out by an hon. member this afternoon, it is rather a matter of protecting the society against elements which want to destroy it. There are not only cases like the Dion case.

I read recently in a newspaper an open letter signed by Mr. G. Monet, 621 rue des Cèdres, Shawinigan, Quebec. Here is what Mr. Monet said:

> The widespread campaign to abolish the death penalty has reached its peak and the members of Parliament will soon vote for or against that measure in the House of Commons.
>
> I read many articles filling a lot of space in newspapers, where considerations ranging all the way from religion to race, from pseudo-religious sects to so-called philanthropic associations, from political parties to individuals—with a lot of statistics thrown in—were invoked in favour of the abolition of the death penalty.
>
> May I state the hidden reason why people want to abolish the death penalty, and no one today has dared to mention it publicly.

Mr. Speaker, I do it more than publicly, as I am reading Mr. Monet's letter in the house so that it will be published in the official record and all the Canadian people can take note of it.

I continue:

The true reason for abolishing it is that at this time, more than ever, revolutionaries are getting ready to overthrow the rule of law and order by resorting to murder, assassination and bombings. As it is possible—and it has happened—that some of those professional killers, agents of the international revolutionaries, will be caught after a crime some people want them to get as the supreme punishment detention in so-called humane conditions where the prisoners will enjoy all the privileges, comforts and amenities of home.

So, if the revolutionary group for which this murderer is working succeeds in assuming power through another *coup d'état*, not only this murderer is freed, but he is decorated, honoured, rewarded and finally he is offered a key position. Now, this is only possible if capital punishment is abolished.

Let us take an actual case of rather recent date:

When Fidel Castro was arrested in Bogota—several years before the revolution in Cuba—during a revolutionary demonstration, he said at the police station . . . "I had a full day, I killed two priests" . . . Well, if capital punishment had been applied, he would never have returned to Cuba to slaughter people like he did. A very significant fact must be kept in mind: these revolutionaries who kill and murder—applying capital punishment as they see fit—say or have other simple-minded parrots say that the death penalty should be abolished. But if they come into power immediately, they execute those they consider as their enemies even though they are not guilty of any murder.

Another instance: At 31, Robespierre was a judge in France in the Pas-de-Calais department. Being of a sensitive nature, he resigned as a judge, because he was against capital punishment. But once in power, he established the Terror, had tens of thousands of patriots guillotined, and even said once: "I shall destroy 80 per cent of the population, if necessary, so that the remaining 20 per cent will make up a true revolutionary people."

To my knowledge, the campaign against capital punishment is nothing new. Over 30 years ago, such a campaign made quite a stir in Europe.

And our public prevaricator, Jacques Hébert, brings nothing new in the field; he uses the same tactics as the European propagandists, he has nothing to teach us.

If one or two innocent persons have been eliminated by capital punishment within two centuries, what does it amount to compared to the thousands of victims, also innocent, these professional killers and murderers in the revolutionary international brigades have assassinated, after sham trials.

These patented and imported revolutionaries who come here to rouse our youth and incite them to terrorism should be deported unmercifully and we want order to be maintained here. You can be sure that those people have no mercy when they kill those they consider a hindrance to their devilish plans.

Anyone with his eyes open cannot fail to see these basic truths. There are some truths that must courageously be stated.

• (6:20 p.m.)

And the letter is signed G. Monet, Shawinigan.

Mr. Speaker, there are certainly miscarriages of justice and, in the past, innocent people surely have been sentenced to hang, people who had not killed. But today, or rather since 1960, 1961, it seems to me legislation concerning commutation is clear enough. If the resolution clearly stated that the ensuing legislation would enable us to determine that generally, the abolition of capital punishment would be accepted and that, in special cases, the death penalty would still be resorted to in Canada, then, I feel, we could support the resolution. But in view of the fact that we do not have this assurance, I for one—and my colleagues of the Ralliement Créditiste are completely free to vote according to their conscience, since the vote is a free one—will have to vote according to my own conscience, which means I will have to vote for the protection of the Canadian society, that is against resolution No. 66 as long as we do not have the assurance that capital punishment will be retained in some cases.

Mr. Speaker, there have undoubtedly been miscarriage of justice in the past. For instance, I am convinced that there was a miscarriage of justice in the case of Donald Perrault, who came from my own area. He had taken part in a break-and-entry theft or an armed robbery. He had accompanied a certain Cloutier, who shot at policemen and people.

I think he killed one or two persons. Perrault was sitting in his car outside the bank. He was waiting for his accomplice. Once in the car, after one or two persons had been killed, the two escaped. The police caught up with them and eventually Cloutier was sentenced to the gallows. Perrault was also sentenced to hang, it being alleged that the man who held the bag was as guilty as the one who filled it up. I suggest that such a conviction was entirely unjustified, for in this case there had been no slaughter nor murder committed by the man.

Let us consider another case, that of Wilbert Coffin, which raised much interest, not only in the province of Quebec but throughout the country. It was never clearly or precisely established that Coffin was a murderer. Then, I suggest, if there is a shadow of a doubt, capital punishment should not be imposed.

In the past our judicial system was defective. I hope we will be able to improve it. We will necessarily remain human and, during this debate, we will certainly hear people who may see this question of the murderer or the man who is harmful to society in a different light. However, in the interest of

Canadian society, I believe that we should retain capital punishment for people like Dion or Marcotte, or for cases where there is no possibility of rehabilitation.

Mr. Speaker, how can the hon. member for Hochelaga (Mr. Pelletier) say that society has evolved and is so much better when these days, in 1964, in 1965, young people 17, 18 and 19 years old put bombs in garbage cans, endangering the lives of children, women and innocent people?

I ask myself then whether the present civilization is so much ahead of that of 500 or 600 years ago?

Has society really evolved when, during the last war, a democratic country, in the name of civilization and christianity, threw two atomic bombs and exterminated the population of two Japanese cities, Nagasaki and Hiroshima? Men, women, children, elderly people were wiped out by two atomic bombs. Do you think it does the United States credit to have dropped two atomic bombs in the world?

Mr. Speaker, I sincerely believe the United States will always bear a stigma for having used the atomic bomb, for having killed innocent people.

Has society so evolved, when we consider what is now going on in Indonesia and in Viet Nam, when we see people who want to kill women, children, in short, to wipe out the population in those places? Has civilization evolved so much? Are the murderers in those countries better than those in Canada?

Let us be logical and consider the facts.

I understand that people may have their opinion and I respect it, but when we receive petitions from police forces as, for instance, the metropolitan Toronto police, in favour of the retention of capital punishment, we must think it over seriously.

I have before me the text of a lecture delivered by the Reverend Father Kelly where he said:

St. Thomas said that in this life, punishment must be remedial rather than punitive.

Mr. Speaker, it is also for a remedial purpose that we say that capital punishment should be retained, in certain cases to prevent those people from repeating their crimes or else from committing crimes and murders as soon as they get out of jail or are released under the Parole Act.

Mr. Speaker, there is also the punitive aspect. A person who dies by hanging is not

[Mr. Caouette.]

punished for a long time since right after the hanging his punishment is over. He is no longer a danger to society, to our people.

Last night, the hon. member for Dollard (Mr. Goyer) told us that society had evolved in the sense that the member for Hochelaga outlined this afternoon. On the other hand, the hon. member for Charlevoix (Mr. Asselin) stated also last night that capital punishment should be retained.

Mr. Speaker, we will have to reconsider this, even if the resolution carries today or Monday. We will have to come back on this matter because, eventually, the government will have to reconsider abolition if ever it takes place, next week or next month.

Mr. Speaker, we must protect the Canadian society and not legislate without due reflection, and it is in that sense and for those reasons that we will vote against the resolution.

Mr. Auguste Choquette (Lotbinière): Mr. Speaker, what can a representative of la belle province say about the death penalty, if not once again to claim a special status?

In our confederation, the premier of Quebec and his Minister of Justice, Mr. Wagner, were the only provincial leaders, I believe, to proclaim their opinions loudly on this controversial subject.

Mr. Wagner even went as far as to ask for a national referendum, a preposterous idea that was quickly drowned in the stormy waters of public opinion.

Do the strong views of those public men have any influence on the population as a whole and especially the people of Quebec? Will they affect the stand to be taken by members here from that province, including this one, when the house is called upon to vote for the abolition or retention of the death penalty?

I rather believe that the utterances of the Quebec authorities merely reflect the general opinion of the citizens of that province, whose representatives in this house seem to favour—I would say the majority of them, perhaps a small majority—the retention of capital punishment.

I would even be so bold, Mr. Speaker, as to tell you about my optimism concerning the vote to be taken. I feel that the house will maintain the status quo and if, by any chance, it should pass the resolution as it appears on the order paper, my impression is that it would not be passed by the Senate.

For my part, I have put before the house a bill to transfer to the provinces the jurisdiction as regards the execution of the death penalty, which is in no way incompatible with the provisions of our Canadian constitution where authority concerning the administration of justice is assigned to the provinces.

The question is not to break the uniformity of the criminal law in the country, but merely to give the lieutenant governor in council instead of the governor in council the power to commute the sentences.

Why? First, in the U.S.A. there is a great difference between one state and the other; in Canada, in the field of divorce, there are special systems for Newfoundland and Quebec; the concept of punitive justice may very well vary from one province to another; it may well be also that in the present social context of our country, the retention of the capital punishment would have a deterrent effect more powerful on the Latin temperament of the French speaking than on the impassivity of the Anglo-Saxons.

• (6:30 p.m.)

With reference to what took place in the United Kingdom, it is proper to point out that a petition was signed by thousands of citizens anxious to see capital punishment reinstated in the statutes.

Mr. Speaker, by transferring to the provinces the power of commutation, this would allow Mr. Wagner to hang, if he feels like it, and other provincial authorities who do not enjoy the pleasure of hanging as much to allow commutations.

However, Mr. Speaker, I take advantage of this debate to deny—I see the Minister of Citizenship and Immigration (Mr. Marchand) in front of me and he will probably give a gasp—the government and the cabinet the jurisdiction in the field of commutation. I believe and I feel that the federal cabinet does not have jurisdiction, the necessary knowledge and the time to consider every case and decide whether or not to commute a penalty.

I suggest the creation of a special committee and if commutations came under the lieutenant governor in council instead of the governor in council, I think it would be imperative to establish in each province of the country a special committee made up of criminologists, sociologists and psychologists who could act under the chairmanship of the chief justice or a judge of the superior court, and whose specific duties would be to advise the lieutenant governor in council in the field of commutations.

In the Quebec Department of Justice, the alarm cry uttered in favour of retention of the death penalty was accompanied by the publication of interesting statistics, which I think are worthy of the attention of the house.

These figures point out a recurrence of murders in the province of Quebec.

I do not want to make any difference between the various provinces because I am convinced that there must exist in the other provinces statistics which could be similar to those I will give and which deal only with the province of Quebec.

Here is the picture which the Quebec Minister of Justice made public:

> For the period between 1951 and 1955 inclusive, there was an average of 38 murders a year, that is an increase of 19 per cent compared to the previous period and running parallel to a population increase of 14.1 per cent.
>
> For the period between 1955 and 1960 inclusive, there was an average of 47 murders a year, that is an increase of 12 per cent compared to the previous period and running parallel to a population increase of 13.6 per cent.
>
> For the period between 1961 and 1965 inclusive, there was an average of 57 murders a year, that is an increase of 38 per cent compared to the previous period and running parallel to a population increase of 11.4 per cent. During that last period, an alarming increase, a truly frightening upsurge in murders was registered. This last period coincides with the systematic application of the commutation system.

I am quoting those statistics, Mr. Speaker, without giving them any intrinsic value or any possible interpretative role; in my opinion, they have only an informative value. But just the same they can be used to refute the arguments of those who call on statistics to prove that the abolishment of the punishment often coincides with a decrease in crime.

Therefore, how is it possible to reach a definite opinion on the subject, if the statistical studies neutralize the positions?

First of all, I want to state solemnly that I am not in favour of the death penalty as such, but that I am in favour of maximum security for our society made up of good citizens.

I am aroused by the brutalities inflicted on innocent victims by wicked people; I am aroused by the serious damage against private property by unscrupulous bandits; I am aroused by the sordidness of criminals who

have no respect for the life and security of others.

Today the current of compassion for criminals is so deep that people are forgetting the odious lot of the victims.

To those who invoke social progress and the level of our civilization to ask for abolition of the death penalty, I say that a truly civilized country, an era truly characterized by social progress can be recognized by its low crime level; the surest way to abolish the death penalty is to abolish crime and murder. This reminds me of a sophism by the late Mr. Duplessis, who used to say that the best health insurance was health itself.

On the technological, medical and scientific levels, our modern world has made enormous advances, but on the moral and social levels, crucial problems interfere with the progress of our civilization.

A lot has been written and said on the subject of capital punishment.

It seems that when we try and refer to those texts and speeches, we only remain at the stage of ratiocination.

For example, abolitionists will say: "The Lord is the only master of our life" and they will put forward the "Thou shall not kill" that the retentionists interpret as "Thou shall do no murder", and who maintain that the Lord exerts his control over the destiny of man through the use of human contingencies; the Lord, first cause, acts through secondary causes.

As for me, I prefer to leave aside these confrontations between biblical justice and legal justice, between the world of theology and the world of human relations.

Too many of those jeremiahs with a shade of religion, against capital punishment do not mention the eternal punishment as a retribution for a temporal life of sin. It is a bewildering disproportion for whoever considers this reality in terms of our human context only.

Abolitionists emphasize the holy nature of the human life; the retentionists reply that the abolition of freedom takes away the dignity of the individual and that the sacrifice of a man's freedom is often equal to the sacrifice of his life.

Is it better to take away a man's life than to reduce him to the condition of an animal?

Abolitionists contend that the murderer, when committing his crime, does not consider at all the punishment that could ensue from it, but retentionists reply that punishment looms over potential murderers and therefore deters many of them from committing murder.

Abolitionists claim that a judicial error is possible; retentionists contend that incarceration alone of murderers endangers greatly the life of the prison guards.

Abolitionists contend that repeated commutations make a mockery of official sentences handed down by our courts; retentionists, on the other hand, contend that there is nothing of the sort, since our penal system provides this legal mechanism by which any death sentence is subject to commutation by the executive.

And we could go on indefinitely with this parallel of pro and con arguments.

Apart from this subtle reasoning, an intuitive knowledge of human nature will clearly establish the deterrent power of capital punishment.

I feel it would be to take leave of one's senses to deny the deterrent effect of the prospect of such penalty.

We can philosophize *ad nauseam* in support of the opposite trend. This is a conviction intimately felt by the whole being, this is a deep feeling possessed by any healthy soul; let us beware of quibbling, by abstract reasoning, philosophers have come to prove that one does not exist.

The abolitionists remind me of the unfaithful husband. He often succeeds, by charming eloquence and argumentation endowed with the most rigid logic, to intellectually convince his wife of his faithfulness; however, she in her heart of hearts feels by intuition that she has been sadly taken in.

• (6:40 p.m.)

[*English*]

May I quote the royal commission:

> It is reasonable to suppose that the deterrent force of capital punishment operates not only by affecting the conscious thoughts of individuals tempted to commit murder, but also by building up in the community, over a long period of time, a deep feeling of peculiar abhorrence for the crime of murder.

[*Translation*]

It is an erroneous belief that life imprisonment, if it does exist, serves the same purpose.

There are some pariahs with no ambition or purpose other than to take life easy, who could easily become instruments of organized crime; for them, it does not make any difference whether they live in jail or elsewhere; why not take a chance to get on easy street

even if murder is necessary. If the deed fails, they live at the expense of the state; if they succeed, they live in the lap of luxury. Only the rope can put the fear of the Lord in these parasites and deter them.

The abolitionists yearn after a level of civilization we have yet to reach. As I said a moment ago, in the light of the developments of human sciences, I do not believe we can do away so quickly with the death penalty as the abolitionists would wish.

Our penitentiary institutions have not reached the required degree of development, our criminal rehabilitation methods are far from adequate; sociology, criminology and psychiatry have not reached the point where capital punishment can be abolished.

To realize how vulnerable our punitive system is, let us consider that from March 31, 1963 to March 31, 1964, there have been 58 escapes from jails in Canada, from March 31, 1964 to March 31, 1965, 67 escapes have taken place; in spite of many recaptures, there are still 11 criminals at large.

If our penitentiaries, our penal institutions are still unable to offer the maximum security society is entitled to, I fail to see why we should lose our time in studying this resolution, at the present time.

We should, first of all, ensure that maximum security and adequate operation of the Parole Board, before going to extremes, that is abolishing the form of social protection capital punishment constitutes.

Those, then, are the arguments I wished to put forward. Before closing my observations, I might say to the hon. member for Hochelaga (Mr. Pelletier), who pointed out a while ago that the official hangman's role was so hateful that the name of the man is not divulged, that while admitting the task is far from interesting, I feel that it requires much courage and allows the law to function to its very limits.

In fact, it might be well to bear in mind that if the name of the official hangman is not revealed, it is far more for his own protection than because his work is infamous as such.

Mr. Speaker, this debate is most interesting; I believe its fundamental object is the most efficient protection of society.

So long as human sciences are what they are, that our knowledge, in the present context, does not reach more deeply, in short, that the maximum security our penitentiaries should guarantee is not a fact, time will not be ripe for us to legislate and reach a decision on such a resolution. I think it might be wise to wait, in order to better protect honest citizens.

[*English*]

Mr. J. H. Horner (Acadia): Mr. Speaker, this is the first time I have spoken on the subject of capital punishment in this house and I do so with some hesitation because the side I favour is sometimes called barbaric brutality. It is very easy to speak as an abolitionist, to try and project across the world that one has a big heart and is willing to help everybody, particularly the down-and-outers, but I think the first duty of all of us in this house is to society in general.

I have listened to arguments presented in this debate and in a previous debate on the same subject when members referred to the nineteenth century and the sixteenth century to show how justice and the question of capital punishment evolved into the position they occupy today. But I think the house should confront itself with the picture of this country in 1966 and not concern itself with conditions in Sweden, Norway and Great Britain back in the 1800's. We should consider the point to which our law has evolved today and how the abolition of capital punishment would affect our Canadian society in 1966.

I accept the fact that justice is continually evolving but sometimes I am of the opinion that it is not evolving in the right way. Sometimes I am of the opinion that it evolves in the direction which offers least resistance. I have felt for a long time that one should remain innocent until proven guilty, but over recent years I have been led to believe, and am slowly becoming convinced that one must maintain his innocence and be prepared to prove his innocence at all times. I do not like the way justice is evolving in this regard.

• (6:50 p.m.)

It is all very well for lawyers and members of the house to concern themselves with this question but I would much prefer if they would concern themselves with the basic principle which we must regard in a democracy, that we are innocent until we are proven guilty. Time and time again, particularly in murder cases, we see the courts spend thousands of dollars, taxpayers' dollars, to prove that some Joe Blow is guilty of a crime of which he may or may not be guilty. Joe Blow, on the other hand, must dig into

his pockets, his relative's pockets and maybe rely on the good heart of some legal counsel in order to defend himself and to prove to all in the land that he in fact is innocent. I have pointed this out at the beginning of my remarks because I do think the house could serve the country better in the field of justice if it directed itself to efforts to maintain the principle that one is innocent until proven guilty. Certainly this is a very very important point when one is being tried for murder or even when the question of murder is involved.

When one talks about capital punishment it is interesting to note how many lawyers are for abolition. It is an interesting thing to note the evolution that has taken place in this country in this regard in the past number of years. Going back six or seven years when the Conservative party was in power and under the leadership of the present Leader of the Opposition, I can remember newspaper after newspaper condemning them for commutations which at that time I thought were just and still do.

Today we have the press all across the country telling us that capital punishment is a terrible crime and that society cannot take the life of an individual even though an individual can take the life of some other person. Where is justice in this regard? The press never has had to answer to justice in this country, and I do not want to see any question of the freedom of the press introduced.

We have seen the law amended. Somebody mentioned the Truscott case in this debate. This question is not even tested in that case because the law has since been changed. A minor cannot be tried today for capital murder and therefore that case does not enter into this debate at all.

We have seen the law changed in 1961. We never have seen the law tried and proven in respect of whether or not the change was a good one. What has happened? The cabinet under the present government has shrunk from exercising its duty to the Canadian public. It is all well and good to promise the country a free vote on this question. I never have seen a free vote in this house and I doubt whether there will be a free vote on this question. I doubt it very much. Maybe I am from Missouri in that regard. I will watch, I will wait, and I will see.

The cabinet has shrunk from its duty to enforce the law of the land on this question and we, the public, have been lax in allowing them to continue shrinking away from the duty they have to perform as the government and as the leaders of the country. It is all well and good for speaker after speaker to say that this debate is necessary and this debate must provide an answer to the question. We have heard speech after speech on this point. I am sure that today and on Monday there will be speech after speech again and I do not think there will even be a vote on Monday because many members wish to express their views.

What is the resolution before the house? It is for complete abolition. What is to be substituted as the major deterrent against murder in this country? Life imprisonment, subject to parole by the Governor in Council. The hon. member for Vancouver East (Mr. Winch) went on about how he would prefer to put a man in a cage for the rest of his life rather than take his life. How cruel can you get? Put a man in a cage like an animal. I suppose the cage would be six by six and have a narrow window at the top. He spoke about how brutal hanging is. Do we want to parade society before a lot of caged animals before they die or put them away where somebody will not see them?

Somebody said we are not proud of our hangings and that we hang people in the dark. I am sure if we had a group of caged animals who were in cages for life we would put them where society would not see them. It is not a good subject; it is not a nice thing. The question it boils down to is, is hanging a major deterrent which should be retained? I have heard members say they will bring in an amendment to retain hanging for murders of policemen, guards and perhaps small children. Why would they do that? What purpose would they be accomplishing? What they are admitting to me is that they are satisfied it is a major deterrent and they wish to keep it for crimes involving jail guards and policemen who protect our society. They refuse to admit it is a major deterrent but they suggest it should be kept for major crimes involving children, policemen and guards whose duty it is to protect our society.

I could go on further on the question of the deterrent. Before the debate is over we will hear that hanging should be kept for second murders. In other words, we put a man in jail, he is then paroled and commits a second murder, and only after he has committed two murders should he be hanged. Here again what these people are saying is that we will use that major deterrent but we will use it less often. In other words, we are

saying the offender is a great man and his life is worth that of two ordinary citizens. This is how ridiculous the question is. The question will boil down to this if we allow ourselves to be swayed by the emotion of a few sentimental lawyers and a few sentimental thinkers.

We must look at this matter in as clearcut a manner as possible. We must look at it as unemotionally as possible. I stated at the outset of my remarks that I do not like some of the trends in justice that are evolving. I think the evolution which came about as a result of the changes in the Criminal Code in 1961 was a proper and just one. We set out two categories, non-capital murder and capital murder. I am in wholehearted agreement with that. I do not think that change in the Criminal Code, however, has been properly tested since it was brought about in 1961.

Ever since 1963 we have had commutations. How great a deterrent is a death penalty which never will be enforced so long as the present members of the cabinet are in their seats? How great a deterrent is that? It is no deterrent at all, or practically none. Some members have spoken in this debate and have said that if this resolution involving life imprisonment is adopted, life imprisonment is equal to the death penalty. The hon. member for Edmonton-Strathcona (Mr. Nugent) in opening the debate stated that life imprisonment is just as much a deterrent as the death penalty. He went on to say that the death penalty is no greater deterrent than anything else. This resolution does not state we shall substitute a life sentence for the death penalty. This resolution states that we will put in place of the death penalty life imprisonment with the possiblity of parole on approval of the Governor in Council, a different matter altogether.

• (7:00 p.m.)

What does that mean? Past experience indicates that these prisoners spend between nine and twelve years in prison, depending on whether their behaviour is good or bad, and they may spend as much as thirteen or fourteen years behind bars.

I always like to simplify things so that I may understand them. In this year, 1966, syndicated crime is moving into Canada and this is not the time for us to abolish capital puhishment or to make things easier for these criminals. In recent years we have had evidence of bodies being buried in lime in Quebec. We are all familiar with the McLaughlan case in Vancouver and the fact that the two people who were to appear in court on a narcotics charge were murdered yesterday. Surely I need say nothing more, because it is obvious that syndicated crime is moving into Canada.

Should we make things easier for criminals, and should we make the laws weaker, encouraging contract killing? Many people have talked about the greatest deterrent in Canada to murder. What does the Mafia have as its deterrent to keep their gangs on the straight and narrow, to keep them from squealing or going soft on the job? I suggest they use the death penalty. Their members either stay in line or they are rubbed out. They are encased in cement and dropped to the bottom of a river, or put somewhere else where they are not seen again. Torture is not used and life imprisonment is not used,—and I am sure the crime syndicates could impose life imprisonments if they wanted to, but it would be a great nuisance. Their ultimate deterrent is the death penalty.

If that analogy is a good one, then society's greatest deterrent is the death penalty. We in this country have not reached the point that we do not need a deterrent. In recent years we have all observed that crime is becoming of major concern to the citizens of this country, as evidenced as recently as yesterday by the killings in Vancouver.

In view of all these facts, I have reached the conclusion that now is not the time to abolish capital punishment. Our society has not reached that point at which we can forget about this ultimate deterrent to murder. It is my duty in this house, not to protect my interests or necessarily the interests of my family, but to protect society. I certainly feel that if we in this house vote in favour of this resolution we will be doing a disservice to society and, in fact, weakening the moral fibre on which we depend so much to protect ourselves and the citizens of this country. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

[*Translation*]

Mr. J.-A. Mongrain (Trois-Rivières): First, Mr. Speaker, I want the house to know that I do not intend to take up much of its time or to repeat all that has already been so well said concerning the abolition of the death penalty.

But I do wish to congratulate the Prime Minister (Mr. Pearson) and the party leaders who decided together that party lines would not enter into this discussion and that the vote would be free. And even if this has nothing to do with this debate, Mr. Speaker, I

must say I am one of those who hope that party leaders will give their supporters more opportunities to deal with matters before us in a non-partisan manner and let them free to vote as they wish. This debate is proceeding with such serenity that, in my opinion, it is setting an edifying example.

In any case, I want to repeat what others have said earlier and what I have discovered many times myself, and that is the great surprise of a fairly large number of Canadians when they learned about the great ease with which the cabinet commuted sentences even in cases where no recommendation for mercy had been given or, indeed, in cases which involved crimes that had shocked the Canadian people. I think that such a situation has been going on for too long and it is time we put a stop to it.

As I said, Mr. Speaker, I listened with a great deal of attention to the comments that were made. Some very instructive things have been said, but I think that the speaker who impressed me most was the hon. member for Bow River (Mr. Woolliams), who made a dispassionate review of the situation. I realized that the hon. member is surely an excellent lawyer, and if I were ever charged with some crime and needed a good criminal lawyer, I think I would go to him.

There was no cheap display of emotion about his speech and I found his arguments most effective. He asked disturbing questions which I am sure will prompt the members of the house to try to find answers in all conscience.

I think this has been the debate for which members were best prepared, since I would say thousands of references and documents were quoted on the subject. We could, if necessary have agreed to forgo this debate, so that the question could be put forthwith because I feel that everyone has a rather good idea as to how he will vote. But as it is also our duty to throw light on these timely topics for the benefit of those whom we represent, this probably explains why each member wants to make his own comments.

Let us, therefore, assume our responsibilities in all conscience, in what I think is one of the most typical examples of the responsibility of the members of the house and after consulting the electorate and, up to a point, involving their conscience also.

I have studied all the letters and circulars which were sent me, and I have been struck by certain things. For instance, the letters from pressure groups or organized groups, seemed to me in some cases prompted by certain leaders rather than by the natural desire of each individual to participate in the discussion.

• (7:10 p.m.)

I wonder if this has not precisely tended to blow up artificially the influence of those organized groups which favour the abolition of capital punishment.

I have been much more impressed by the large number of individual letters I received from my riding and from all over the country because I have had contacts all over the place. I told myself that those people who have gone to the trouble of writing me personally without outside pressures, without being urged by a well incorporated, organized and set up association probably expressed more authentic personal opinions than members of organized groups.

The personal testimonials I have received at home appear to be, to a very large extent favourable to the retention of capital punishment.

Mr. Speaker, there seems to be some sort of misunderstanding on this question. I heard members talk of those mediaeval methods, of that barbaric attitude which consists in killing people, but it should nevertheless be realized that progress has been made in that area. People are no longer hanged for peccadillos, or quartered on the public square; since 1961, capital murder has been defined.

Miscarriages of justice are almost impossible in the present circumstances and the people who are sentenced to the gallows have been found guilty of capital murder beyond all doubt, and on the basis of complete evidence.

I say, Mr. Speaker, that capital punishment must be retained in the present circumstances, because we are not ready for abolition.

I shall even add, at the risk of seeming cruel to those who are against the retention of the death penalty, that a great many of them give me the impression of dreaming. They tell us that in our enlightened era, the death penalty is no longer required and, at the same time, we hear in this house very urgent requests for the setting up of judicial inquiries on organized crime, which would indicate that our enlightened era is perhaps resorting to modern methods to kill with more refinement than in the past, to commit mass murders as in the past perhaps, in short,

to kill for purposes of personal ambition and profit unthought of in the past.

It has not been proved, therefore, that our civilization has reached the point where it can do without the death penalty, which surely gives food for thought to people bent on doing wrong.

There is another thing which impressed me a great deal, Mr. Speaker, and I think that members of the house should not minimize this intervention: representatives of police forces at every level have unanimously requested the retention of the death penalty.

We, legislators, must by all means support the law enforcement officers who are certainly justified in asking us to retain the death penalty in the present circumstances, because they realize too that we are not ready for the abolition of capital punishment.

The time will come perhaps when we can abolish the death penalty. But until I am given proof that subversive activities against the established order, sometimes with violence, can be controlled in our country, I shall not accept the abolition of capital punishment.

Mr. Speaker, as long as it has not been proven to me, that reasonable prevention of organized crime has been set up here, I shall refuse to vote for the abolition of the death penalty.

As long as it not proven to me, Mr. Speaker, that we are organized to provide efficient rehabilitation of criminals here, I shall refuse to vote for the abolition of the death penalty.

As long as it has not been proven to me that we have enough prisons, modern prisons, built according to 20th-century standards, to house all those prisoners or criminals and keep them busy at something constructive, I shall refuse to let the death penalty go.

As long as we do not have here enough experts, psychologists, sociologists and, finally, specialists in all fields who will help us precisely to rehabilitate those people we want to keep in jail until they die, I say it will be illusive to advocate the abolition of the death penalty.

No. I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that we must be realistic and say to ourselves that Canada took a great step forward in 1961, with the passage of legislation defining capital crime, capital murder.

I think we have gone through a stage. The next one will entail a reform of the penal code, in which there will be gradations in crimes; the granting of a little more leeway to judges; the organization of those jails where immates will be detained for life, according to modern standards; the training of those technicians and specialists who will look after rehabilitation; better preparation for ourselves to carry out prevention, of juvenile delinquency for instance; the continuation of the war on poverty, precisely to prevent the fostering of young bandits in the most deprived sectors of society.

All these things represent the stage we have to go through today before abolishing this crime deterrent called capital punishment and to act otherwise would be deceptive, I believe.

Mr. Speaker, I will now conclude my remarks. I will vote against the abolition of capital punishment, because in my opinion it is a hasty and deceptive legislation, and before passing any such legislation, we should rather undertake the reforms I mentionned earlier, such as modern penitentiaries as well as the training of a qualified staff, and later a legislative reform to cope with this new situation.

Hon. Martial Asselin (Charlevoix): Mr. Speaker, the resolution now before us has been discussed and carefully studied for many years in various countries.

It is not the first time the Canadian parliament deals with this question. I am sure this debate will give rise to an objective exchange of views that will enlighten the Canadian people on a matter that is more and more in the mind and conscience of Canadian parliamentarians.

It was difficult for the work group which considered this question for some weeks to bring forward in this house a better method of discussion that should not appeal to one's feelings and sentimentality and partisanship.

I hope this debate goes on in this serene atmosphere, free from all strain that might have distorted the findings of our study in some cases.

Each one of us, Mr. Speaker, will have to vote freely at the end of this debate on the timeliness of abolishing or retaining in our statutes the death penalty for criminals found guilty of homicides.

May I be permitted, Mr. Speaker, at the outset of my remarks, to embark on a digression and confess to the house that, in 1960, when we dealt with Bill C-6 intended to abolish the death penalty, I took part in the debate at that time. Then I made a study of

the provisions of the Criminal Code respecting homicide and I made some reservations on the definition of this crime in our statutes.

The legislation on homicide, as defined in the act passed in 1960, does not satisfy me. At that time, I had suggested that capital punishment be suspended as long as the legislator would not succeed in establishing various degrees in murders.

I had also suggested that in the spirit of the legislation enacted in 1960, judicial error could cause irreparable wrong to some criminals.

But since that date, Mr. Speaker, after a review of the question and a closer study of the various reports of the royal commission appointed to investigate this important issue, I am not prepared, today, to uphold the argument for the abolition of capital punishment, as I had done in 1960.

However, what mostly influenced my opinion on this matter was obviously the amendment to the Criminal Code which was moved in this house, by way of Bill C-92, on May 23, 1961 by the former Minister of Justice, the hon. member for Kamloops (Mr. Fulton).

• (7:20 p.m.)

As a matter of fact, the intention of this Bill C-92 was to divide murder into two classes, namely capital murder and non-capital murder.

This bill was the long-awaited answer to a judicial need and contributed to eliminate, in several cases, judicial errors resulting from the appreciation of essential facts submitted to the consideration of judge and jury.

Since this bill was passed, the judge must impose capital punishment only in cases where a premeditated murder was committed, and even in such a case, this legislation gives the jury the authority to recommend that the convicted individual receive the clemency of the court.

Under that act, an accused sentenced to death for capital murder may *de plano* appeal to a higher court against his conviction.

As far as those who are convicted of non-capital murder, the legislation provides as punishment a sentence of life imprisonment. That, I think, was a great improvement over the former provisions of the Criminal Code.

Therefore, pursuant to that Act, persons accused of being indirect accomplices to a crime of homicide, either before or after the fact, can avoid the death penalty and be sentenced to life imprisonment.

[Mr. Asselin (Charlevoix).]

Such was not the case before. Indeed, under the former provisions of the criminal code concerning homicide, persons indirectly implicated in such a crime were treated in the same way as the main murderer and were liable to the same penalty, that is the death penalty.

To my mind, the adoption of bill C-92 has had for effect to greatly reduce the risks of judicial errors.

In the history of our courts, It has never been proven beyond doubt, that miscarriages of justice had caused irreparable prejudice to some convicts.

Statistics show that one error out of 250,000 cases was committed in all the history of some countries' courts.

I say "irreparable prejudice" because under our present legal set up, the case of a person sentenced to death can be reviewed by judges of different courts of appeal, and as a last resort, the cabinet reviews carefully each case where the death penalty has been imposed.

Bill C-92 goes still further than the recommendations in the reports from the joint committee of the Senate and the House of Commons on capital punishment; it may be remembered that this committee sat for two years, namely in 1954 and 1955.

Members in this house will recall that this committee had recommended the retention of capital punishment and had also recommended that murder should not be qualified. However, Bill C-92 defined homicide as capital and non-capital murder, thereby going beyond the conclusions of the report presented by the joint committee of the Senate and the House of Commons.

What incites me also to change my mind as regards this question is the large increase of crimes in this country. I know that the abolitionists are going to say that this should not be considered as a determining factor as far as reaching an objective conclusion on this question is concerned.

Some of the members in this house will quote statistics so as to prove that, in some of the states in the United States and some other countries, the abolition of capital punishment did not contribute to any crime increase in those countries.

This is obviously a matter of interpretation. However, I should like to emphasize the fact that, in the province of Quebec, the incidence of homicide rose sharply during the last few years.

Unfortunately, I did not have time to make statistical research in the other provinces, but I should like to put in the record anyway the statistics I have for the province of Quebec.

A survey conducted on the number of homicides committed in Quebec from 1946 to 1965 provides us with the following figures: In 1946, 36 murders; in 1947, 32 murders; in 1948, 32 murders; in 1949, 29 murders; in 1950, 34 murders. Or an average of 32 murders a year for the five year period.

In 1951, 40 murders; in 1952, 42 murders; in 1953, 43 murders;, in 1954, 32 murders; in 1955, 36 murders. Or an average of 38 murders a year for the five-year period and an increase of 13 per cent over the five preceding years.

In 1956, 40 murders; in 1957, 37 murders; in 1958, 39 murders; in 1959, 44 murders; in 1960, 47 murders. Average for these five years: 41 murders, or an increase of 12 per cent over the five preceding years.

In 1961, 57 murders; in 1962, 45 murders; in 1963, 63 murders; in 1964, 54 murders; in 1965, 65 murders. Hence an average of 57 murders a year for the five year period 1961 to 1965 incl., and an increase of 28 per cent over the five preceding years.

I would like to point out, Mr. Speaker, that between 1961-65, a period during which the cabinet commuted death sentences, in addition to the statistics which I mentioned earlier, there was a considerable increase in the number of murders in the province of Quebec.

The following figures refer to our population:

In 1951, the province of Quebec had a population of 4,055,681.

In 1956, the population reached 4,628,378 inhabitants, an increase of 14.12 per cent of the five-year period; there was a 13 per cent increase in crime in the same period.

In 1961, the province of Quebec had a population of 5,259,211, an increase of 13.6 per cent for the five-year period, but during the same period, there was a 12 per cent increase in crimes.

On December 31, 1965, there was a population of 5,700,000 in Quebec, an increase of 11.4 per cent over the previous years, whilst the murder rate for the corresponding years showed an increase of 27 per cent.

In Quebec, since 1959, all death sentences have been commuted, and there was no execution; but at the same time, the rate of murders has doubled in our province in the last five years.

These statistics, Mr. Speaker, indicate an alarming and nearly desperate situation. All the members of this house understand that the province of Quebec has had a sad experience for the last few months in this respect.

We may recall the case of an ex-convict who had been sentenced to life imprisonment and who, having been released from the penitentiary after some years by the National Parole Board, a few months later cut the throats of four children.

We all remember vividly the murder of two policemen which occurred in Montreal last year and in which the criminal, without batting an eye-lash, shot down two peace officers who were endeavouring to arrest the perpetrator of a bank robbery who had killed a person in the commission of his crime. All this shows that to my mind the time is ill-chosen to abolish the death penalty.

It will be said that it is not proven that the death penalty acts as a deterrent and can prevent a criminal from committing a crime. But what is not known is that there is no certainty either that the abolition of capital punishment would not lead to a greater number of crimes precisely because of the removal of this deterrent which is the death penalty.

It is impossible to assert that individuals who are not criminals now would not let themselves be led down the path of crime if we were to abolish capital punishment.

• (7:30 p.m.)

Mr. Speaker, from my experience in the practice of law, I believe that criminals give great importance to the penalties provided in the criminal code. How many times, in the practice of law, have we realized it.

Indeed, the bill before us provides no alternative, since the death penalty is to be replaced by life imprisonment; I submit that that is not a proper alternative.

Indeed, we do not have the assurance that the person sentenced to life imprisonment will remain there all his life since this resolution provides that the responsibility will lie with the governor in council to carry out his prerogatives concerning mercy.

Does life imprisonment mean a term of 10, 15, 20 years or more in this resolution? We do not know.

Experience has shown to date that in many cases, the parole board has released murderers sentenced to life imprisonment after a period of 10 to 12 years; and the same thing could happen when the governor in council chooses to exercise his prerogative of mercy.

We have been told, during this debate, that the abolition of the death penalty would show that our country has achieved a certain maturity, that our civilization has evolved; however, in a well-organized society, there are laws which ensure the preservation and protection of its members. Its rules and its laws must be adhered to by all individuals.

The basic rules of society are the expression of what the latter prescribes and of the penalties it provides for the violation of its rules. Without penalties, rules have no effect; and the penalty must be proportional to the crime or offence committed.

It is by practising the virtue of justice that society can secure that balance, and it is by practising concurrently the virtue of charity with the virtue of justice that the individual will respect the life and property of his fellowmen.

The third part of the resolution deals with the prerogatives of mercy and pardon which may be exercised by the governor in council. I think it is placing a very heavy responsibility on the shoulders of members of the cabinet to provide that they will consider alone each case of mercy.

That is why I would suggest that a standing committee of the house made up of members of the various political parties—or, if preferable, the justice and legal affairs committee—be asked to consider on merit each case of mercy and that a report be subsequently transmitted to the governor in council so that he can decide on the appeal for mercy.

Of course, committee reports would not necessarily be binding on the cabinet since only the governor in council is entitled to reprieve a convict.

Nevertheless, the aim of this committee's studies would be to help the cabinet, in some cases, to reach decisions and it would still minimize the remote possibility of judicial errors that may occur from time to time.

During debates in the house, several members have already expressed their dislike of hanging, the mode of execution now in use. I agree with them on this matter and I believe this very primitive mode of execution should be replaced by the gas chamber or the electric chair.

In closing, I should like to say this. We live in a society ruled by laws; peace and order must prevail in it.

Each individual forming this society must understand that the law applies equally to everyone, that every law by its definition and concept calls for a sanction and penalty proportional to the crime and offence. And it is our duty and responsibility as parliamentarians to see that those laws and their penalties are applied, if we want our civilization to continue enjoying the prestige and reputation it now has.

[Mr. Asselin (Charlevoix).]

Mr. Gérald Laniel (Beauharnois-Salaberry): Mr. Speaker, my intervention in this debate will be brief, because I do not want to repeat the arguments which were put forward so far. However, I want to show that my attitude concerning the matter of capital punishment, is serious and that I respect the opinions of others. My decision to vote against the motion before us, does not make me a propagandist of the retention, who is trying to convince the abolitionists and prove them they are completely wrong. On the contrary, I believe that, under the present circumstances, there is some good in the position of both groups and I even think it is easier to be an abolitionist in the face of the rapid social evolution of our civilized world, since abolitionists are considered as reformists and seem to be more modern than we are.

Mr. Speaker, since I am basically in favour of the retention of capital punishment, I must admit that all the arguments advanced so far have not yet convinced me of the necessity for completely abolishing from our law this punishment, that some consider as barbaric. I am ready to admit that it is desirable to use it in a more and more limited way, as we improve our penal system, but, it is hard for me to think that I shall become convinced of the necessity of its total abolishment. Besides, it is not the punishment itself which concerns me most, but rather the fact that this punishment remains a usable instrument hanging over the heads of the criminals, as the spear of Damocles.

Therefore, the resolution in its present form, gives me no alternative, except if it is amended in order to maintain the death penalty for at least a certain number of crimes, among which the murder of police officers and prison guards on duty, as well as for some capital murders. It might be desirable that in this last instance, more leeway be made available to the judge, so that he may use clemency, replacing death penalty by life imprisonment when circumstances warrant.

Capital punishment is considered by many as a deterrent, some see it as a punishment or the repayment of a debt toward the society. Others consider it as barbaric, scandalous, as contrary to our principles of christian charity. I considered all these points, I searched for an answer in statistics, the scriptures and literature published on this issue but I have always failed to convince myself that I should change my original opinion.

It is not only the question of playing with statistics, of setting forth a number of pros and cons, of appealing to our civilized spirit, but also there is another factor, which is one of personal feeling and what we feel deeply in our soul and conscience.

In regard to this issue, Mr. Speaker, we must ask ourselves whether we really want to protect society; whether we are not becoming more sympathetic to the criminal than to his victim or eventual victims. It is our responsibility to provide this additional protection to our policemen, to our law officers and to our prison guards. This is a very risky job, the danger is sometimes great and these people, who also have wives and children, risk their lives to protect society. Should we be selfish enough to deprive them from the maximum protection, even though certain groups or associations, in the name of civilization, term the death penalty as barbaric. Have you ever talked to a prison guard. Have you ever thought of gangland activities within and outside the walls of such institutions? Is there any difference, as far as a murderer is concerned, between one, two or three life sentences? He only has to say: "Put it on my bill" and he will be ready to start again the day after.

• (7:40 p.m.)

It is ridiculous to see what is being done and said in the name of liberty, human rights and civilization in this 20th century. One wonders who has more rights; the respectable, quiet and law-abiding citizen, the forces of law and order, who have the responsibility to pass and implement laws? I wonder, when I look at the activities of some of our fellow citizens. Even here in this house, Mr. Speaker, certain groups of members show more eagerness in defending criminals, spies, incorrigibles, than in defending the reputation and the integrity of the public servants; and they sometimes are prone to denounce police forces.

Another thing that strikes me is that many abolitionists are among those who are against our maximum security institutions. We saw it this week when a group of women called on us. They are against building fortresses to hold those who cannot be reformed, who cannot be saved—and there are some, believe me—but how is society going to protect itself? It is all very well to talk about rehabilitation, but it must not be done at the risk of endangering the life of the peaceful and law abiding citizens.

Coming back to the death penalty itself, those who preach its abolition are doing so mainly in the name of respect for human life. They are right, life is a sacred thing, it comes from God, and criminals should begin by respecting it. Did Marcotte really have that respect when he retraced his steps to finish off police officer Brabant, already seriously injured?

What do you think of gang killings in the underworld, like the recent ones in the United States? We also have our own underworld in Canada, in Quebec. What about the fraudulent bankruptcies and the elimination of witnesses? We are not dealing with school children and I am not ready to say that they are all mental cases.

Mr. Speaker, I start from the principle that life is sacred and that it does for an individual to dispose of it. Whoever deprives another of his life is liable to lose his own. And I add that society, through the authority which comes to it from above, has the power and right to decide if such an individual deserves to live and how he must pay his debt to society.

I do not see in this statement anything to contradict the evolution principle in our civilization but rather a protection for that civilization.

I am conscious of the fact that in many cases there is need to ask oneself to what extent a murderer is responsible for his act. After the changes made in the law of 1961, I think we can leave it to our judicial system to define responsibility and to prove premeditation in cases of qualified murder. Most lawyers admit themselves that the danger of judicial errors is now eliminated by the changes made in the law. I do not accept either the argument that an individual who commits a murder is always in an abnormal state, it is too easy a way to make excuses for the murderers.

Mr. Speaker, I agree that we should endeavour to improve the world to the extent where capital punishment would no longer be required, but we have a long way to go. In my view, retention of the death penalty in the Criminal Code in no way interferes with the efforts already launched to rehabilitate criminals, to improve our social environment and to administer justice equitably.

Even with the eventual regression of crime, as a result of the evolution of social conditions and legislation, there will always be criminals. That is why I favour retention of

capital punishment, if only to remind those who might feel inclined to make an attempt on their fellowman's life that they may be forced by society to forfeit theirs in return.

[*English*]

Mr. Heath Macquarrie (Queens): Mr. Speaker, this is an important topic, dealing as it does with the supreme and fundamental right: the right to live. The Declaration of Independence sets out that men are endowed by their Creator with certain inalienable rights, and among those are life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness.

Since the hon. member for Antigonish-Guysborough (Mr. Stewart) is not here, I thought I would get away with quoting that Republican document.

At some stages in our discussion we focus on the aspect of the right of life, so far as the accused or condemned is concerned. At other stages we concentrate on the right to live of his victims, actual and potential.

In any organized community as distinct from an anarchic state, the relation between the state and the individual is constantly of the essence. The right of the state to take life is precisely the question to which we must address ourselves as legislators in this debate. For that is the supreme assertion of the authority of the state, which represents the group, or the mass, against the individual.

I am very happy—and I hope I am not being naïve in this—that there is to be a free vote. I think that one of the good legacies from this difficult era in our public life will be the greater degree of independence in the House of Commons on the many occasions when monolithic party solidarity and unity are at least unnecessary, and often unhelpful.

I do not pretend to specialist knowledge of this subject. Indeed, since it is a broad issue involving morals, ethics and the fundamental application of the rights of the state, and of the citizens to which the state belongs, I doubt if anyone can ground the certitude of his opinions upon the basis of esoteric knowledge. Not even lawyers, in my view, have any special pre-eminance in the solution of this very important question, because this is far more fundamental than the operation of the mechanics of the law, or the appraisal of an institution.

I confess that I enter the debate with a feeling far removed from supreme overconfidence in the rightness of my view. Over many years, both before and since leaving the halls of learning for the arena of politics, I have studied, as much as I have been able to, the views of people who have written on this subject. Like many other hon. members, I have read reams of statistics.

Out of this experience, and out of my observation of Canadian conditions in this realm, I reluctantly confess that I cannot in conscience, and conscience here is our only and final guide, give my support to the abolitionist cause. I say reluctantly, because my basic emotional response and my sentiments all combine, if I may use that word—

Mr. Knowles: Be careful.

Mr. Macquarrie: —to incline me to oppose capital punishment. I therefore would designate myself as a non-dogmatic but convinced retentionist.

An hon. Member: Very good.

Mr. Macquarrie: I admire those who champion the abolitionist cause, although I note in passing that on this question on which public opinion seems so evenly divided the persuaders on the abolitionist cause seem to be heard much more in the land than those who with equal sincerity and after equally careful study and reflection support a different course.

• (7:50 p.m.)

Sometimes the retentionist is made to appear as a sort of hardhearted antediluvian who cares not for the feelings of his fellow man. Nor do I find myself impressed by the argument that the abolition of the death penalty is somehow synonymous with advancing civilization.

What is civilization? Is this not an area where we may make very subjective judgments not only from place to place, from community to community, but from age to age? In the present epoch the cultural group to which we belong in the western world seem to show an unprecedented regard for the sanctity of human life. We have vastly narrowed the grounds on which the state appropriately can take life. We have legislated against practices which shorten the life span, and we have made phenomenal advances in the war against fatal illnesses.

On the other hand, this same society has a technology which allows us to destroy one another, not in hundreds of thousands but in millions, and yet all of these developments are advances. So I cannot accept the suggestion that our advancing civilization must be assured and certified by the abolition of the state-imposed death penalty.

I listened with great pleasure and interest to the brilliant speech of the hon. member for Hochelaga (Mr. Pelletier), but even after having heard it I cannot find it in my heart to equate the abolition of capital punishment with such things as the discovery of America or the invention of the wheel.

Often it is said that it is morally wrong for the state to take life. Yesterday the hon. member for Kootenay East (Mr. Byrne) said:

> I personally am unalterably opposed to the taking of life of any creature, either by an individual or by the state—

This is a strong statement. He went on to say:

> —except unavoidably in self-defence, or to fulfil a need.

This caused the hon. member for Swift Current-Maple Creek (Mr. McIntosh) to call him a qualified retentionist, and cause the hon. member for Acadia (Mr. Horner) in a very powerful address to point to this as a underscoring of the value of the deterrent. But it does strike me that when you erect moral postulates—

Mr. Byrne: Would the hon. member allow me to ask a question?

Mr. Macquarrie: I shall listen when I am finished, and try to reply to the best of my ability.

Mr. Byrne: I simply want to correct a misunderstanding of that statement. If the hon. member will note, it was to fulfil a need—that is, any creature. The fulfilling of a need would be to kill an animal for food value. It has not anything to do with human beings.

Mr. Macquarrie: I was quoting the hon. gentleman and was not suggesting that cannibalism was acceptable, or anything of the kind.

Mr. Byrne: Animal.

Mr. Macquarrie: But once a moral postulate is erected it seems to me that the allowing for exceptions greatly undermines the moral position. To say that capital punishment is wrong, period, is a strong position. But once you argue that there are certain conditions, certain circumstances which justify death at the hands of the state, then you move the question from that of moral certainty to expediency, to utilitarianism. You ask, not is it right or wrong absolutely, but does this or that course serve best the interest of the state or of the individual.

I think we get into much of our difficulty—and yet it is hard to keep out of this area—when we start to sort out kinds and degrees of murder, and begin to place different evaluations on the type of person murdered.

Those who are asked by the state to risk their lives in the care or incarceration of the criminal are placed by society in a most exposed position. They walk with peril daily. A penitentiary guard, a policeman, if they serve society's ends surely deserve society's special protection. I am much moved by the communications which I have received from members of this goup. They speak from an exposed position. They speak from a deep and awful awareness of the danger and when they write, as did the Civil Service Association of Canada not long ago, I cannot be cold to this kind of argument:

> In the past years three penitentiary officers have lost their lives in Canadian federal penal institutions through inmate inspired disturbance or direct attack. Penitentiary officers feel that to remove the death penalty for murder committed under these circumstances would, in effect, remove the only deterrent to deliberate attacks on their lives.

I cannot be deaf to that kind of plea.

Other hon. members have developed the question of the life long sentence, the life sentence which is really for life. We all know, and society knows to its sorrow, that convicted murderers after serving a certain time have struck again at society after leaving the prison walls. And so some say, "Make a life sentence mean a life sentence." Others have already expressed their view on this. To make the life sentence a real life sentence removes all chance for rehabilitation, and knocks out completely all possibility of reform. It has already been described by others how life imprisonment itself is a living death. But the role of the prison guard in all of this is extremely dangerous.

I do not want to traverse the ground that has already been covered by some people who have gone over their 20 minutes. I hope I can finish within that limit, but the painful aspect for the sincere retentionist—and there is no monopoly of sincerity in this regard—is the awful possibility that an innocent man may be hanged. Regrettably this has happened. Legal institutions, like all human institutions, are fallible. It is a situation which would bring nothing but agony to anyone involved closely or remotely with such an irremediable and final miscarriage of justice.

But the anguish of those responsible for such an error as that, Mr. Speaker, would

surely not be greater than that of those responsible for prematurely releasing upon society one who will again take the life of his fellows. Cases of this kind are, alas, far from uncommon.

Lord Justice Darling told a British House of Commons committee that 26 years experience on the bench had convinced him that in view of the checks and safeguards of English law it is practically impossible for an innocent man to be hanged, although a great many guilty ones escape. But when the state itself allows a guilty one to escape to deal death again to a member of society, what then? Errors have been made.

Some people seem to believe that they can look at a man for a short while and know he is innocent. I do not have the omnicompetence to do that. I know psychiatrists can do much to reveal a man's mind but they cannot look into his heart and know exactly what is there. I say it is very hard to be sure and I would not want to be the one to take an unnecessary chance.

• (8:00 p.m.)

We hear much about statistics and we will hear more. I was very impressed by the statistics used by the hon. member for Lotbinière (Mr. Choquette). I think, if we look at our own country and see what has happened here in recent years under the *de facto* abolition of the death penalty, we will find statistics there that are not overly cheering; in fact they are very disturbing. To me they seem to be going in the wrong direction; they are rising.

It has been said by those who dispute this point of view that you cannot make any short-range judgment, and that you must have a long time. But can those in charge of society's welfare and security take a long time? There have been highly civilized countries—to use that expression—which have abolished the death penalty and after careful consideration of the consequences of this action have reverted to it. It is not an easy question at all; far from it.

Like many other members I was present at the last two-day debate in 1960 on this question. I heard many fine speeches then. One which I remember very well is that of Mr. Martineau, a former colleague of mine. He said something which is very applicable today, when he pointed out as an absolute certainty that if that particular bill were

[Mr. Macquarrie.]

voted down, not one additional murder would be committed.

But, how many hon. members who are listening to me here can say, consulting their own consciences, that if such a bill as this becomes law some murders which otherwise might not have been committed may be committed.

Let us search and consider that.

My learned friend from Royal said that there would be those who would quote scripture on all sides. That has been traditional. The clergymen in the south at the time of the civil war did quote many things in support of slavery, while their fellow theologians in the north found that the same doctrine gave them support.

No one has mentioned the Presbyterian church but, lest they think some Presbyterians base their views only on the grim Old Testament preachments, I would refer to a Presbyterian statement on the subject:

The right of the state to inflict capital punishment is currently being called into question.

That certainly is true.

Yet we would affirm the right of the civil magistrate to impose the death sentence for crimes like malicious and deliberate homicide. The state is given this right as the minister of God—

This is a reference to Romans 13: 1-7.

—and it shall have this right as long as evil continues to disturb the social order.

This is a religious statement, but I think it is a very meaningful observation of what we are facing up to today. So, Mr. Speaker, I am abridging my remarks in the hope that other speakers will have time. I can only say in conclusion, on the basis of careful thought, and in the hope that society might be a little safer, I feel it is in the public good that the law should remain as it is.

Mr. Winch: Might I ask a question, Mr. Speaker, of the hon. member who has just spoken?

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order. I understand that the time allotted the hon. member has expired.

The hon. member for St. Paul's.

Mr. Ian Grant Wahn (St. Paul's): Mr. Speaker, ever since the subject now before us was first raised, I have found it very difficult to decide just how I should vote on the question of the complete abolition of capital punishment. It is only very recently I have come to the conclusion, contrary to my original belief, that I must support this resolution.

From the beginning I felt that capital punishment should be limited even more than it was by the amendment passed in 1961 which made the distinction between capital and non-capital murder. Nevertheless, for a long time I believed that capital punishment should be retained in certain circumstances; for example, pre-meditated murder for gain by a sane, sober adult, or the murder of a police officer or prison guard by a criminal in the course of committing a violent crime or while escaping or attempting to escape from prison.

Like other hon. members I have received a great deal of helpful correspondence from constituents and others and have been furnished with a great deal of informational material on the subject. After reading all of this and after discussing the matter with other members, and after listening to the debate in the house, I have, after considerable hesitation, come to believe that it is now possible for us to dispense completely with capital punishment, and that it is desirable we should do so.

Perhaps because of my own difficulty in reaching a decision, I fully appreciate the strength of the arguments which can be advanced in good faith by those who believe that capital punishment should be retained. For this reason, while I will vote for the complete and immediate abolition of capital punishment, I think it would be better to follow the procedure which was followed in England, namely to pass a statute suspending capital punishment for a trial period of five years.

During the last two and a half years the cabinet, by its policy of commutation, in effect has suspended capital punishment on its own responsibility. It would be much better for this house to provide specifically for the suspension of capital punishment for a five year trial period and remove this responsibility from the cabinet.

In this five year period I hope it will become apparent to an overwhelming majority of members that at our present stage of social development we safely can dispense with capital punishment. The necessary statute providing for permanent abolition can then be passed. If however, this hope proves ill-founded, then the present law providing for capital punishment will be reinstated automatically without further argument or debate.

I have said, Mr. Speaker, that I reached my conclusion only after a great deal of difficulty. Because I know some other members at least have had the same difficulty, perhaps I may be permitted, at the risk of boring some, to retrace the tortuous course by which I reached the conclusion that contrary to my original belief I must support this resolution.

Like the rope itself, the case for capital punishment depends not upon the strength of a single strand, but upon the combined strength of a number of strands when entwined. All of us know, for example, and will have to admit, that capital punishment certainly serves one very fundamental principle of law in that it prevents repetition of the offence by the criminal; it is absolutely final and effective in this preventive function: this is one of the functions of punishment. I also believe that capital punishment has a somewhat greater deterrent effect than any sentence of imprisonment. I think each one of us can recognize this intuitively without reference to statistics.

• (8:10 p.m.)

Where there are so many variable factors involved, statistics are of doubtful value. If they are of any value, they merely indicate that the deterrent effect of capital punishment is not sufficiently great to make any very substantial difference in the rate of violent crime.

Capital punishment is also in accord with a basic feeling—perhaps a primitive one—that most of us have, that punishment should be in proportion to the seriousness of the crime. From this point of view, in executing a criminal, society does not show any lack of reverence for life. On the contrary, the execution of the criminal who has taken life without cause is meant to emphasize the reverence which society has for human life and the horror with which it regards the criminal act which destroys it.

The fact that certain other countries have abolished capital punishment is not really very helpful in view of the fact that many other countries retain it and, in any event, our circumstances in Canada may be different. Canada is a relatively young country with a relatively small and non-homogeneous population dispersed over a great area. We have very special problems in maintaining law and order, and we must find our own solutions to our special problems.

Nor do I believe that the issue before us can be resolved by reference to religious, philosophical or moral principles applied in the abstract. These principles must be applied, of course, but with specific reference to

our actual circumstances in Canada today. Most of the great religions have recognized capital punishment in certain circumstances. Surely we must all recognize that it is impossible to say that capital punishment is immoral under all circumstances. In time of war or in a society emerging from disorder, or threatening to dissolve into disorder, or in a primitive society where other means of control and restraint are not available, capital punishment for the most violent crimes is probably essential.

I very much doubt that our ancestors were any more cruel than we are. The prevalence of capital punishment for a very large number of crimes just a hundred years or so ago is probably due to the fact that at that time society had not developed an effective prison system. In the absence of other means of preserving law, capital punishment was not immoral. On the contrary, it was essential, for, without law, society itself would perish.

It also seemed to me that arguments based upon the cruelty of hanging are really not relevant in this debate. If hanging is, in fact, cruel, surely less cruel methods of capital punishment could be developed. Nor do I place much stock in arguments based upon the fact that capital punishment is ignoble or degrading. Death is ignoble or degrading only if the cause of death is ignoble or degrading. The death of Socrates was not ignoble or degrading, nor was the death of Christ: tragic, yes, but not ignoble or degrading. Certainly the death of a murderer is ignoble and degrading, but it is so because of his crime, not because of the fact that society has executed him for that crime.

The argument that all criminals including murderers are ill or are the victims of society and should, therefore, be given medical and psychiatric care and attention can, I believe, be misleading. Some criminals may be insane or ill and they may respond to medical and psychiatric care; but there are other criminals who may be abnormal in the sense that they do not understand or respect the rights of others, or do not act or respond in a normal or socially acceptable way, but who are not ill in the sense in which we usually use that term. Even more important, in many such cases we have no reason to believe, in the present state of our knowledge, that their criminal abnormality, which is so dangerous to our fellow citizens and to society, can be cured by medical or psychiatric methods.

[Mr. Wahn.]

Nevertheless, while I appreciate the strength of all these arguments, I have come to the conclusion that I should support the abolition of capital punishment although, as I have said, I would prefer to see parliament suspend it for a trial period of five years.

At one time I was also inclined to think that there should be no possibility of parole in the case of a murderer who commits a premeditated murder for gain. I have since come to the conclusion that if it is believed he can be rehabilitated, the hope of parole should be extended even to him. Possibly also a life prisoner with hope of parole is less likely to kill a prison guard or commit a serious offence in prison if he has that hope of parole.

The resolution before the house suggests that parole should not be granted in these cases unless approved by the cabinet. I have some doubt as to whether this is desirable. I would have thought it better to impose final responsibility on the parole authorities and, if any review is considered desirable, it should not be by the cabinet but by a special board having specialized experience and knowledge in the field.

In abolishing capital punishment we must recognize the very heavy responsibility we are imposing upon our judicial and parole officers in trying to decide which offenders respond to rehabilitative treatment and which do not. We must be prepared to accept the fact that at the present stage of our knowledge, there are some offenders who cannot be rehabilitated and who will have to be imprisoned indefinitely. We who support abolition cannot have it both ways. If we want to abolish capital punishment we must be prepared to accept the fact that offenders who are incurable must be detained indefinitely in maximum security institutions, and possibly in special detention units of those maximum security institutions.

In making a decision to abolish capital punishment, we are imposing certain risks on society. We are imposing risks upon those who must work with the prisoners and we are imposing some risk on fellow citizens who must live in the immediate vicinity of the institutions in which dangerous criminals are confined.

Mr. Speaker, the governing principle which determined my decision in this debate is this. The purpose of our society should be to preserve and advance human life. It must be prepared to take life but only when necessary to protect other individuals or society itself.

In conformity with this principle, history appears to record a gradual movement away from capital punishment in peaceful and well-ordered countries as they mature and as they develop alternative methods of effective control.

In primitive societies, in impoverished societies which have not developed or cannot afford effective institutions for detention and correction, or in countries at war or faced with serious disorder, capital punishment is no doubt necessary, and indeed inevitable. The real question then facing us is one of judgment. Have we in Canada reached the point where we can now abolish the capital punishment of criminals without imposing undue risks upon other citizens and society itself? Clearly this is a question on which responsible and intelligent people, acting in good faith, can have very different opinions. That is why there is such a difference of opinion in Canada which, in turn, is reflected in differences of opinion among the members of this house.

Canada has developed a wealthy, complex and relatively mature society. I believe we can afford a multitude of institutions to deal in an appropriate manner with the great variety of offenders inevitable in a complex society. We can afford to provide medical and psychiatric care for those criminals who will respond to known methods of treatment. We can afford to establish institutions or special detention units from which there can be no parole or escape for murderers who do not or cannot respond to rehabilitative treatment.

• (8:20 p.m.)

I am happy that the decision was made to have this debate on the resolution before us and not on a detailed bill. As many of my constituents have pointed out, the issue of capital punishment should really not be considered in isolation or out of context. Instead this debate should give rise to a reconsideration of the much broader social questions relating to crime and punishment and rehabilitation. As was pointed out in a newsletter from the John Howard Society of Alberta, we should consider the lack of psychiatric and other rehabilitative treatment and perhaps, indeed, the complete investigation and reform of our penitentiary system and penal practices.

For example, one of my constituents has suggested that benefits might accrue to society and to the prisoner himself if he were made to do productive work for fair wages and use such wages to help pay his keep and contribute money to persons he had injured. I am told this has been done for years in Minnesota. There is other experience we could draw upon and many worth-while possibilities we could explore.

Earlier this month the appointment of a parliamentary committee on penitentiaries was authorized. I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that the authority of this committee should be widened to consider the broader problems to which I have referred and which cannot possibly be debated here at this time. However, the deliberations of any such committee should not be permitted to prejudice or delay the present resolution, which I hope will be supported by a large majority of members from every party in the house.

Mr. David MacDonald (Prince): Mr. Speaker, more than one person who has spoken in this debate has said that, while listening to all the various speeches, he has not yet been convinced. I have been struck by the fact that in many ways what we have in this exercise is not really a debate, inasmuch as we are not taking close note of the various arguments that are presented and then weighing them to find how they equate with our own points of view. If I am looking for a serious and lively discussion on this issue, I merely have to retire a few feet behind this curtain and thereupon jeopardize all my opinions and ideas. It seems that to deal with what appears to be a highly insoluble problem we should all retire behind the curtain until we have reached a decision and then come forward and announce the result.

I may not have too many opportunities —indeed, I hope I shall not have too many opportunities—to disagree with my hon. colleague from the constituency of Queens (Mr. Macquarrie), I find that in this particular debate I am in considerable disagreement with him. The hon. member began his remarks by saying that surely a fundamental question to be raised here is the right of the state to take life. I do not think this is the fundamental question. The fundamental question on the part of the state is the necessity to take life. That, to me, is indeed the question we should be wrestling with in this forum.

I hope that in the course of my remarks I may say very clearly what is to me a position that has grown out of a number of years of association with those to whom we refer generally as criminals. I might say that I have probably spent more time behind bars

and in prison than any other member in this house, and I am somewhat proud to make that assertion.

An hon. Member: You are not that old.

Mr. MacDonald (Prince): An hon. member says that I am not that old. Age does not have too much to do with it. During my years at theological college I was fortunate enough to be prison chaplain. There I became acquainted in a very close way with a number of people who had been convicted of a variety of offences all the way up to and including murder. At a later date I was fortunate enough to visit, in the city of Chicago, a halfway house to which for further reformation some of the most incorrigible and dangerous offenders had been released after serving sentences. In all my experience with a variety of criminals it became obvious to me that many of the superficial conclusions we have drawn about people who commit criminal offences are highly incorrect.

I believe there are far too many of us in this house who make an easy division between those who are involved in some kind of crime, no matter what that crime may be, and ourselves. There is no such easy black and white division in humanity. Those who run afoul of the law, those who inhabit our various prisons and penitentiaries, are really not that much different from ourselves. The various motivations for their crimes are part and parcel of the same motivations that we experience daily, and we must try to do a much better job of understanding how they arrived in such an unfortunate position.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. MacDonald (Prince): One of the arguments that has been used, and will be used, is this kind of indefinite referral from time to time to moral law. Very often in backing up such references to the moral law there is referral to the scripture. In my profession I must admit that I am not unfamiliar with various portions of the scripture, but I often find that in dealing with people who like to quote scripture a little knowledge is a dangerous thing.

Often people who desire to do so can find a text in the Old or New Testament to support their position, and they use this text as a proof text, out of context on a pretext. That is the kind of distortion of Biblical text that I am not going to tolerate. If I had the time, which I have not because Mr. Speaker will not allow it, I could prove almost anything by the use of various scriptural texts. It is not this kind of isolated quotation from here and there that proves any position to be the right and infallible one. If one wants to make a serious appraisal of the scripture and the Christian position he should examine the total text.

What are the overriding and fundamental assertions of Christianity? If you take a serious approach to this question you will find, I think, that the teachings and practices of Our Lord and His followers was much different, in terms of His attitude to the criminal and social offenders, than we are often inclined to believe from these various texts that are hurled at us.

I shall not at this point make use of a variety of texts to prove what to me is a fundamental and overriding concern of the Christian gospel, that of acceptance, forgiveness and love. This was ultimately proved by Christ's own handling of those who were criminal offenders at the time of His own execution. One of the concerns that is uppermost in the minds of all of us, or it should be, is indeed the protection of society; and truly it has been stated that one of our fundamental, if not the most fundamental, concerns here is that society is truly protected.

When you come to the question of the protection of society, the arguments often go something like this: We do not really know what dangers we will be introducing to society by abolishing the death penalty; we do not want to take the risks of doing away with that protection and inflict untold misery on people in our society. That is the argument, is it not? But what of the other side of that argument? May there not be some dangers to society in retaining the death penalty?

• (8:30 p.m.)

What proof has been advanced in this house that retaining the death penalty will provide some increased advantages to our society? Should we not be fair and ask the question: Do we perpetrate, continue and prolong harm to society by retaining the death penalty? Surely, if one side of that question can be asked, the other side should be asked as well. The burden of the proof has, by and large in our particular time, been upon the abolitionist. Let us hear, then, from those who defend retention. I feel, as the hon. member for Queens said, that the abolitionists have been speaking much more because they have something definite and conclusive to say.

Surely, if we are concerned about the protection of society, it is primarily a custodial concern. If you are going to advance the argument that by having the death penalty as a deterrent you are now protecting society, then let us revert to those golden, bygone days when we could execute people for the merest kind of social offence. Nobody would accept that position today. Then why should we accept the assertion that capital punishment is proper for one kind of crime but not for another? We are I submit illogical at that point.

There is, in our concern here, that great question of deterrence. Time and again it has been raised, and I am sure it will continue to be raised until the conclusion of this debate. At rock bottom, the thing which prevents us from removing capital punishment is the thought that somehow or other, it is going to deter a man who is contemplating a certain crime if he realizes that the penalty for it will be capital punishment. Is it a deterrent? I can say, as a result of having spoken to many hundreds of people for hours in prisons, that I have yet to meet one man behind bars who even intimated to me that the fear of the punishment he would receive for his offence would have in any way prevented him from committing it. Indeed most offenders with whom I have talked said it never even entered their minds. I have yet to meet an offender who did not say: I never expected to be caught. These men did not expect to be caught. When these people commit crimes, does anyone believe they are going to take the time to think of what the consequences of their acts might be from the standpoint of the administration of justice?

When we talk about fear as a deterrent, we must also ask the other question: Is it possible that fear of the death penalty may, for some people at some time, be a compulsion to commit a capital crime? I feel that at times it has been. A man has recently written a book that has gained quite a bit of popularity. His name is Bill Sands. Some of you may have read the book which is titled, "My Shadow Ran Fast". Mr. Sands is not a man who committed the ultimate offence, but is a man who has spent many years in notorious prisons, one of the major ones being San Quentin. He knew men who had committed terrible crimes. Caryl Chessman was one of his acquaintances. He said in his book and in public interviews that he found men behind bars who were saying that this business of being locked up like an animal was so bad, so meaningless an existence, that they would be willing to take a chance on murdering either a fellow prisoner or a guard so they would be quickly and speedily dispatched from this world.

Let us not think that by keeping the death penalty and locking men up in our institutions year after year we are protecting our prison guards. At times we may be doing the reverse of that. More than one prisoner behind bars today will tell you that he would much rather find a way to end his life quickly than to drag out this kind of meaningless existence. There is a great deal that needs to be done within our whole penal system, a system that we think is effective. We talk time and again about how valuable the fear of punishment is in the protection of society. If the fear of punishment is effective, I ask this question: Why is it that more than two thirds of those who are serving in our penitentiaries at this moment will, in all likelihood, return after their release, having committed other crimes? Does that sound like protecting society by some sensible kind of institutionalized justice? I think it is an atrocity that we put up with this kind of inferior system. Surely we should give much greater consideration to the fact that it may well be that the fear we are creating may do more harm in our society, may create more social hostility, than any danger that would be involved in the removal, once and for all, of the method of capital punishment.

Now, I suppose I have been fairly emotional in this debate. I am an emotional person at times. We have been told by the press that we were going to have an emotional debate, so we do not want to let the press down. Why is it we are having an emotional debate? Surely this should not be that emotional an item. Rarely have we dealt with such an issue which involved so few people. This is such an emotional question that it is not wise to get behind the curtain if you do not want to become involved in one of these emotional debates.

Why is it an emotional debate? Is it because of a tremendous feeling of antipathy, a sense of revenge, which we feel when a particularly horrible crime is committed? We want to see that person get what is coming to him. Is it also because of the fact there is a presupposition throughout our whole social organization that in order to control the relationship of men in our society we must always have in the background some certain element of fear? Far too much of our social

control is registered at the level of fear. It is a sad sort of thing, I think, that we have come to accept this as a fact, that the instrument of fear must be used in working out ways for our society to control our comings and goings, our human patterns in society.

I am even somewhat dissatisfied with this motion which is before us. I feel that the movers of this resolution have their feet in both worlds. They are against capital punishment but they have also put in that safeguard of life imprisonment. In other words, they are doing away with one fear deterrent and putting another in its place. Surely some time in our society we must come to the point where we can free these fear ridden, hostile people who offend our society and control them by some other means than blind punishment and directed social hostility. I hope the time has come when we can take some positive action in this regard. The hon. member for St. Paul's (Mr. Wahn) has suggested that perhaps we are not quite ready to take the risks the hon. member for Hochelaga (Mr. Pelletier) urged us to strive for today. Perhaps we will have to adopt the British solution of a five year period in which we really give this thing a test. I would vote for that, because at least we would be making a step in the right direction. I cannot vote for anything less than that, really, because the retention of capital punishment in any form, for any criminal offence whatever, is in effect saying that the retention of capital punishment is a right and proper system for our society. I cannot agree with this.

I hope that we are in a period where we can accept what I believe the majority of opinion of this country has accepted in a passive way for the past three years. I hope we can take enough responsibility, show enough desire in this house to be in favour of something that says something tremendously important about the dignity of each and every individual and his relationship to his fellow man.

• (8:40 p.m.)

[*Translation*]

Mr. Jean Berger (Montmagny-L'Islet): Mr. Speaker, I do not intend to be very long, but I wish to indicate clearly what stand I shall take, as other members will, when the time comes to vote on the matter now before us.

Naturally, we are discussing a disturbing, emotional matter; I might even say that while participating in such a debate, there is somehow a feeling that one's neck is in the noose.

[Mr. MacDonald (Prince).]

Nevertheless, most of the speakers who spoke before me managed to come through with flying colours, and I feel I should have no difficulty in expressing my opinion on the matter.

However, I am in a slightly difficult situation. I have, as many other members, made several inquiries in my riding, in the last few months, indeed for over a year now, inviting my constituents to let me know how they feel about this debate, that is, the abolition or retention of capital punishment.

The response of my constituents has not been very strong; in fact, the percentage was very small. I do not know whether they were embarrassed to speak, or what else. At any rate, if I had considered only the letters I received, the decision would have been that much easier. But I felt among the people of my riding and among the people of the province of Quebec a certain reticence to depart from this system of justice called capital punishment.

Then, of course, I thought of the attitude I should take myself and I came to the conclusion that I had no other alternative. There may be some who would be inclined to fear that in taking position against such a measure, perhaps against the will of the people they represent, they might commit political suicide. At any rate, I believe it would be preferable to make known my position because if I did not act as I do, I would feel guilty of betraying the sacred principles supported by the most unfaltering and most serious beliefs.

Of course, there might be a very easy way out: one could sit in one's place, let the others do the talking and when the time comes to vote, go along with the majority. Or again, if I had simply followed the desire which may not have been sufficiently expressed by the people of my riding, but which I think I detected, I could have said: "Well, I rely on what the people of my riding have told me." But I refuse to play the part of Pontius Pilate and wash my hands of it all, hiding behind the feelings of the population which might not be sufficiently well informed regarding the problem we are discussing today. Therefore, I refuse to play the part of Pontius Pilate, and in a debate of this kind, I must make my opinion known freely, sensibly, honestly and conscientiously, facing up to my own responsibilities, according to my conscience, in that respect.

Naturally, I may say that I have great respect for the opinions which have been

expressed but I do not share the same views; I respect somebody else's opinion because any human being has a right to his own opinions and I make a duty of respecting this right which is one of the most sacred to man.

I should wish, however, that a greater number of people would get more information and more literature concerning abolition or retention of the death penalty, as I had time to do myself and, no doubt, most of the representatives of different counties of this country in this house for the past two or three years. If more people had been able to become informed in this way, it would be perhaps easier for them, thanks to references which would enlighten them on the situation, to express their feelings in this house.

My interest in this matter is not recent, because several years ago already I was closely interested on account of my work at that time as a news commentator on radio and television in a crime, a legal case, a trial which made the rounds of the legal circles in Quebec city, and since I did not live very far from where the alleged crime had been committed, I followed the case closely. I was a little excited to see how the case had been dealt with; as a matter of fact, it came up again not so long ago, and it raised doubts among the people on various aspects of justice. And, of course, I also discussed with learned colleagues, lawyers—a profession which I respect, I wish to add in passing—but I cannot agree with what some of them told me and what has been repeated here: If you were a lawyer, if you ever had to plead some cases. I repeat, with all due respect to the honourable members of the legal profession, that I cannot agree that it is an over-riding criterion for a better assessment of the case for the retention or the abolition of capital punishment, for, in my opinion, the spirit, or if you prefer, the concept of justice does not necessarily require legal knowledge or great legal know-how to express itself. It is something that is felt, it is something which has to do with the heart and the spirit, and I believe that any right-minded person is also in a position to form an objective opinion on such matters.

It is not necessary to let ourselves be mesmerized by high-sounding words such as criminology, penology, psychology and so on. We must consider the matter objectively.

Looking at the members gathered in this house, I ask those who have made up their minds and those who may still be in doubt what would be their reaction if they were called upon, let us say tomorrow, to sit on a jury who would have to decide whether a fellow human will live or will have to forfeit his life. Perhaps, in this way they would see whether they could express their views with as much ease. They would have to face the learned and moving pleas of counsel for the defence and of the prosecutor who seek, each in his own way, to impress those men or women that have been selected to decide the issue.

I had an opportunity to attend a number of trials, and that is roughly what I witnessed, It was claimed that people who could afford it made sure to retain the services of a skilled criminal lawyer to defend them.

I even saw one of our great criminal lawyers of the province of Quebec defend a poor chap accused of manslaughter; he felt so secure that he was sleeping in the dock. He said: My lawyer will fix it up for me. As a matter of fact, everything went well, but this cannot always be expected. At some trials, one may wonder, for instance, whether there should not rather be some equality, when one sees the difference between the amounts spent by the crown to prosecute the offender, and by the accused; if the latter has rather limited means, there is then a disparity which, in my opinion, is not normal. That is why, when one often attends trials, one wonders, if the man could afford one of the most outstanding criminal lawyers, whether he would not stand a better chance of having his case settled, of saving his life, of escaping the noose. This is a further reason which prompts me to speak in favour of the abolition of the death penalty.

Now, the death penalty itself has been referred to on several occasions and in various ways. Is it really an effective deterrent? That is the point. There is surely room for doubt. Can it be asserted that the threat of the death penalty has ever prevented anyone from committing murder? Surely not. Many instances, many quotations could be given.

And then, why all this secrecy surrounding the death of a criminal if it is to be used as a deterrent? In certain African countries, in Saudi Arabia, I believe, not only is the law of retaliation applied, but rather barbarous punitive measures are also taken.

For theft, for instance, they are satisfied simply to cut off the hand of the thief in the public square. I grant you it is rather radical, but it seems that it works out there. Nevertheless, these are barbaric methods, but

this represents somewhat a shameful execution, because in the system we know today an execution is carried out on the sly, generally after the twelve strokes of midnight.

The trial is public, the sentence is public, but when the time set for the execution comes around, it is carried out before a few select witnesses in the small hours. How do you think this can deter? And what results can it have on a criminal who may be recognized as such at a later date?

If punishment were to be meted out in public, as it used to be, there could be grounds for discussion. In any event, I too agree that the criminal should be in a position not to do any harm. Abolition deserves a try.

• (8:50 p.m.)

Obviously, there is nothing perfect on this earth. Society will always be imperfect. Punishment will always have to be meted out. It seems this is a hard fact of our social life. But capital punishment produces no good; everyone is aware of it, everyone admits it. It makes the condition of man more distressing than it need be. The fate of man will be no worse if capital punishment is abolished.

These are great hopes that abolition will improve society. Nothing is lost through abolition of capital punishment, society is not being jeopardized in any way. It may be, and I was most interested by the opinions of the previous speaker, that we will do some little good in working at finding other solutions to this problem. Mr. Speaker, we should stop to consider the root of the evil. Who is truly responsible? Perhaps we should not always punish those who disobey the law. Most criminals today are the victims of a still badly-organized society which has been unable, in the 20th century, to clear away its many slums. There are also other reasons. Let us not forget that many were taught to kill in cold blood—those who fought in world conflicts, who were in the Korean war, for example.

There are also deficiencies at home, parents who are too often irresponsible. There are many factors: the unhealthy climate of our penitentiaries and other institutions where criminals are further taught the ways of crime rather than rehabilitated. where young prisoners are perverted by older ones. These are also sources of evil and they too should be dealt with.

It is all very well to say that we should continue along the present lines, but we should look around us and strike at the root of the evil. It is the evil itself that must be cured. It is not simply a question of legal murder by hanging, the electric chair or the gas chamber. All these things should be studied, all the more so because there are many other reasons for a deeper and more appropriate study.

And when you look at the roots of the evil, you see a spread of firearms. You can get them with the greatest of ease. There is also television which spoils many of our young people, who are watching programs that are surely unsuitable. At Christmas, when gifts are received, most toys are murderous weapons such as guns and revolvers. Kids learn at a tender age.

Everything should be examined and, as I said, we should go directly to the source of evil. Obviously, I cannot personally endorse the statement found on page 60 of the English version of the white paper on capital punishment sent to us by the Minister of Justice:

> The fact that there was no known Canadian instance of the execution of an innocent person indicated the effectiveness of present procedures by way of trial and executive review and this suggests that the risk of error does not present a reasonable argument for abolition in Canada.

Many members who have spoken before me had the opportunity to take a stand on that. Yet, it seems to me that there have been such instances. In Quebec city, many years ago, a nephew was hanged for the murder of his aunt but his uncle, on his deathbed —I do not remember his name and I was thinking of Giroux, but I do not know—confessed that he himself had killed the old aunt. He recovered his health and he has not been seen since.

This is just a case I am referring to in passing. There are others that raised many comments and made the headlines. In my opinion, the case of Wilbert Coffin was never clearly settled. It was discussed and will keep on being discussed for many years. Other cases were also submitted by the other hon. members.

So, there still remains the possibility of mistakes. These could be eliminated, and in a most simple way.

Obviously, there are certainly improvements to be brought about before taking perhaps such a decision. The Criminal Code should be amended. There will surely be amendments proposed to the National Parole

Board, and here I must admit that I had to read over this paragraph (c) several times:

> Providing that no person upon whom a mandatory sentence of life imprisonment is imposed shall be released from imprisonment without the prior approval of the Governor in Council.

I had some doubts as to the effectiveness of this paragraph, and I still have a few reservations to make about it. Others may have succeeded in making a better analysis of it. At all events, I would also be inclined to fear certain repercussions as was explained, I think, by the hon. member for Bow River (Mr. Woolliams) this afternoon, with regard to this paragraph and its possible implications for certain or all members of the cabinet in particular. At any rate, some changes should certainly be made in the parole board.

There might be some way also to proceed with justice itself. I understand that loathsome crimes are committed and that may be why a definite hesitation to do away with this medieval system of capital punishment seems to be felt in the province of Quebec at present. Well, several cases occurred, as was said by several people, and that is when emotions became involved. I understand there is the Marcotte case, and the Santa Claus case, there is the Dion case; these are very sad, obviously.

But if the workings of justice are examined in these cases, there may also be improvements to be made. It seems to me, and I am not so well informed on legal matters, I admit, I am not a lawyer, it seems to me very strange that in the Marcotte case, for instance, there were three persons involved. Fournelle, the accomplice, was taken aside and told: "You are going to help us. You are going to tell on your partner in crime and if you tell us, you will save your life."

What do we do, then, with a gangster who is as guilty as his partner if not more, who may also have done the shooting? By letting him think that his life will be spared, we make him perhaps not more of a criminal than he was, but more base and vile, since he will be used to prove his companion's guilt. And what will happen to him? He will be sentenced to some years or a lifetime in prison, but his life will be spared and he will be used against the other culprit.

It seems to me that such deals have no place in today's society. That is another reason why I go on record as in favour of the abolition of the present system.

You know that a dangerously close margin separates revenge from punishment in the application of the death penalty. There may be another argument. Some people think that prisoners get too much pity. They wonder what will be done with them. They say that it will cost a great deal to the state if they are sentenced to life imprisonment.

For those who had an opportunity to read a bountiful literature, for instance for those who are interested in birds, there was a prisoner known as the Birdman of Alcatraz, who wrote marvellous things about birds while in prison. Several generations of young and older people are taking advantage today of his masterly research.

Many have certainly had the opportunity to read books by Caryl Chessman, this American whose death sentence was commuted several times before he was finally executed. He had already begun to make a fine contribution.

I heard some mention that in a few years when psychology will have made some progress, it would perhaps be advisable to deal again with this matter and to consider then the opportunity of abolishing capital punishment.

Therefore, while we are waiting for science to develop and for us to become more intelligent, all we have to do, it seems, is to wait. It seems to me that such an attitude means: Let us remain barbarians, wait until science has made further progress; then we shall become more human again. This is, perhaps, too strong a language, but, obviously, it reflects, in a way, the views of many people.

Consequently it seems to me there is surely a way of ending this practice described by many, and I am one of them, as meaningless in the modern world.

I do not intend to quote the Bible. On the other hand, it is amazing that so many denominations have drawn from it for all the literature that we have received. The majority of people, those who belong to Christendom, seem to share the opinion that the time has come to show a little more respect for human life and to put an end to those executions that can no longer be justified in this twentieth century. I do hope that by the end of this debate, many will keep on looking for information, reading the documents they received and discussing with friends and fellow citizens—two heads are better than one—and that we shall find all together the best solution, the most desirable one, which will provide for the upholding of law, order, and authority.

Mr. Speaker, I thank you for having so patiently listened to my remarks. I will now yield the floor, with pleasure, to the others who would like to express their views on the subject.

• (9:00 p.m.)

[*English*]

Mr. John Gilbert (Broadview): Mr. Speaker, I would preface my remarks by paying the highest tribute possible to three Torontonians, Arthur Maloney, Q.C., Hon. Frank McGee, and Arthur Martin, Q.C. for their fine and effective work in bringing to the attention of the Canadian public the problems of the abolition of capital punishment.

I would also like to complete the record with regard to the Presbyterian church position set forth by the hon. member for Queens (Mr. Macquarrie) where he quoted from a Presbyterian document as follows:

> The right of the State to inflict capital punishment is currently being called into question.
>
> Yet we would affirm the right of the civil magistrate to impose the death sentence for crimes like malicious and deliberate homicide.

Then he used a quotation from Romans in support of this.

I might add that the statement he quoted is the only official statement of the Presbyterian church in Canada on the question of the death penalty, but recently this has been under review, and the 91st General Assembly appointed a special committee in 1965 to consider this question and report to the 92nd General Assembly in June, 1966. The Synod of British Columbia, and at least a dozen of the 49 presbyteries in the church, have adopted resolutions calling for abolition of the death penalty. Therefore it seems to me that the Presbyterian Church in Canada is looming in the direction of the abolition of the death penalty, and I think the hon. member for Queens would permit me to add that to the statement he quoted.

This afternoon the hon. member for Swift Current-Maple Creek (Mr. McIntosh) prefaced his remarks by saying he was taking the position taken by the young Conservatives with regard to the retention of capital punishment. I would add that this does not necessarily embody the position taken by young Canadians in general.

The hon. member for Royal (Mr. Fairweather) set forth the poll that was conducted in his son's class. I can reply with the same kind of poll conducted in my son's class,

concerning the position of young people with regard to the abolition of capital punishment.

Today all members of the house received a copy of a letter from the Student Christian Movement which reads:

> The Student Christian Movement in the University of Toronto has asked me to express its concern with respect to the forthcoming motion and debate on capital punishment. The cabinet of the S.C.M., after much thought and discussion on the subject, has recorded its unanimous disapproval of such a penalty, no matter what the crime, and its decision is based on all grounds, both moral and objective. We urge you to consider our conviction in this matter, and to vote in favour of the abolition of the death penalty.

The letter was signed by the president of the Student Christian Movement.

There are two aspects of capital punishment with which I would like to deal. The first is the religious view, the position that a religious person may take, based on his religious faith. The second aspect is the question of compensation for victims of criminal violence, and in particular for the widows and dependents of victims of the crime of murder.

Concerning the religious view there is a great diversity of thinking among Christians on the question of capital punishment. All of us have received letters from individuals, and briefs from organizations, setting forth their different views. I think it is fair to say that most Protestant churches favour abolition, with a few fundamentalists disagreeing with the general view. Roman Catholics in the main agree with abolition, and I was deeply impressed with a lecture given by Father Kelly, president of St. Michael's College in Toronto, before the Society for Abolition of Capital Punishment. I ask your indulgence, Mr. Speaker, to quote some parts of his speech. He said:

> The voice of Protestant ministers and Jewish rabbis has been heard. If the Roman Catholic voice has been heard, it has generally been the voice of Catholic laymen. I feel obliged to be here because I think it necessary to add at least one Roman Catholic priest's voice to the crusade . . .
>
> The first point I should like to make is that I see no theological or moral basis for retention and I see both theological and moral reasons for abolition . . .
>
> Now it seems to me that punishment is by definition retributive; it pays back irrespective of the intention of the authority which imposes it. The big question is whether some substitute for capital punishment pays back enough. At this point another necessary consideration intervenes: a human punishment must always be directed to the good of society. A punishment which would prejudice rather than promote the good of society is plainly not a just punishment irrespective of the guilt of the offender or the authority of the punisher. The point I am trying to make here is that it is seriously questionable whether retribution alone ever provides a

sufficient motive for punishing. If I seem to labour this point it is simply because the die-hard retentionists are not satisfied when the obvious lack of reform necessarily implied by the death penalty is buttressed by the proof that capital punishment is no deterrent to the so-called capital crimes. The die-hard retentionist comes back to the argument on retributive grounds, and retributive grounds alone. He comes back to the point where it seems to me he must logically insist that inflicting suffering on an offender is justified in itself, an end in itself, regardless of the consequences whether they be good or bad. The crime seems to him to warrant pain and the degree of pain is determined by the gravity of the offence. Vindication is made a sovereign and self-justifying end. The modern conscience rejects this and I think that on this point the modern conscience is right.

He continues:

The death penalty is obviously not adapted to purposes of reform. This element can in no way be suggested as a justification for retention of capital punishment. Neither can retribution. The "life for a life" appeal is made on emotional rather than rational grounds. It is rather curious that this is the only instance in modern law where we try still to maintain a perfect matching of the crime and the punishment for it. If one man stabs another we do not insist on stabbing him in return; if he victimizes another by perjury, we do not in turn victimize him by perjuring him. The "life for a life" may have the appearance of justice but it is appearance only. To object that the indignation of society at an act of murder is different from and needs an expression different from that shown toward other crimes puts the burden of proof on the objector. Death of the offender is not the only way of expressing indignation. Whether it is the most practical way can be decided only on the basis of empirical investigation. This is precisely the area in which it has been demonstrated beyond any reasonable doubt that the death penalty for murder does not achieve the ends alleged for having it in our law books; it does not reform; it does not deter; it is purely vindictive and, as such, does society no good at all.

• (9:10 p.m.)

It is not the only way or even the best way of upholding the divine law and it does not promote human betterment. The empirical evidence available to us in this moment in history does not allow a case to be made for retaining capital punishment for murder nor for maintaining that it is the only or best way of registering our indignation at those who take the lives of others.

I would also like to note, Mr. Speaker, that the Vatican state retains the death penalty but no longer carries out executions. Indeed the Pope frequently appeals for clemency. I recall attending Holy Blossom Temple in Toronto in the fall of 1964 where I heard Rabbi Powell give the position of the Jewish faith with regard to the abolition of capital punishment. He stated that although the Old Testament calls for the death penalty, there was abundant evidence in the Talmud which supported abolition, and indeed the Jewish faith has taken this position.

The religious persons in favour of retention of the death penalty use mostly selected Old Testament texts with an occasional New Testament text to support their position. This is a wrong approach to the problem. What we are called upon to do is to strive for that mind which was in Jesus Christ and to bring it to bear upon the issues of our time. The New Testament gives us much guidance on the problem, not in the form of a set of answers, but in developing an attitude and a concern to find the ways and means of loving God with our whole being and our neighbour as ourselves. Slavery is an issue which provides an example. There is no specific Bible text prohibiting slavery, yet when we take the Bible as a whole and strive to walk by the spirit, slavery is unjust and evil. So with capital punishment. We should not approach these issues by asking what this verse or that verse says, but by bringing an elightened and compassionate conscience to the issues. It is not what the Bible says in this specific verse, literally interpreted, but what it says to us through its total message interpreted in terms of today's conditions that is relevant.

To take a Christian approach, Mr. Speaker, we must find out what is the situation. We must see what is wrong and use our best reasoning to deal helpfully and effectively with the problem, always keeping in mind the social ethic of reverence for life. Therefore, a necessary part of the Christian approach is to discover how capital punishment works out. We have had difficulty since 1961 because of the distinction between capital and non-capital murder, and the statistics have been rather difficult to interpret. However, in recent years the average number of convictions for murder in the United States has been slightly more than 8,500 and the average number of executions has been slightly less than 35. The statistics show with remarkable unanimity that neither the presence of the death penalty nor the frequency of the executions acted as a deterrent to murder. As it is now applied the death penalty is nothing but an arbitrary discrimination against an occasional victim. The victims tend to be selected on a very emotional basis in which the prejudices of society find expression.

The great majority of executions are of persons who, because of ignorance, poverty or other reasons, are unable to secure adequate legal counsel for themselves, while criminals of a higher economic or social status find

legal means for evading execution. The possibility of the death penalty can influence jurys to acquit persons actually guilty of murder, thus contributing to the miscarriage of justice. So long as they are administered by fallible human beings, courts will be subject to error. All other judicial errors, upon discovery, in some measure can be corrected and repaired; a judicial error culminating in an execution, however, is totally irreparable.

Without minimizing justice, the Christian must find his answer to the problem in compassionate concern. This is not sentimental romanticizing over a criminal, but a recognition that since man was made in the image of God, his life and blood are sacred, and that the major concern is his rehabilitation. Vengeance must give way to forgiveness and reconciliation. This means that the primary concern of correctional institutions is rehabilitation and restoration based upon informed compassion and humane wisdom.

The Christian has a continuing task of interpreting to the community the kinship of all human beings, and the depth of our concern is based on the fact that he is a human being and our brother under one God and Father of us all.

The second aspect I am going to deal with, Mr. Speaker, is compensation for victims of criminal violence. In murder cases there usually is a proper and deep public concern for the families of the victims. The loss of the head of a family results, among other things, in serious financial hardship for the widow and dependant children. The community must show as much, if not more, concern for the widow and the dependants for the loss suffered as it does for the reformation and rehabilitation of the offender.

In England a white paper on compensation for victims of crimes of violence was approved by way of motion on May 5, 1964 by the House of Commons and on May 7 by the House of Lords whereby a criminal inquiries compensation board was directed to be set up to compensate victims of criminal violence and which included compensation for the spouse or dependants of persons fatally injured.

This board operates in much the same manner as our workmen's compensation board, and in the case of a fatal injury any compensation awarded to the spouse or dependants is assessed on the same principles as a claim under the Fatal Accidents Act, except for a restriction in the calculation of the loss of income of the deceased. This scheme is a major breakthrough in the development of our laws concerning victims who have suffered as a result of crimes. It is a recognition that not only must the offender be punished but, equally as important, the victim must be compensated. To my knowledge only England, New Zealand and California have introduced this type of legislation. Canada needs similar legislation and Canadians are entitled to demand it immediately in our move forward with our treatment of offenders for crimes.

May we be granted wisdom, vision and courage, Mr. Speaker, as we move forward in the full brotherhood of man and the fatherhood of God.

Mr. Joseph P. O'Keefe (St. John's East): Mr. Speaker, I suggest it might be useful at this time if, for a moment or two we were to think about what we are being asked to do here tonight and what we have been asked to do in the last couple of days. It seems to me we are talking about the abolition of capital punishment when in effect capital punishment now has been almost abolished. The only area in which capital punishment now obtains is premeditated coldly calculated murder and also murder of some particular individuals, such as policemen.

The hon. member for Queens (Mr. Macquarrie) impressed me very much tonight when he said if we vote down this resolution Monday night not one additional murder will be committed; not one that is certain. If we do not, I will leave someone else to answer that question.

• (9:20 p.m.)

Mr. Speaker, my good friend the hon. member for Kootenay East (Mr. Byrne) said we should be Christ-like, and that we should in effect turn the other cheek. I suggest to him that the same Christ took a whip and drove the money changers out of the temple. He was not a namby-pamby.

The hon. member opposite, for whom I have the greatest respect, representing a Prince Edward Island riding the name of which I cannot remember, suggested, if in fact he did not state, that most of the criminals behind bars would prefer to hang rather than be imprisoned. I find that difficult to accept. I had a little to do with the commutation of one man's sentence of death to life imprisonment. It seemed to me that that man was very happy when he received this news.

I have heard it said by retentionists, of which I am one, not without some difficulty, that they base their conclusions on the fact that life ends at the grave. I cannot believe that because I do not believe life ends at the grave, and in that regard I am in very good company, including a succession of Popes, one of which was Pius XII. Another who believed as I was St. Thomas Aquinas.

I did not think I would have to refute a speech made by a Catholic priest, but someone had the courtesy to send me a copy of one made by Father Kelly. I do not intend to attempt to refute his speech at this time, but the quotation of the hon. member seemed to concentrate on retribution only. There are many other reasons for punishment and retribution. Surely the important part of punishment is its deterrent effect. I am not interested in retribution, as I hope I am not a very revengeful person.

One of the questions we have to ask ourselves is whether the death penalty is a deterrent, and would its removal be helpful in protecting innocent victims? It seems to me the essence of the abolitionists' case is the sanctity of human life. Yet it is for that very reason, the fact that I do value so highly the sanctity of human life, that I must oppose the complete abolition of the death penalty. I am concerned about convicted criminals, but I am far more concerned about the innocent victims and, above all, the possible future victims of criminals.

The ultimate justification of any punishment, Mr. Speaker, is not only that it is a deterrent, but that it is an emphatic denunciation by the community of a crime, and from this point of view there are some murders which, in the present state of public opinion, demand the most emphatic denunciation of all, namely the death penalty.

Saint Thomas Aquinas said, "The slaying of an evildoer is lawful inasmuch as it is directed to the welfare of the whole community". Every human being is a social being by nature, needing to live in society and not being self-sufficient. He cannot attain his perfection without the help of others.

Social living requires the setting up of a government and order. The government of a country has the right, indeed the duty, to do what is necessary to preserve social order and the well-being of its citizens. When any member of society commits such serious crimes as to be a menace to the community, I believe the government has the right to put him to death.

It has been said that society is like a body with a head, and that if a member of the body becomes gangrenous it can be cut off, when necessary, to save the whole body. Of course only the government can administer capital punishment, having responsibility, indeed the duty, of safeguarding the community. I know the Bible gives us as one of the Ten Commandments of God: "Thou shalt not kill". But surely in its very context this refers to murder and unjust killing. It must be remembered that God also gave Moses the Jewish law which contained death as the penalty for several grave crimes.

An individual obviously is allowed to kill in self-defence if necessary. The state can also defend itself and the country in war when unjustly attacked, and can order its soldiers to kill. The state has done so and will do so. Likewise the state can kill an individual of its own if the individual is, indeed, a deadly enemy of society.

The fear of capital punishment should, and in my opinion does, deter many from serious crime. I feel that even though life imprisonment does stop this man, the convicted criminal, from further crime, it will not be sufficient to deter others. Capital punishment has been, as I said earlier, almost abolished in this country. I cannot agree in conscience that complete abolition is warranted.

Much of the opposition to the retention of capital punishment is based on the idea of the fallibility of a single jury in a murder trial, of the possibility of an inflamed atmosphere in which a trial might take place, and of the personal disposition of a single judge in directing the jury in such a trial. However, under the appeal provisions a person convicted of murder may appeal his conviction and, in the impartial atmosphere surrounding this court, he may have the conviction set aside with a judgment or a verdict of acquittal entered. He may be granted a new trial or he may have the capital charge reduced to a lesser crime, if the jury on the evidence could have found him guilty of such an offence. My observation and my experience is that murder trial juries demand the highest possible standards of proof. I suggest there is a natural human reluctance to bring in a guilty verdict. I know this from personal experience, having been a member of a murder trial jury. This is not a duty that one takes lightly. Nor do attorneys or judges take this duty lightly. No man on trial for murder is ever given a superficial trial. I feel therefore

that there is little chance of an innocent man's being sentenced to death.

I want to add my voice to the growing number of Canadian citizens who feel that the innocent victims of violence, of murder and other crimes should be in some way compensated. Too long have we ignored the innocent victims of criminality. I am quite sure that members of parliament in all areas of this big land of ours have had experience in this matter and have constituents who have been, are being and will be victimized.

This government and all governments spend millions and million of dollars on crime prevention. Certainly this money is well spent on police protection and all the multifarious activities surrounding our protection. However, when all this police protection breaks down and a family is victimized by a murderer or other criminal, surely the state owes something to the victim or victims of its failure, in some cases—in many cases—widows and children. Just as society bears the responsibility for crime prevention, it seems logical to me that society should bear responsibility for its failure in crime prevention.

I should like to discuss one other point if I may, Mr. Speaker. Many times we have read in the newspapers, or realized through our own experience, that citizens have not come to the aid of policemen in certain instances. Indeed, it is a misdemeanour knowingly not to come to the aid of a policeman in the exercise of his duty. Yet when one does act as a citizen should and is injured or even killed in that endeavour, it seems to me there is little provision for the victim or for the family for injury or death caused in this way, no matter how heroic the action might be.

• (9:30 p.m.)

If this were done, if suitable and just provision were made, obviously it would provide the incentive for more volunteer action by ordinary citizens on the side of the law to help the police when they could. It seems to me, Mr. Speaker, that too often the personal plight of those involved has been ignored. I believe this should and must be remedied.

In this debate a moralist may argue that the state has no right to take away human life, for in so doing the state is playing God. Somebody once said, "Man must play God for he has acquired certain God-like powers, among them a considerable degree of mastery over life and death, and he cannot avoid that exercise." Science has put into our hands, and

[Mr. O'Keefe.]

politics has required us to grasp firmly, instruments that can affect the very image of man hundreds of years hence, and for that matter, the duration of all life.

In a less awesome, but awesome enough way, modern medicine has been usurping prerogatives once held to be God's alone. It has learned to cheat death, not merely by the prolongation of life but by calling men back to life after several hours on the other shore. The judge who orders an execution is no more guilty of playing God than the doctor who, having decided that a human being has been summoned to eternity too soon, restores him to this world of time, and often of suffering.

Any case for the retention of the death penalty does not rest upon sentiment or hysteria. It is based quite simply on the fact that, human nature being what it is, potential criminals are most effectively deterred from crime by what they fear most. The penalty of death is obviously the most dreaded punishment. It seems to me it is certainly more dreaded than life imprisonment. While saying this, Mr. Speaker, I am certainly not reasoning for the retention of the death penalty by hanging: Far from it. It is not for me to decide what form the death penalty should take. I suggest there are far more humane methods of execution than hanging. As I see it, there could hardly be a less humane method. However, the death penalty is a warning always there, always warning; just like a lighthouse throwing its beams out to sea. We hear about shipwrecks, but we do not hear much about the ships that the lighthouse guides safely on their way. We do not have proof of the number of ships it saves, but we do not tear down the lighthouse.

I am not one of those who believe that punishment alone promises social security. A year or so ago a minister of justice said:

> Whenever public opinion sees only the horror of the criminal act and not the history of a delinquent soul, it naturally seeks merely to punish.

He went on to say that we must show Canadians how human conduct is moulded by poverty, sickness, mental deficiency, ignorance or a childhood marred by cruelty, hate, divorce and alcoholism. We must show the grotesque defamation of character which results from punishment which is blindly vengeful. We must show how human treatment, confidence and modern scientific care can salvage an individual, apparently criminal by nature, and return him to civil society transformed and grateful. This I believe, Mr.

Speaker. But the law of love is also the love of liberty, and love and mercy have no stability without basic justice. Lowering the standards of justice is never a substitute for the concept of mercy. I find it only too easy to agree that the execution of a murderer is a horrible spectacle, but I insist that the murder of an innocent person by an atrocious crime is far more horrible. To love your neighbour is to protect him.

Some time ago in these parliament buildings there was a meeting of the attorneys general of our 10 provinces. I am informed that almost all those attorneys general—I believe with the exception of just one—agree that the retention of the death penalty is necessary, at least for atrocious crimes. These are men of long experience in justice, and with men and criminals of every type. It is their considered opinion that the stand I take here tonight—and not without a great deal of difficulty because certainly I am not, I hope, a particularly vengeful person—is the correct one; that is, that capital punishment should be retained at least for deliberate, despicable, atrocious murders deliberately planned and coldly committed.

After the most careful consideration, Mr. Speaker, I have reached the conclusion that I cannot in all conscience vote for the complete abolition of the death penalty.

Mr. Herridge: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a question of personal privilege. When the hon. gentleman who has just resumed his seat rose to speak, I applauded him most vigorously. I was misinformed. I understood he was opposed to capital punishment. I now wish to recall that applause.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Rinfret): Order. May I say that there is no question of privilege here. If the hon. member wishes to make a speech on the topic of the abolition or retention of the death penalty, he will be able to do so in due course.

Mr. D. R. Gundlock (Lethbridge): Mr. Speaker, very soon the Canadian people through their representatives in this house, will in conscience vote upon whether to retain capital punishment in this country. This is a serious matter to all of us in the house. The motion before us is a serious matter to hon. members and Canadians generally. Some of us thought there would be introduced a resolution which we could consider and perhaps amend until it was more generally acceptable not only to this house but to the Canadian people at large.

It has been mentioned that there will be a free vote on this motion. I appreciate this very much and the people of Canada appreciate having, through their representatives in the house, a free vote on this most important question. We have a very serious responsibility in considering this matter. I mentioned earlier that some of us in this house and many Canadians generally had hoped there would be some qualifications in the motion with regard to the imposition of the death penalty. Many Canadians and hon. members of this house believe that one qualification might be that a person who has escaped from a penitentiary and killed a guard in the process of escaping should be subject to the death penalty. Many people believe that capital punishment should be meted out to a prisoner who commits such a crime.

• (9:40 p.m.)

There are those, Mr. Speaker, who feel that someone who kills a policeman, a man who is hired to protect society, certainly should receive the death penalty. We are charged with protecting society, too, Mr. Speaker. We have listened to many arguments this afternoon and yesterday, and we will probably listen to many more before this debate is concluded. How far do we go, how deeply do we consider this duty of ours to protect society? As I mentioned a moment ago, there are those who feel that a person who kills a policeman, a man who is hired to protect society, should be meted out the death penalty for that crime.

After listening to the debate, I find there are Canadians who feel there are even worse crimes than murder. I refer to the dope pedlar, for instance, who pushes dope to high school children in Canada. Many people feel that this is an even more heinous crime than murder, because it leads to all sorts of things up and down the scale.

As a representative, Mr. Speaker, I feel that I know what my constituents think. From what I have read, I feel that I know what the Churches of Canada think. I feel I know how the chiefs of police think. I feel I know how I think, personally. As a representative, then, I know full well how I should vote. The question is a simple one when looked at in that way. However, when the time to vote comes closer, and it is rapidly approaching, and I have to stand in my place and, in conscience, as a representative cast my vote upon whether or not we shall retain capital punishment, the problem becomes more serious. It becomes

more serious moment by moment, day by day. A month or two ago I did not think too much about it. A year or so ago, I thought very little about it. Tonight I am thinking of it very seriously, and tomorrow I will think of it more seriously. As I said earlier the Canadian people, in conscience through their representatives in this house, shortly will cast their votes upon whether or not to abolish capital punishment.

I have mentioned conscience, and when I think of conscience I think also of the student of theology. Many of these people, young and old, bring forth the argument—not necessarily the argument, but put forth the idea—as to whether there is a difference between body and soul? I am sure that we, as Christians, must consider this question seriously. Is there a difference between the physical reality and the spiritual reality? Is there then a difference between the natural law and the spiritual law? Is there a difference between natural justice and eternal justice? As I said earlier, we are confronted with these thoughts. We go to a funeral and we are told: This is a piece of clay; the spirit has departed. This is just one of the ideas that we must consider, Mr. Speaker.

The one real argument that is put forward again and again by the abolitionists is that we must grow up; we must become more civilized, that we must treat people differently. I realize it is only about 150 years ago that the death penalty was meted out for people who stole the sum of five shillings or over. It was at this time the idea of abolishing the death penalty was first put forward. Surely, Mr. Speaker, I can agree with that: No one should be put to death for stealing five or ten shillings. Now we have come to the point where we are told we must grow up and we must abolish the death penalty for the ultimate crime. In my opinion, in considering this resolution, I am not too sure we shoud grow up so quickly. We have been told of many countries in which the death penalty has been abolished. We have heard a great deal about the United Kingdom and the United States. Capital punishment has been abolished in England, but I am not too sure the experience has been a happy one. The United States has not seen fit to completely abolish the death penalty. I wonder, Mr. Speaker, if Canada is not trying to grow up too quickly. Perhaps we should go part way; perhaps there should be a qualification and the death penalty should be retained for certain crimes but not for others.

[Mr. Gundlock.]

Now, Mr. Speaker, I do not intend to take up very much of the time of this house. I have no intention of going through all the arguments for and against abolition of capital punishment. However, I want the Canadian people to remember that if this motion is carried and capital punishment is abolished, then we will have some other problems. Where do we go from there? For instance, the hon. member who spoke before me mentioned the innocent victims, the members of the family of the person who is charged. I say, Mr. Speaker, we have to consider also not just the one family but we have to consider two families: We have to consider the innocent victims on both sides.

• (9:50 p.m.)

We have spent very little time considering the innocent victims or their families, and I feel that this consideration should come within the qualifications I mentioned earlier. If we are considering so deeply the person who has committed the crime, we must also give that kind of consideration to the innocent victims on both sides. People in the world today are actually starving to death, yet the parliament of this great country is here considering only a few individuals.

In conclusion, I will mention one other matter. If the death penalty is abolished, then I would ask, Mr. Speaker, whether we should not also consider something else. We are strongly charged with the protection of society, which is the reason I rose in my place this evening. The question is how strong that charge is and how far we can go to protect society. Should we go a step further?

We are all familiar with intelligence tests. All our children submit to them. I am not too sure what they are worth, but they are accepted by society in general as worth while. Therefore I would leave this thought with the house. Should we go a step further and have the psychologist, the doctor, the lawyer, the clergyman and the teacher get together with the scientist and construct a machine which would test each and every one of us early in life, and from time to time through life? Then if certain traits manifest themselves, should we not begin control before the fact?

This is only a thought; I do not advocate this step. I agree with hon. members that a penalty is a deterrent. I do not agree that the death penalty is not a deterrent, and for this reason. Whether we collect a parking ticket, a speeding ticket, or commit any crime, if there

was no deterrent our whole correctional system or the protection of our society would collapse and chaos would reign. Therefore I cannot agree that the death penalty is not a deterrent.

I grant you, Mr. Speaker, it is an extreme penalty, but if we do abolish it I think we are bound to consider an alternative. We are still strongly charged with the protection of society, and we cannot fulfil that charge by doing away with deterrents and laws. As I said earlier, we have a penalty for every crime, even a parking ticket. I have heard no amendment moved to this resolution, Mr. Speaker, but I would strongly urge the house, through you, that some qualifications be made in it which would make it more acceptable to this house.

Mr. Richard Cashin (St. John's West): Mr. Speaker, I should like at the outset of my remarks to point up what I think was an inaccuracy in the remarks of the preceding speaker. He made some reference to the need for laws, and the impression I got from his remarks—and the impression I have received from many who appeared to be retentionists —was that there is only one deterrent, if in fact there is any, and that is capital punishment.

It is therefore suggested that the issue is whether we are going to have deterrents or whether our whole legal system is going to break down. I know other speakers have dealt with this point, and the hon. gentleman who just preceded me seemed to be talking along the same lines. I would point out, as others have, that it is erroneous to assume that capital punishment is the only deterrent.

The issue—and this will be the main body of my remarks—has to do with the necessity for capital punishment. I am not one who feels that this is necessarily a moral issue. I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that the morality of killing, of taking human life, is determined by the circumstances. The taking of human life is the highest form of barbarism and is degrading to society. It is degrading whether or not this taking of human life is done by hanging, in war, or even in the case of self-defence. But no one commits an immoral act if he legitimately kills another in an act of self-defence.

Therefore I suggest, if we are all agreed, as my colleague from St. John's East (Mr. O'Keefe) is agreed, that it is a dreadful thing to take human life, and if we agree with the remarks of the hon. member for Prince (Mr. MacDonald), then the issue which must be decided in the matter now before the house is the necessity for taking human life.

I suggest that this very important matter ought not to be decided by emotion, by sentiment or suspicion, but by fairness and reason. I suggest that reason is the greatest mark of a civilized society. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, the onus of proving the necessity for maintaining capital punishment is clearly upon the retentionists. They must give the clearest evidence of an imperative need and, I suggest, show beyond reasonable doubt the necessity for the cause which they espouse. We must examine the subject and find grounds to determine the imperative need for convincing evidence which will justify the taking of human life.

The answer, Mr. Speaker, I suggest falls under two headings. The first is retribution.

Mr. Bell (Carleton): Ten o'clock.

Mr. Cashin: This is the community's way of expressing its abhorrence of a grievous crime.

Mr. Ricard: Ten o'clock.

Mr. Cashin: Mr. Speaker, hon. members are calling ten o'clock and I am wondering whether it is ten o'clock.

Mr. McIlraith: Mr. Speaker, I am wondering whether the house will agree to let the hon. member finish his remarks.

Mr. Churchill: Mr. Speaker, I think the hon. member should have his full 20 minutes, and that time would be better taken on Monday.

Mr. Cashin: I suggest that I would finish my remarks in eight or nine minutes.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Rinfret): Has the hon. member unanimous consent of the house to continue his speech, in view of the time limit he himself mentions?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

• (10:00 p.m.)

Mr. Cashin: As I was saying, retribution is one of the two grounds on which we can find the evidence necessary for establishing whether or not we ought to take human life. The first ground of retribution is the community's way of expressing its abhorrence of the crime of murder, through the gravity of punishment which society extracts. In this way society hopes to impress upon its members the gravity of the crime itself. This is a paradox, I suggest, Mr. Speaker, because the

community is expressing its exereme revulsion at such a crime, and in itself uses the very same means to convey this revulsion. On the long term basis the well-being of the community will be more affected if it does not resort to this type of retribution.

When we speak of deterrent we should look at the facts in order to determine the position we are taking. We must not do this by emotion, or by sentiment, or by fear. It has long been said that it is the abolitionists who are the sentimentalists. I believe that an earlier speaker has already quoted Sir Ernest Gower's book "A life for a life". Sir Ernest confessed that when he began the study of this matter he was convinced—and this seems to be the widespread feeling among those with whom I have discussed the matter—that sentiment was on the side of the abolitionists and reason on the side of the retentionists. At the end of the four years which it took to complete this work, he had to reverse himself. He came to the conclusion that reason was on the side of the abolitionists and sentiment on the side of the retentionists.

We must ask ourselves, Mr. Speaker, what are the facts? What is the evidence? What evidence can be put forth by the retentionists, who suggest that the death penalty is such a unique deterrent as to warrant its retention by society?

There are, I would suggest, in general three kinds of killers. There is the psychopath or the sex offender. People of that type are not subject to normal restraints. For these men perhaps there is no such thing as a deterrent. They are sick. Unless we publicly support a policy whereby we say to these sick people: "We cannot cope with you in society; therefore if this illness becomes evident, we will extract you out of society," then I suggest there is no reason for capital punishment; because many people of that ilk might commit crimes which may not result in the taking of human life, but which could be very serious in society. Those people can be equally a menace to society whether or not they have a particular tendency to the taking of human life, or something just short of that.

Really, if we are going to kill them because they are not the normal kinds of people in society, we should perhaps kill them before they take a human life, if they show any tendency in that direction. I would suggest that this is the logic that must be employed by anybody who would kill them, if in fact they were guilty of murder.

[Mr. Cashin.]

Of course there are those people you might term the one-shot offenders, who commit murder in anger, or under the influence of alcohol, or under a particular set of circumstances. These are the once-in-a-lifetime murderers. These people are obviously not going to be deterred by capital punishment, and perhaps they will not be deterred by anything else.

We then come to the group which is causing most concern, perhaps, the group of the professional killer. The evidence, as other hon. members have mentioned, suggests that for these people there is no difference between this kind of deterrent and any other kind of deterrent. If you will, they are equally effective or equally ineffective.

There are in this house probably a great number of hon. members who fought in the war. I was not among them because I was not one of the nine-year olds who was conscripted. I am sure that you may recall this suggestion which was made by a man who had spent some time in the war. He said that if you were asked to do something dangerous you did not say to yourself, "I will not do that because I will be killed, but I will do it because I will only lose a limb or I will only lose an eye."

The thinking process, if any, as I understand it from those who have discussed this with me was, "I will do it because I think I will get away with it", and most people who think they can get away with it, do it. Those who withdrew were people who did not think they could get away with it.

I have a great deal of respect for my colleague from St. John's East (Mr. O'Keefe), and I disagreed with what I thought was a rather unkind and unwarranted gesture on the part of the hon. member for Kootenay West (Mr. Herridge), when he rose on his facetious question of privilege. But I would like to say to my colleague from St. John's East, with whom I disagree on this point, that I can well understand and respect his position, but I think he is like a great many other Canadians in looking at this matter and saying, "I would be deterred from doing it, therefore others will also." But these, Mr. Speaker, are precisely the people who would not be doing it anyway.

When we are talking about this as a deterrent we ought to realize that the greatest deterrent is detection. There are certain communities in Canada that have a high incidence of traffic infractions. I can give an example of neighbouring municipalities. In

one municipality fines for traffic infractions are higher than in the other, but it is notorious that motorists speed in that municipality. However, they do not speed in the other municipality because the police there are more on the ball and they know they will be detected. So if it is a deterrent perhaps only the professionals, however many they may be, are the ones who would really consider this is a deterrent; but the best deterrent obviously is detection.

I should now like to give a quotation. Although I have tried to listen to most of the debate, I do not know if this quotation has been given already. When I read it I suggest many hon. members will not know whether the quotation is from a present-day retentionist or a man who actually made the statement 150 years ago. It is:

> Repeal this law and see the contrast. No man can trust himself for an hour out of doors without the most alarming apprehensions that on his return every vestige of his property will be swept off by the hardened robber.

No, Mr. Speaker, he was not talking about capital punishment as it applied to the murder of a prison guard. These were the words of Lord Ellenborough, when he abhored a change in the law that permitted a person charged with stealing five shillings to be hanged.

While I respect the sincerity of all those who are retentionists I suggest that any study of the debates on this matter over the past 150 years does not show the position has changed one bit since the time of Lord Ellenborough, and the evidence of every study undertaken continues to prove that Lord Ellenborough was wrong. And, as Lord Ellenborough was wrong in 1810, I suggest that those who take the same position today will perhaps in a decade, I hope, or 25 years, look back on some of the things that were said in this debate and regard them in the same light as they regard what Lord Ellenborough said in relation to the offence of stealing five shillings.

Mr. O'Keefe: Would the hon. member care to explain the position taken by nine attorneys general in Canada today?

Mr. Cashin: I am glad my colleague asked that question. I may suggest by the answer I am going to give him that I asked him to ask it, but I did not. I cannot suppose what the attorneys general think; but I know a very distinguished ex-attorney general from the other side of the house spoke on this matter, and he is the only attorney general, other than the one in my own province, with whom I discussed the matter.

I would say that perhaps one of the fears of the attorneys general is that this could have a demoralizing effect on policemen and prison guards. I have met individuals who otherwise accept my reasoning but say it is a very serious matter for prison guards and the policemen. We must respect their views, but the reason they would exempt the murder of prison guards and policemen from the abolition of capital punishment is not so much for the deterrent effect but because its retention is important for the morale of the police and prison guard force.

• (10:10 p.m.)

Now, perhaps if that much were so and if perhaps in the next year or two our police force were to disintegrate, then perhaps we might be justified in saying because it is a deterrent in respect of police officers we will be justified in taking a human life in order to be able to have a police force. In that case I think we would be obliged to do that. However, I am quite sure that would not be the case. There are now 13 states in the United States which are abolitionist states. Looking at the records there and looking at the facts, I suggest to my hon. colleague from St. John's East and the attorney general from Newfoundland who is of the same view as the hon. member for St. John's East (Mr. O'Keefe)—

Mr. Alkenbrack: May I ask a question, Mr. Speaker? I would like to ask the hon. member whether he knows of any case where a person was convicted of murder who did not have the benefit of psychiatric examination?

Mr. Cashin: Mr. Speaker, I regret that unlike many other members of this house I have not had a distinguished career before the bar. My experience is purely academic; but from the study I have made I was abhorred by what we regard as insanity and by the many cases where the exact conditions you outlined did not exist. Recently I read a book entitled "In Cold Blood". This was the most vicious crime one could imagine. Four persons in a family were killed. I do not know what reaction others might have but I do know of one person very close to me who has had perhaps a different view of it than I had from reading that book. I think the result was that it made her less convinced of her view of retention and made me stronger in my own view of abolition. If you read about that case, the boy who actually killed that

man did not think as he killed him; he thought what a nice man he was. He was not killing that man; he was killing his father. I do not think we are enhanced by killing him, unless we say we do not want that man in society, and then we should take him out; but that man should have been taken out long ago.

We should be finding out who these people are at an early stage in life and should be getting rid of them. Nothing was served by killing that man. To say to the contrary is to fly in the face of reason, to fly in the face of the views of the criminologists and sociologists who have made a study of this matter. I say it is important not to approach this by emotion or sentiment. If we are to adopt a position, let us know what it is. If we are to continue on with capital punishment, let us know why we are doing it. Are we doing it for vengeance or because we do think this has some kind of deterrent effect and one which is greater or more unique than any other? If the latter is our view, let us prove it.

I am grateful to the house for the time they have given me this evening. I would hope that the consensus now would be one of fact over sentiment, of reason over emotion, and of hope over fear.

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE

Hon. G. J. McIlraith (Minister of Public Works): Mr. Speaker, tomorrow we propose to submit to the house for its consideration, first interim supply, and then the final supplementary estimates; then the two resolutions in the name of the Minister of Justice (Mr. Cardin) to increase the number of judges. If the house is agreeable perhaps we can complete all stages of that tomorrow.

We will then take item No. 8 under government orders, house again in committee of the whole on Bill C-145, an act to provide for the development of commercial fisheries in Canada. This will be followed by government order No. 9, second reading of Bill C-153, an act to amend the Aeronautics Act. We will then take second reading of Bill C-150, an act to amend the Research Council Act and item No. 15, second reading of Bill C-149, an act to provide for the establishment of a science council of Canada.

Mr. Grégoire: Mr. Speaker, may I ask the minister the number of months for which interim supply is being asked?

Mr. McIlraith: Yes, Mr. Speaker, we propose to ask for two months interim supply. We thought that appropriate in view of the Easter recess.

[Mr. Cashin.]

PROCEEDINGS ON ADJOURNMENT MOTION

A motion to adjourn the house under provisional standing order 39A deemed to have been moved.

HOUSING—REPORTED SHORTAGE OF MORTGAGE MONEY

Mr. Reid Scott (Danforth): Mr. Speaker, the matter I wish to raise tonight with the Minister of Labour or his parliamentary secretary, who is here, arises out of a statement attributed to the president of the National Homebuilders Association speaking in Montreal, in which he stated that in his view a growing shortage of mortgage money is creating the danger of a critical stoppage in construction in this important industry. He has suggested that the government should re-enter the field of direct mortgage loans for speculative housing.

It is becoming apparent that there is a general tightening of the money supply in Canada at the present time, which has two effects. One, interest rates on mortgages rise because of competition for available money and, two, such investment funds as are available tend to shift out of the N.H.A. field, because of its controlled interest rate, and to move to more lucrative fields, conventional mortgages and industrial and commercial properties.

As conventional lenders shift to non-N.H.A. loan areas, the market dries up and the construction industry tends to slow down. To date this may not appear as a serious problem, but the clouds are on the horizon. Because of the importance of the building industry to have some indication of government policy, I hope that the government, if it cannot do so tonight, will consider making some type of extended statement in this regard.

Those of us who are associated with clients in the construction industry realize that builders must plan a long time in advance. If there is any danger of a mortgage shortage accumulating during the year, unless they know whether or not the government is prepared to act, it is virtually impossible to design a housebuilding program for the entire year. No matter what the government's answer is, I hope at some early stage it will make a decision and an announcement. Does the government intend to re-enter the direct

lending field if a mortgage shortage develops and, if so, to what extent? I hope it will tell the building industry either yes or no. It does not really matter which it is, as long as a decision is made so that other decisions can be based upon it.

Does the government intend to permit banks to enter the N.H.A. field to supply some of the needed funds? Is the government giving any thought to trying to design some orderly consistent method of providing mortgage financing in Canada? Up to now it has been turned on and off like a tap, largely for economic reasons, and the building industry has never felt that there was any reliable and constant source of mortgage money on which it could base its plans.

• (10:20 p.m.)

Finally, when and where does the government intend to honour its election pledge that N.H.A. financing will be extended to older homes? All the Liberal literature circulated in the urban areas in the last two election campaigns carried this promise, and we have so far seen no signs of its being fulfilled. I hope that the government will consider making a statement as to its intentions so that the people interested in this matter may know what the program is to be.

As I said, Mr. Speaker, this could become a serious problem. The building industry must know a year or more in advance where it is going. Builders cannot buy land, service it and make all the necessary commitments unless they are assured that there will be an orderly supply of mortgage financing available. Even though the building industry is continuing at a very good rate, all the signs at the present time indicate that there is a continuing shortage of mortgage financing. Because of the importance to the industry, because of the need to make decisions now for the balance of the year, I hope that if he cannot do so in the three minutes available now, the parliamentary secretary will urge the minister to make a full statement at an early date.

Mr. B. S. Mackasey (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Labour): Mr. Speaker, I am sure the hon. member for Danforth (Mr. Scott) will realize that it is impossible to answer adequately his thoughtful question in the three minutes placed at my disposal. I shall bring to the attention of the minister the many thought-provoking questions the hon. member has raised. In the meantime I should like at least to place on the record a few facts that were given to me earlier in the day for use in replying to some of the questions raised this evening.

The suggestion, for instance, that the housing industry is to be jeopardized by a shortage of money is a problematical one. It might be of interest to hon. members to know that at the end of 1965 there were 120,000 housing units under construction in Canada. Because of this very high carry-over and the further fact that the whole housing construction industry is working to full capacity at the present time, it is expected that during 1966 not only will this level be maintained but the indications are that, despite the fears of representatives of the housing industry and despite the fears voiced tonight by the hon. member for Danforth, housing construction will surpass the record year of 1965.

The hon. member has made a point about planning in advance. He mentioned that this should be done a long time ahead. I am not too sure whether by "a long time ahead" he means three months, six months or a year. But I am sure that when the minister returns and has an opportunity to voice his opinion on future policy in this connection, he will cover this question. In the meantime, Mr. Speaker, I should like to make this point to the hon. member. National Housing Act mortgage lending the approved lenders and by C.M.H.C. was 33 per cent higher during the first two months of 1966 as compared to 1965, and housing starts were six per cent higher during the first two months of this year as compared to 1965. This is hardly a very gloomy picture.

Furthermore, during the past three years C.M.H.C. has been authorized to make speculative building loans in support of the winter housing incentive program, and approximately 22,000 such loans were made during the last four months of 1965. These houses are under construction at the present time. I might point out, of course, that this was in collaboration with the winter housing incentive program, or what is familiarly known as the $500 bonus.

The minister says that he can state unequivocally, however, that it is not the intention to authorize C.M.H.C. to make direct speculative loans at this time. Finally, in the question raised by the hon. member for Danforth (Mr. Scott) he used the word—

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Rinfret): Order. I regret to interrupt the hon. member—

Mr. Mackasey: May I have just two seconds, Mr. Speaker? The hon. member used the word "re-entry", implying that we were once in this field. According to my information, the department was never in the field of speculative loans.

HARBOURS—VANCOUVER—INQUIRY AS TO PROPOSED WHARF DEVELOPMENT

Mr. Grant Deachman (Vancouver Quadra): A couple of weeks ago the Minister of Transport (Mr. Pickersgill) came out to the west coast to visit the harbour of Vancouver, to have a look at its facilities and to learn a little more about the great debate, some of the furore which was surrounding this harbour. He looked at that time at the C.P.R. property which forms one of the major elements of the Vancouver harbour. The C.P.R. property in Vancouver harbour is in a state of neglect. I do not need to enlarge too much upon this. It has been debated in the house, in committee and this story has appeared in the press many times.

The Canadian Pacific occupies piers that are condemned, old wharves that are no longer suitable for modern shipping. At the foot of Granville Street, the main street of Vancouver, it has a burnt out old pier which is marked on marine maps as a ruin. We want to see this end of the harbour, the best available deep waterlots in Canada today, properly developed. This is what we wanted the minister to see. We would like the minister to tell us what the National Harbours Board and the government of Canada are going to do in Vancouver this year.

The property in question has long been under dispute between the government of Canada and the Canadian Pacific. Historically the dispute goes back to 1884, when the steel came in as far as Port Moody and stopped there. This was the obligation of the Canadian Pacific to bring the steel through to Tidewater, which is at Port Moody. Then the company decided to move into the city of Vancouver, and when they moved into the city of Vancouver they assumed that they were given further grants along the right-of-way. The question of whether these grants were to be interpreted in the same way as the original land grants along the right-of-way up to Port Moody is the question under dispute.

There are areas in Vancouver harbour which have been under legal dispute since 1930 and the revenue from this property is put into escrow. What we would like to know is this: When are the government and the Canadian Pacific going to get together and settle this long, historic dispute so that Vancouver can enjoy the development of these lands. We have to await the end of this dispute before proper wharves and piers can be built to serve this Canadian western port. We want to know whether or not there is to be expropriation of Canadian Pacific property, whether the Canadian Pacific itself can be encouraged to develop the property. There are rumours and stories in the Vancouver newspapers today that $50 million is to be spent by the National Harbours Board in this area. We know the dispute has not yet been settled. The minister has hinted at some things but we want something more definitive. I hope the parliamentary secretary will be able to say something about it tonight.

[The Acting Speaker (Mr. Rinfret).]

Mr. J. A. Byrne (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Transport): I want to thank the hon. member for Vancouver Quadra (Mr. Deachman) for his eloquent description of the Vancouver harbour. It seems almost presumptuous of me to imply that I know more about Vancouver harbour than he does. I am sure I can add little to what he already knows. However, there are plans for the development of wharves on the south shore of the Vancouver side of the harbour for general cargo facilities which will require the use of the property now under dispute with the Canadian Pacific Railway. It is hoped that this property dispute can be settled quickly so that the early orderly development of harbour facilities can take place.

I understand that the minister was in Vancouver earlier this month. He did say that he hoped and expected that this dispute would be settled at a relatively early date, certainly within this year.

Mr. Deachman: That's nine months away.

• (10:30 p.m.)

LABOUR CONDITIONS—ATLANTIC REGION—STEPS TO IMPROVE UNEMPLOYMENT SITUATION

Mr. Robert C. Coates (Cumberland): Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Finance can accept the fact that the content of my question, which we are now debating, will be the basis of numerous questions and speeches unless he takes special steps open to him to guarantee a continuing climate for expansion in the Atlantic area. We have the double-barrelled problem of keeping pace with the expansion in the remainder of Canada and of gaining

back the ground lost through a lack of interest and attention until the Diefenbaker administration took office in 1957. We recall very well the damage to our economic progress during the last period that a Liberal administration put into effect a national tight money policy that retarded our advancement, and members on this side of the house will not sit idly by and watch this happen again.

The national rate of unemployment in this nation as of February 19, according to the Dominion Bureau of Statistics figures, stood at 5 per cent, with more than 350,000 individuals unemployed. This is not a figure to brag about, for it indicates the extent of human suffering in our nation today. The shocking aspect of these figures is that 65,000 of these individuals and almost 11 per cent of the working population of the Atlantic provinces is included in this group. Over-expansion, boom and prosperity are foreign words in the Atlantic provinces, and tight money will only guarantee less hope of their ever being removed from the vocabulary of our people.

A new philosophy has been nurtured in the Atlantic provinces since the days of the Diefenbaker administration which produced programs and policies that were geared to find solutions to the special problems of our area. These programs were of significant benefit to the provincial governments in carrying forward their programs of development.

Since the present administration has taken office we have found little of the philosophy that was so evident between 1957 and 1963. With the one exception of an increase in assistance in the construction of the trans-Canada highway, we have witnessed a disinterest in our special problems. The Atlantic Development Board, while helpful within the confines of the amended legislation, does not have the financial resources available to it that will make the impact on our economy we had anticipated when we established it. We have not enjoyed the same degree of favour from this administration, and with the fractured thinking within the cabinet there is little hope in the foreseeable future for expecting the kind of approach we must have if we are to progress at the rate we consider advisable for the nation's good.

The minister has available to him the means of alleviating the tight money policy in so far as the Atlantic provinces are concerned. There is no question but that action could be taken that would eliminate tight money from being the burden it presently is to the business community in the Atlantic area. If the minister wishes to implement a program that will allow our area to continue its advancement and share in the prosperity much more evident in the remainder of Canada, he can do so.

He can take the first step next Tuesday evening, when he brings down his budget, by recognizing the recommendations of the second annual review of the Economic Council of Canada, which appears on pages 175 and 176 of that report. He can also recognize the views of the Chairman, John J. Deutsch, to the effect that national policies need not and should not retard growth in our area of Canada.

We have a right to expect this kind of approach from the Minister of Finance, and he may rest assured that his inaction in this regard will lead to a concentrated and continuing attack from members in the Progressive Conservative party until such action is forthcoming.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Jean Chrétien (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Finance): Obviously, Mr. Speaker, it would be quite improper for me to try to anticipate what sort of budget will be revealed to us in a few days, next Tuesday to be exact.

I think that the Minister of Finance is well aware of the problems facing Canada and especially eastern Canada.

[*English*]

I should like to point out to the hon. member who has just spoken that, according to the latest figures that have been published, the employment situation in the maritime provinces has improved tremendously in the past few years. I am willing to admit that there is still room for improvement, but I can assure the hon. member that the Minister of Finance (Mr. Sharp) is quite familiar with the economic situation in Canada and that he is now preparing, for Canada as a whole and every part of Canada, a budget that should provide some very interesting listening next Tuesday.

Motion agreed to and the house adjourned at 10.37 p.m.

APPENDIX

LETTER FROM QUEBEC PREMIER RESPECTING CONSTITUTION AMENDMENT

OFFICE OF THE PRIME MINISTER
PROVINCE OF QUEBEC

February 17th, 1966.

The Honourable Lester B. Pearson,
Prime Minister,
Government of Canada,
Ottawa, Ont.

My dear Prime Minister:

Your reply of January 26th to my letter of January 20th has been brought to the attention of my Cabinet colleagues who have thoroughly examined its contents.

After full consideration, and for the reasons set out in my letter, the Government of Québec feels that it must maintain its decision to postpone indefinitely the study of the present proposed amendment to the constitution.

Of course, if such is the desire of the Government of Canada or of the other provinces, Québec has no intention to oppose the reconsidering, at a future federal-provincial conference, of the repatriation of the constitution in the light of the circumstances mentioned in our letters.

In any event, I must add that we are most anxious to see the Quebec Parliament Act adopted. If this question is not settled as envisaged it will have to be taken up again in any discussion of a new formula for the repatriation of the constitution.

I readily understand your disappointment at the decision taken by the Government of Québec. You may rest assured, however, that in this matter my colleagues and I have never questioned the basic aim that our constitution should become absolutely and truly our own.

With my best regards,

Sincerely yours,
Jean Lesage.

HOUSE OF COMMONS

Friday, March 25, 1966

The house met at 11 a.m.

THE BUDGET

TABLING OF BUDGETARY PAPERS

Hon. Mitchell Sharp (Minister of Finance): Mr. Speaker, I wish to table copies of the usual budgetary papers in English and in French, and with the consent of the house I should like to have them appended to today's *Votes and Proceedings* and also to *Hansard* of March 29.

Mr. Speaker: Is it agreed?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

CRIMINAL CODE

AMENDMENT RESPECTING SENTENCE FOR CRUELTY TO ANIMALS

Mr. Barry Mather (New Westminster) moved for leave to introduce Bill No. C-155, to amend the Criminal Code (cruelty to animals).

Mr. Knowles: Explain.

• (11:10 a.m.)

Mr. Mather: Mr. Speaker, the purpose of this bill is to make a minor amendment to the Criminal Code. The aim is to enable a magistrate who has imposed a sentence upon a person convicted of an offence of cruelty to animals to also prohibit such person from owning, harbouring or otherwise possessing an animal or a bird for a stated period of time as part of the sentence. This is in line with the wishes of the humane society of Ontario.

Motion agreed to and bill read the first time.

[*Translation*]

INDUSTRIAL RELATIONS AND DISPUTES INVESTIGATION ACT

AMENDMENTS RESPECTING POWERS OF CHAIRMAN AND BOARD

Mr. Maurice Allard (Sherbrooke) moved for leave to introduce Bill No. C-156, to amend the Industrial Relations and Disputes Investigation Act (Powers of Chairman and of the Board.)

Some hon. Members: Explain.

Mr. Allard: Mr. Speaker, once again, this bill is inspired by the present dispute between the C.N.T.U. and the C.B.C. with regard to a decision of the Canada labour relations board.

The purpose of the bill is to amend the industrial disputes legislation so that only the chairman of the labour relations board may be allowed to make a decision whenever there is a conflict between unions about union recognition for one group of employees.

Motion agreed to and bill read the first time.

[*English*]

LABOUR RELATIONS

ONTARIO TRUCKING STRIKE—MOTION FOR ADJOURNMENT UNDER STANDING ORDER 26

Mr. David Lewis (York South): Mr. Speaker, I ask leave, seconded by the hon. member for Hamilton South (Mr. Howe), to move the adjournment of the house under standing order 26 for the purpose of discussing a definite matter of urgent public importance, namely the need to take steps to end the nine week old strike in the trucking industry in the province of Ontario, most of whose employees fall within federal jurisdiction, and the failure of the Minister of Labour to implement the Canada Labour (Standards) Code by ordering a rapid transition to the 40-hour week provided in the said act, which would remove a major obstacle to the settlement of the strike.

Mr. Speaker, I respectfully submit that the urgency of the matter is self evident—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. Will the hon. member kindly address the Chair on the question of urgency of debate.

Mr. Lewis: Mr. Speaker, this strike has now gone on for nine weeks, with a great loss of earnings to the trucking firms, a great loss of earnings to the drivers and other workers in those trucking firms, and at tremendous inconvenience to the shipping public. Over 70 per cent of the employees involved in the strike are engaged in interprovincial and international transportation and therefore fall within federal jurisdiction.

Labour Relations

One of the major issues, if not the major issue, between the unions and the trucking firms is that of the 40-hour week which presumably is guaranteed under the Canada Labour (Standards) Code. The failure of the minister to do anything under that act is, in my submission, directly responsible for prolonging the strike, and the prolongation of that strike is of great and urgent concern to the entire industrial complex, not only in the province of Ontario but throughout Canada.

Since it is within the power of a federal minister of the crown to make a major contribution to the settlement of that strike, I respectfully submit that the business of this house ought to be adjourned for the purpose of fully debating this matter.

Hon. A. J. MacEachen (Minister of National Health and Welfare): Mr. Speaker, may I address myself for a moment to the point of urgency, which really has not been dealt with by the hon. member who has attempted to make this motion.

The question before the house is whether the proceedings ought to be interrupted at this point to deal with the matter raised by the hon. gentleman. While it is a very important matter, a matter which has engaged the attention of the Minister of Labour and other members of the house from Hamilton and other parts of Ontario, it is still a fact that we intend to move into supply when the orders of the day are called. The hon. gentleman will then have ample opportunity to raise this point.

On that ground, therefore, it cannot be argued that the ordinary proceedings ought to be interrupted in order to deal with this matter, because it can be dealt with the moment the orders of the day are called.

Mr. Speaker: As the hon. member for York South well knows, urgency within the rules does not apply to the matter itself, but to the urgency of debate. I refer him to citation 100 (3) of Beauchesne's fourth edition. As has been pointed out correctly by the Minister of National Health and Welfare, there will be an opportunity later today to discuss this matter which the hon. member has raised. In the circumstances I cannot accept this motion.

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE

INQUIRY AS TO FORTHCOMING LEGISLATION

On the orders of the day:

Hon. Michael Starr (Ontario): I wish to address a question to the Prime Minister. In view of the co-operative effort and the excellent progress we have made with legislation, and in view of the fact that with one or two exceptions there are only minor pieces of legislation on the order paper, can the Prime Minister tell us when he expects to put on the order paper the major legislation that was dealt with in the Speech from the Throne?

Right Hon. L. B. Pearson (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, there are matters on the order paper which could hardly be described as minor. We are at present debating a very important matter. After that we will have the budget debate. I can assure my hon. friend that there will be other important matters on the order paper in due course before we reach the end of the budget debate.

PUBLIC SERVICE

REPRESENTATIONS FROM STAFF ASSOCIATIONS ON BILINGUALISM

On the orders of the day:

Mr. T. C. Douglas (Burnaby-Coquitlam): I would like to ask the Prime Minister if he had a meeting on March 23 with three of the national staff associations of the civil service with regard to bilingualism. If so, why was the Canadian Union of Postal Workers not invited to sit in at this meeting, in view of their great interest in this question?

Right Hon. L. B. Pearson (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, I have received a letter from the postal workers bringing this matter to my attention. I am looking into it at once, because certainly we do not wish to discriminate against representations from any group of civil servants. It is my impression, but I should like to check just as soon as I get to my office, that it was not a question of invitation but that these three other agencies asked to be heard by the government. I want to emphasize that we do not want to discriminate against representations by the postal workers on this matter.

[*Translation*]

EXTERNAL AFFAIRS

CEYLON—INTEREST-FREE LOAN BY CANADA

On the orders of the day:

Mr. Réal Caouette (Villeneuve): Mr. Speaker, I wish to put a question to the right hon. Prime Minister, since the Minister of Finance is absent.

An agreement was signed the day before yesterday at Colombo whereby Canada will lend the government of Ceylon, $1,717,000 without interest.

Can the right hon. Prime Minister tell us if this loan will be made through the Bank of Canada?

[*English*]

Right Hon. L. B. Pearson (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, I shall have to look into this matter. Under the Colombo plan we do give help to these countries, and certainly without interest; but I should like to find out the details of this particular matter.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Caouette: Mr. Speaker, I wish to put a supplementary question to the right hon. Prime Minister.

Would he consider the advisability of granting similar loans to the provinces and municipalities in Canada?

[*English*]

AGRICULTURE

BUTTER—INQUIRY AS TO EXTENT OF PRICE INCREASE

On the orders of the day:

Mr. H. A. Olson (Medicine Hat): Mr. Speaker, I should like to ask the Minister of Agriculture whether he has checked to see how much the price of butter has risen to consumers in Canada and whether it is in line with the increase in price to the wholesalers.

Hon. J. J. Greene (Minister of Agriculture): Mr. Speaker, having in mind both this question and the question the hon. member asked the other day, I have checked into this question and I find there is no practical way in which wholesalers can take advantage of the increase inasmuch as retailers can, and often do, buy directly from the stabilization board at the new price of 59 cents. Therefore any wholesaler who attempted to take advantage of this position would be caught (a) by the competition and (b) by the fact that the retailers themselves can buy in carload lots directly at the 59 cents price.

Mr. Olson: Has the minister checked to see whether the retail price has gone up more than the wholesale price, whether it is the wholesalers or the retailers who buy directly?

Mr. Greene: Mr. Speaker, to the best of my information to date the retail price has not gone up more than this, subject to the differential factor which I spoke to my hon. friend about in respect to western Canada, which is now being obviated.

LABOUR CONDITIONS

POINT EDWARD NAVAL BASE—JOB PREFERENCE FOR EMPLOYEES

On the orders of the day:

Mr. Robert Muir (Cape Breton North and Victoria): Mr. Speaker, my question is based on a wire just passed to me from the National Defence Employees' Association at Point Edward naval base, and my question is directed to the Associate Minister of National Defence. I am not going to read the whole wire but just a small portion to explain the situation to the minister. It says:

> —recently Hon. Allan MacEachen assured N.D.E.A. that any positions in the area first preference would be given to classified civil service employees already engaged at Point Edward naval base. Urge immediate reply—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. Questions cannot be prefaced by the reading of telegrams, newspaper articles, or letters.

Mr. Muir (Cape Breton North and Victoria): Thank you, Mr. Speaker. May I ask the minister whether he will investigate this situation and ascertain why these employees are not being given the opportunity that was promised to them by the hon. member for Inverness-Richmond?

Hon. Léo Cadieux (Associate Minister of National Defence): Certainly, Mr. Speaker.

[*Translation*]

INQUIRY OF THE MINISTRY

On the orders of the day:

Mr. Gilles Grégoire (Lapointe): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Citizenship and Immigration.

In view of the fact that the minister had promised to me in this house that he would come with me to picket the headquarters of companies having no French Canadians on their board of directors, and in view of the fact that we have just received the annual report of the Polymer corporation, which has no French Canadian director, can the minister inform me whether next Monday would be agreeable to him for picketing the headquarters of that corporation?

[*English*]

Mr. Speaker: Order. The hon. member for Regina City.

Inquiries of the Ministry

[*Translation*]

Mr. Grégoire: Mr. Speaker, I feel my question is in order and urgent, for it is raised at a time when we have just received a report, and I would like to take this opportunity to ask the minister whether he would be ready to come and picket—

[*English*]

Mr. Speaker: Order. I suggest to the hon. member that it is not within the administrative responsibility of a minister to picket the office of the president of a corporation.

Mr. Grégoire: That is what he promised, Mr. Speaker.

CANADIAN PACIFIC RAILWAY

MEETING OF WESTERN MAYORS RESPECTING REDUCTION IN SERVICE

On the orders of the day:

Mr. K. H. More (Regina City): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Transport. I believe he met on Wednesday with the mayors of the cities concerned with the curtailment of passenger service by the C.P.R. Could he indicate to the house the results of this meeting?

Hon. J. W. Pickersgill (Minister of Transport): Mr. Speaker, I thought the results of the meeting were very adequately described by the mayor of Moose Jaw, who was spokesman for this delegation, on radio and television last night.

[*Later:*]

Mr. More: I rise on a question of privilege, Mr. Speaker. I should like to know if the Minister of Transport suggests that members of parliament can obtain more information about the affairs of the country by watching television and listening to the radio than by asking responsible ministers.

Mr. Pickersgill: Sometimes, sir, I think that would be true. However, I do not want in any way to suggest that the hon. gentleman's question was not proper. I think it was. I myself did hear an account of the meeting we had, and I wanted to indicate that I thought the mayor of Moose Jaw had very accurately reflected both the atmosphere and the results of that meeting. An excellent presentation was made, with much of which I had a good deal of sympathy, and I undertook to study it.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. Is the minister addressing the house on a question of privilege?

[Mr. Speaker.]

TRADE

UNION BETWEEN CANADA AND U.S.—STATEMENT BY B.C. MINISTER

On the orders of the day:

Mr. H. W. Herridge (Kootenay West): Mr. Speaker, I wish to address a question to the Prime Minister. Has the Prime Minister's attention been drawn to the statement made by Hon. Ralph Loffmark, Minister of Industrial Development, Trade and Commerce for British Columbia, in which he advocates economic and customs union between Canadian provinces and some states in the United States, and in which he calls for a quick and complete union between British Columbia and the states of Washington, Oregon and California? Has the government given any consideration to this most unusual proposal?

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. I do not think that question is in order.

ADMINISTRATION OF JUSTICE

IMPLEMENTATION OF REPORT ON JUVENILE DELINQUENCY

On the orders of the day:

Mr. S. J. Enns (Portage-Neepawa): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Justice. In his absence, I wonder if the acting minister or the Solicitor General might have some advice to give to the house on the many useful recommendations contained in the report on juvenile delinquency tabled one month ago in this house. Does the government have any intended action on this report?

Hon. L. T. Pennell (Solicitor General): Mr. Speaker, this report is under study by the office of the Solicitor General and by the Department of Justice. However, it has been temporarily delayed because the Solicitor General has taken on special duties relating to another matter.

COAL

INQUIRY AS TO REPORT ON ASSISTANCE PROGRAM

On the orders of the day:

Mr. Donald MacInnis (Cape Breton South): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Mines and Technical Surveys. I would ask the minister if the Dr. Donald report has been completed and, if not, when this document is expected.

Hon. Jean-Luc Pepin (Minister of Mines and Technical Surveys): It has not yet been completed, Mr. Speaker. An extension has been given to Dr. Donald. However, I can say that the report will be in by the end of next month.

Mr. MacInnis (Cape Breton South): A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Does the minister not realize that on January 28 he said this report would be ready soon?

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

PENITENTIARIES

COLLINS BAY—INVESTIGATION INTO ESCAPE OF PRISONERS

On the orders of the day:

Mr. A. D. Alkenbrack (Prince Edward-Lennox): Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the Solicitor General and relates to a certain report pertaining to the prison break of February 9 at Collins Bay penitentiary. Does the Solicitor General now have this report, and will he table it?

Hon. L. T. Pennell (Solicitor General): Mr. Speaker, the report referred to by the hon. member is a report directed to the commissioner of penitentiaries, not to the minister. It would ordinarily be considered a confidential document. However, I appreciate the special interest that the hon. member has in this matter, and I am prepared to make the document public. In doing so I would respectfully ask the house that it not be considered a precedent.

ST. VINCENT DE PAUL—SUICIDE OF PRISONER

On the orders of the day:

Mr. Warren Allmand (Notre-Dame-de-Grâce): My question is addressed to the Solicitor General. Will the Solicitor General say whether he intends to conduct an investigation into the suicide of Conrad Brunelle which took place yesterday at St. Vincent de Paul, especially as this prisoner tried to commit suicide three months ago?

Mr. Speaker: Order. I doubt whether this question should be asked on the orders of the day and I would invite the hon. member to place it on the order paper.

INDUSTRY

AUTOMOBILE AGREEMENT—INQUIRY AS TO HOUSE CONSIDERATION

On the orders of the day:

Mr. W. B. Nesbitt (Oxford): Mr. Speaker, I should like to direct a question to the Minister of Industry. In the absence of the minister perhaps I should direct it to the government house leader, the Minister of Public Works. Can he inform the house when there will be an opportunity in this house to discuss the automobile treaty between Canada and the United States?

Hon. G. J. McIlraith (Minister of Public Works): Mr. Speaker, if I had my way it would be almost at once. However, it is a matter of what time the house takes on the very important measures before it at the moment. We expect to have the discussion very shortly.

Mr. Starr: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a question of privilege—

Mr. Nesbitt: I have a supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Could the minister not indicate to the house whether this matter will come up before the Easter break?

Mr. McIlraith: Mr. Speaker, I think it is a little difficult to answer that question now. The government house leader is trying to get all the legislation on the order paper as quickly as possible. On two or three occasions I have included this item on the list of business for the house to consider. On those occasions the house made very good progress with legislation, and I think all hon. members would have to agree that we made good progress, but did not reach this item. I cannot forecast how long the house wishes to take on any given measure brought before it. All I can do is indicate that we are anxious to get it through as quickly as possible.

Hon. Michael Starr (Ontario): I rise on a question of privilege. The leader of the house is suggesting that if he had had his way, this resolution would have been discussed already. But he has always placed this resolution concerning the Canada-United States auto pact at the tail end of the business to be discussed. We have made excellent progress with some 14 pieces of legislation since the beginning of last week—surely the leader of the house must recognize this—and had he wished to deal with this resolution he should have brought it forward ahead of some of the other business he suggested.

Inquiries of the Ministry

Mr. McIlraith: I believe the rules provide that the government has to establish its own priorities, bearing in mind its responsibility for bringing forward legislation. We have brought this resolution forward for consideration on two or three occasions and on those occasions, as I tried to indicate, we have received good co-operation from other members of the house in getting legislation through, but we have not reached this item of business. I suppose one could accuse the government house leader of being somewhat impatient at times, but all I can say is we are anxious to get it through as quickly as we can.

Mr. Starr: That is a lot of nonsense, if I ever heard it. It is sort of two-faced, too.

Mr. McIlraith: No, sir.

SHIPBUILDING

BRITISH COLUMBIA—DISCUSSIONS RESPECTING SUBSIDIES

On the orders of the day:

Mr. T. S. Barnett (Comox-Alberni): If the government and opposition house leaders have finished their discussion I should like to address a question to the Minister of Transport, now that he has had time to catch his breath since his recent visit to British Columbia. I should like to ask him whether while in British Columbia he had the opportunity of holding any discussions with members of the British Columbia government concerning shipbuilding subsidies. I should also like to ask the minister quickly, if I may, before the hon. member for Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands (Mr. Cameron) who has a rather other worldly outlook on this question, whether he had any opportunity of looking into the provision of some form of causeway transportation to Vancouver island.

Mr. Speaker: Order. I suggest this question should be placed on the order paper, unless there is an urgency about it which the Chair fails to see.

[*Later:*]

Mr. Barnett: Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Prime Minister which I shall try to make somewhat narrower than the earlier question I addressed to the Minister of Transport. I should like to ask the Prime Minister whether he would look into the matter of tabling a letter from the premier of British Columbia on the question of shipbuilding subsidies, which on March 1 he told me he would be glad to do. Also would the Prime Minister inquire into the delay in tabling the correspondence which was ordered under notice of motion for production of papers on this same subject on February 2?

Right Hon. L. B. Pearson (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, I was under the impression that the correspondence had been tabled. There may have been one telegram which has come in which was not tabled. In any event, I will be glad to look into it and make the information available.

TECHNICAL AND VOCATIONAL TRAINING

REQUEST FOR SUBSIDIZATION OF TEACHER TRAINING PROGRAMS

On the orders of the day:

Hon. W. G. Dinsdale (Brandon-Souris): I have a question for the Minister of Citizenship and Immigration, who I believe has responsibility for all manpower problems. In view of the critical shortage of teachers and the increasing pressure placed on teacher resources by the rapidly expanding technical and vocational training program, would the minister consider subsidizing teacher training programs under the government sponsored retraining scheme?

Mr. Speaker: Order. I suggest to the hon. member that this is a question of a very general nature, and not the type of question that should be asked at this time.

Mr. Dinsdale: With deference, on a question of privilege, this is a matter of great urgency, as anybody who reads the papers these days must know. I believe the minister himself will be interested in this problem, because it was due to an oversight that teacher training was not included in the retraining program.

Mr. Speaker: I still fail to see the immediate urgency of the matter. It may be very important and urgent, but it seems to me that nothing would be lost by having the question placed on the order paper or, if the hon. member prefers, by discussing it at ten o'clock.

Mr. Dinsdale: I will discuss it at ten o'clock at the first opportunity.

AIR TRANSPORT

NEGOTIATIONS RESPECTING DIRECT SERVICE BETWEEN MONTREAL AND MOSCOW

On the orders of the day:

Hon. J. A. MacLean (Queens): I wish to address a question to the Minister of Transport and ask him whether he has anything to tell the house about negotiations reportedly being carried on between Air Canada and its opposite number in Russia in connection with a direct air service between Montreal and, I believe, Moscow.

Hon. J. W. Pickersgill (Minister of Transport): Some time ago the government authorized Air Canada to enter into discussions with the air line in the Soviet Union, Aeroflot, with a view to seeing whether conditions would be favourable for intergovernmental discussions preparatory to establishing a bilateral agreement. I heard the report on the news this morning, as no doubt the hon. gentleman did, that both parties seem to think quite good progress is being made in these talks. I hope it is.

Mr. MacLean (Queens): Is it contemplated that the Russian air line would have any subsidiary benefits? Would it have just one terminal, or would it have the right to carry passengers from, say, Montreal to Toronto?

Mr. Pickersgill: I do not think one would normally reply to a question of this kind while negotiations were in progress, but I should like to allay any fears that there is any thought of fifth freedom rights.

Mr. Thomas M. Bell (Saint John-Albert): Am I right in understanding that it is the particular air lines which are negotiating this agreement rather than the governments?

Mr. Pickersgill: The actual negotiations would, of course, be between governments, but it would perhaps be somewhat futile to negotiate a bilateral agreement and then find that the air lines were not interested in flying. This is purely an exploratory operation.

POWER

NOVA SCOTIA—GRANT FROM ATLANTIC DEVELOPMENT BOARD

On the orders of the day:

Mr. Richard Cashin (St. John's West): I have a question for the Minister of Transport. Can the minister inform the house whether the Atlantic Development Board has approved a grant for power development in the province of Nova Scotia?

Some hon. Members: Order paper.

Hon. J. W. Pickersgill (Minister of Transport): Yes, sir.

Mr. Donald MacInnis (Cape Breton South): A supplementary question to the Minister of Transport. Would he be as quick with a reply if he were asked to give comparative figures showing how much the Atlantic Development Board had done for Newfoundland as compared with Nova Scotia?

Mr. Pickersgill: Just as quick.

Mr. MacInnis (Cape Breton South): Then I would ask the minister to give us the figures.

Mr. Pickersgill: The figure is $12 million for Nova Scotia for the thermal plant.

Mr. MacInnis (Cape Breton South): And for Newfoundland?

AIRPORTS

VANCOUVER—REPORTED LAY-OFFS AT AIR TRAFFIC CONTROL CENTRE

On the orders of the day:

Mr. Barry Mather (New Westminster): I, too, have a question for the Minister of Transport. It is based on a number of telegrams I received this morning from the Vancouver area. Can the minister say whether lay-offs are taking place in Vancouver air traffic control centre despite a reported shortage of such staff in other areas, posing a possibly hazardous situation?

Hon. J. W. Pickersgill (Minister of Transport): I cannot do so without checking, but I should like to be permitted to say just this word, since the hon. gentleman referred to a possibly hazardous situation. I do not think anyone in the house would like the impression to be left that either the Department of Transport or our air lines would wilfully do anything which would create any hazardous situation.

Mr. Mather: Would the minister undertake to look into this situation?

Mr. Pickersgill: I will look into it just as soon as the orders of the day are reached.

[*Translation*]

URANIUM

POSSIBLE SALES TO PAKISTAN

On the orders of the day:

Mr. Henri Latulippe (Compton-Frontenac): Mr. Speaker, I had a question for the Minister of Trade and Commerce but in his

absence I shall direct it to the Prime Minister.

Following agreements entered into with Pakistan in January 1966, on the financing of an atomic power plant for peaceful purposes, can the Prime Minister tell us whether this nuclear power plant will benefit Canada with respect to the sale of Canadian uranium?

Mr. Speaker: This question should be put on the order paper.

[*English*]

GRAIN

PRINCE RUPERT, B.C.—INCREASE IN ELEVATOR CAPACITY

On the orders of the day:

Mr. Frank Howard (Skeena): In the absence of the Minister of Northern Affairs and National Resources, who usually makes announcements about these matters in British Columbia, I wonder if I can ask the Minister of Agriculture whether he has yet reached a favourable decision about the grain elevator in Prince Rupert.

Hon. J. J. Greene (Minister of Agriculture): Mr. Speaker, I think I will leave the answer to that question and the venue to the Minister of Northern Affairs and National Resources.

AGRICULTURE

SUGAR BEETS—REQUEST FOR ANNOUNCEMENT OF SUPPORT PRICE

On the orders of the day:

Mr. H. W. Danforth (Kent (Ont.)): Mr. Speaker, I should like to address a question to the Minister of Agriculture. Could the minister indicate when he will be in a position to announce the policy of the government with regard to the support price for the Canadian sugar beet crop during the year 1966-67?

Hon. J. J. Greene (Minister of Agriculture): Mr. Speaker, the policy is under consideration and will be announced in due course in a short statement.

[*Translation*]

INVITATION TO MINISTER TO VISIT QUEBEC

On the orders of the day:

Mr. Auguste Choquette (Lotbinière): Mr. Speaker, I would like to put a question to the Minister of Agriculture.

[Mr. Latulippe.]

In view of the minister's successful trip in western Canada and the hearty reception Quebec gave the recently announced dairy policy, does the minister propose to visit very soon those areas of rural Quebec where he will be most welcome?

Mr. Greene: Soon, Mr. Speaker.

[*English*]

BROADCASTING

REQUEST FOR MORE RELIGIOUS PROGRAMS ON SUNDAYS

On the orders of the day:

Mr. R. A. Webb (Hastings-Frontenac): Mr. Speaker, I should like to address a question to the Secretary of State. Would the Secretary of State kindly consult with the members of the Board of Broadcast Governors and request that there be more Sunday programs with a religious content?

Mr. Speaker: Order. This question should be placed on the order paper.

POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT

INVESTIGATION INTO GRIEVANCES OF EMPLOYEES

On the orders of the day:

Hon. Michael Starr (Ontario): Mr. Speaker, I should like to ask the Postmaster General when he expects the report from His Honour Judge Montpetit who is investigating the grievance of the postal workers.

Hon. Jean-Pierre Côté (Postmaster General): Mr. Speaker, it is hoped that the report will be presented by the end of June.

Mr. Starr: Would that be the final report or an interim report?

Mr. Côté (Longueuil): I do not think there will be an interim report.

ADMINISTRATION OF JUSTICE

PROPOSED REMOVAL OF FEMALE PRISONERS FROM KINGSTON PENITENTIARY

On the orders of the day:

Mr. Harold E. Winch (Vancouver East): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Solicitor General, and it is urgent. In view of the policy statement to the effect that 20 women are to be removed from Kingston penitentiary to the new institution at Matsqui, and in view of the fact that 19 of the 20 said they did not wish to be removed, is consideration to be given to the request of those who have stated their desire to remain in Kingston and not be removed to Matsqui?

Hon. L. T. Pennell (Solicitor General): Mr. Speaker, I have had a preliminary discussion with the commissioner of penitentiaries. He is now in western Canada, and as soon as he returns I believe I will be in a position to report on the matter.

NORTHERN AFFAIRS

ROADS TO RESOURCES—RE-ESTABLISHMENT OF PROGRAM

On the orders of the day:

Mr. Robert Simpson (Churchill): Mr. Speaker, I should like to address a question to the Minister of Mines and Technical Surveys. Is the minister in a position to advise the house whether the government has as yet made a decision one way or the other in respect of the re-establishment of the roads to resources program?

Hon. Jean-Luc Pepin (Minister of Mines and Technical Surveys): No, Mr. Speaker.

PENITENTIARIES

INQUIRY AS TO STAFF RECLASSIFICATION AND SALARY REVISION

On the orders of the day:

Mr. Robert C. Coates (Cumberland): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of National Revenue. Is the minister in a position to indicate when a decision will be rendered in respect of the reclassification and salary revision of the Canadian penitentiary service?

Hon. E. J. Benson (Minister of National Revenue): Mr. Speaker, the report has been received and is being studied by the civil service association as well as the civil service commission, and the treasury board. There will be consultation after this, and I can promise when it comes to the treasury board after the consultations there will be no delay.

NATIONAL CAPITAL COMMISSION

REQUEST THAT RESPONSIBILITY BE ACCEPTED FOR OTTAWA STREETS

On the orders of the day:

Mr. Barry Mather (New Westminster): Mr. Speaker, I have a question I should like to ask the Minister of Public Works. Having in mind the money which Canadians spend to beautify Ottawa, our national capital, and also considering the perpetually dirty and deplorable conditions of Ottawa streets, would the minister consider asking the National Capital Commission to take over and keep clean at least some of what appear to be the main Ottawa streets?

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. This question might be placed on the order paper.

AIR TRANSPORT

INQUIRY AS TO AIR LINES TO OPERATE NEW ROUTES

On the orders of the day:

Mr. Stanley Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Mr. Speaker, may I ask the Minister of Transport whether the government has yet made a decision in respect of which air line will be given the route between Toronto and Los Angeles, and which air line will be given the route between Vancouver and San Francisco?

Hon. J. W. Pickersgill (Minister of Transport): Mr. Speaker, the government is in the process of making these decisions at the moment.

COAL

REPORTED INTENTION OF BOARD MEMBERS TO RESIGN

On the orders of the day:

Mr. Robert Muir (Cape Breton North and Victoria): Mr. Speaker, I should like to direct a question to the Minister of Mines and Technical Surveys. May I ask the minister if he can advise us whether one or two members of the Dominion Coal Board have left or are comtemplating leaving their positions? I would hope this is not so.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. I do not see how this question can be so urgent that it is the type of question which may be asked at this time.

Mr. Muir (Cape Breton North and Victoria): Mr. Speaker, the only reason I ask this, and the reason I consider it of great importance, is the fact that this board is of importance to the coal mining industry. We have a new coal board chairman, and I would hope we are not losing any members of the staff. I am sure the minister understands the situation.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

Interim Supply

SUPPLY

The house in Committee of Supply, Mr. Batten in the chair.

INTERIM SUPPLY

Mr. Sharp moved:

Resolved, That a sum not exceeding $870,275,-281.00, being the aggregate of—

(a) two twelfths of the total of all of the items set forth in the main estimates for the fiscal year ending 31st March, 1967, laid before the House of Commons at the present session of parliament, $817,997,151.83;

(b) an additional nine twelfths of the total amount of Transport item 103 (schedule A) of the said main estimates, $408,000.00;

(c) an additional four twelfths of the total amounts of Agriculture item 35 and Atomic Energy item 5 (schedule B) of the said main estimates, $3,382,966.67;

(d) an additional three twelfths of the total amounts of Finance item 15, National Research Council item 10 and Transport items 95 and 104 (schedule C) of the said main estimates, $19,582,-100.00;

(e) an additional two twelfths of the total amount of Legislation item 20 (schedule D) of the said main estimates, $959,816.67;

(f) an additional one twelfth of the total amounts of External Affairs item 5, Justice item 1, Mines and Technical Surveys items 20, 25, 35, 55, 60, 70 and 85, National Health and Welfare item 41, National Revenue item 5, Northern Affairs and National Resources item 1, Secretary of State item 40, Solicitor General item 5, Transport item 85 and Veterans Affairs item 25 (schedule E) of the said main estimates, $27,945,245.83,

be granted to Her Majesty on account of the fiscal year ending 31st March, 1967.

• (11:50 a.m.)

Mr. Pennell: Mr. Chairman, I rise on a point of order. I have the honour of being asked to fulfil a long standing engagement to address the John Howard Society of Saskatchewan tomorrow noon. I understand it has been traditional for the minister responsible for penitentiaries to honour such a commitment. Ministers of previous administrations have had this honour. There is also another very important event taking place in Prince Albert on the same day and I would be pleased to be able to attend it also. I would therefore ask the indulgence of this house to permit me to fulfil this engagement. There is a reference to a supplementary item of my department in the supplementary estimates, but it will be necessary for me to leave today to be in Saskatchewan in time for this appointment.

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Mr. Benson: Mr. Chairman, the resolution before us regarding interim supply will be followed by a bill to provide for all requirements of the public service up to May 31, 1966. We are asking for two months interim supply. I should like to give the usual assurance to the house that in no instance is the total amount of an item being released by this resolution or the ensuing bill, and that the forms of the resolution and the bill to follow are the usual ones for interim supply.

The passing of this resolution and the ensuing bill will not prejudice the rights and privileges of members to criticize the items of the estimates when they come up for consideration in committee of supply. I give the usual undertaking that such rights and privileges will be respected and will not be curtailed or restricted in any way as a result of the passage of this measure.

Mr. Churchill: Mr. Chairman, I am not launching into a full speech, so any applause I might receive will quickly subside. At this moment what I am doing is recording an objection so there will be no misunderstanding in the future. I do not consider it normal practice, usage or custom of this house to grant interim supply for a two month period at this time of the year. The normal practice has been to grant one month of interim supply at a time until the main estimates are passed, except in circumstances where a summer adjournment occurs or where advance notice of an election is given. Under those circumstances perhaps three or four months interim supply is granted.

Therefore I record my objection to this request for two months supply, and I hope this will not be considered as a precedent for the future.

Mr. Lewis: Mr. Chairman, I rise to address myself to the question I posed earlier today, regarding a situation which I earnestly request the Minister of Labour to look at with more realism than he has done up to now. I refer to the strike in the trucking industry in the province of Ontario which, as was indicated earlier, has been going on now for some nine weeks with disastrous results to some 8,000 families, because there are 8,500 truckers involved. I imagine this has also had serious results for the 55 trucking firms involved, as well as for many hundreds of shippers throughout the province.

I appreciate that negotiations have been taking place for a long time, and that there was a conciliation procedure which was followed through the co-operation of both the federal and provincial governments. There

[Mr. Speaker.]

was a conciliation board report which the unions were not willing to accept.

I want to draw your attention first, Mr. Chairman, to the fact that I am not raising this matter on the floor of the federal House of Commons lightly. I know a little about the organization of this industry, having been involved in court in one or two cases on problems of jurisdiction as between federal and provincial authorities. I am certain in my own mind that the strike involves the federal authority very much more than it involves the provincial one because, in my opinion, at least 70 per cent of the employees concerned are engaged in interprovincial and international transportation and are therefore covered by the federal law.

Last Saturday night I was in Hamilton, and that is the reason I am raising this issue with some urgency today. I addressed a meeting concerned with raising some funds to augment the benefits paid to striking workers who are members of local 879 of the teamsters' union which has its headquarters in that city. I learned from some of the workers that they are reaching the point now where their personal lives and the lives of their families are pretty seriously affected by the continuation of the strike.

I also learned from the president of the local union, Mr. Ray Taggart, who is also chairman of the negotiating committee involving all the unions concerned, that there are now three remaining issues of any importance in dispute between the unions and the trucking firms. The first is the question of a 40 hour week; the second is the question of the owner-operators, and the third is the question of certain retaliatory steps taken by some firms against local unions for earlier alleged wildcat strikes.

From my knowledge of the situation I would urge the Minister of Labour not to worry about what are called reprisals; that is, the actions by trucking firms, grievances and damages against local unions, particularly the local in Hamilton; because I am confident that cannot and will not be an obstacle to a settlement if the 40 hour week problem is settled. That is why I speak with very considerable indignation about the attitude of the Minister of Labour in a situation of this sort.

I have often said that a strike is a very regrettable interruption of the normal peaceful labour-management relations that in most cases does, and in all cases should, if at all possible, obtain. When a strike does occur it usually occurs as a result of the accumulation of pretty serious grievances by the people concerned. When a government has the power to do something that will hasten the settlement of a strike but fails to act, it is guilty of a very reprehensible omission of action within its authority. If a government cannot do anything because the matter is merely one of negotiation between the workers and the management concerned, and only offers its good offices and the offices of its labour department to seek conciliation, mediation and negotiation, that is one thing. But when a government has within its hands a law for which it is responsible but fails to act quickly enough or with enough vigour and devotion to the situation, then it is dangerously dilatory.

This government does have a law which it brought in and which was heralded throughout the country as a great social advance for labour, and it could act. The previous minister of labour, the present Minister of National Health and Welfare, made some very moving speeches about this great benefit he was producing for the workers under federal jurisdiction when he introduced the Canada Labour (Standards) Code.

Mr. Douglas: There were some wonderful advertisements in the papers.

Mr. Lewis: There were some very good ads in the papers, as my leader suggests. I did not have the pleasure of listening to the minister when he introduced this legislation, because I was not a member of parliament at the time; but because of my interest in this field I carefully read the reports of his speeches which indicated that they were speeches of great hope and satisfaction, if not smugness, in regard to the great good he was performing for the workers of Canada.

• (12:00 noon)

So you pass a law, and the law says that the standard work week is to be 40 hours. Then you have a strike of workers precisely on the issue of the 40 hour week, and the Minister of Labour sits back and lets the strike continue for nine weeks, doing nothing at all about it.

Some hon. Members: Shame.

Mr. Lewis: I say to you, Mr. Chairman, that I might have raised this issue on the floor many weeks ago. I did not. Instead I wrote to the Minister of Labour as long ago as February 22. I was not interested then, no more than I am interested now, in raising the issue on the floor merely to make a lot of noise. So I wrote to the Minister of Labour

on February 22 and pleaded with him to make a decision and announce the decision on the application for deferment of the hours of work provided under the Canada Labour (Standards) Code.

I indicated in my letter to him that even if he was not prepared to say the 40 hour week shall be applied immediately, he would perform a service in the present strike if he had the imagination and the will and were ready to say at least that the hours of work from then on would be 42 or 43 hours a week for the next 18 months, and at the end of that time we would have to go back to what the law provides. Even that would have been of some help to the negotiating parties.

I received an answer from the minister dated February 28. I will paraphrase it instead of reading it—and I assure you, Mr. Chairman, that I will paraphrase it accurately—in which he said, "The parties are negotiating. Therefore I am not going to make any statement. I do not think it would serve any purpose."

Therefore I wrote again to the minister on March 1 and pointed out to him what was obvious, that it is his law; that he has a duty to administer it; that he has a duty to make sure the law is applied, not at the whim of employers or even of unions but in the interests of the public; that he has a duty so to act without waiting for the negotiations to drag on and allowing all the evils of the strike to continue. He replied saying, "I don't agree with you. I am not going to act because these people are in negotiation."

Mr. Caouette: Mr. Chairman, would the hon. member permit a question?

Mr. Lewis: Yes.

Mr. Caouette: Before the strike took place, how many hours a week were these people working in the transport industry in Ontario?

Mr. Lewis: An outrageous number of hours, in my opinion. Many of them were working as many as 48 hours a week. Some of them were working a lesser number of hours, but many were working as many as 48 hours a week. They have been fighting to my knowledge for many years to have their hours reduced to the 40 hours which is the standard work week throughout Canada.

Not only has parliament said that there was to be a 40 hour week, and this is what I consider to be—I use this word deliberately—the criminality of the Minister of Labour in not taking action, but I am confident in my

mind that the union might not even have asked for the 40 hour week if it had not been the law. It is an experienced, well established union, and might have asked for a reduction only of four or five hours from the 48 rather than a reduction of the full eight hours. The only reason it asked for the 40 hour week is that it said "Here is the law of Canada. Our parliament said to us that we should not work more than a standard work week of 40 hours. So we go to the negotiating table and ask for it. We ask for what the law provides. Then we are denied it, not only by the trucking firms but by the government that introduced this law." I am almost speechless with indignation at this kind of irresponsible and callous behaviour toward a law of parliament for which the government itself is responsible.

I said the other day in another connection that I took the trouble, at some considerable time and with some help, to go through the various Canada Gazettes some time ago to find out how many firms and what firms asked for deferment, particularly of part 1 of the Canada Labour (Standards) Code, namely the part that deals with hours of work. This was because a question placed on the order paper by my hon. friend the member for Winnipeg North had not been answered, and I do not think it has yet been answered. Therefore I looked for this information myself. I think I am not exaggerating, in fact I am sure I am not, when I say there is not a single firm that comes under federal jurisdiction which has not asked for deferment under part 1 of the Canada Labour (Standards) Code.

May I take a moment to remind hon. members of the following facts about that code. The code provides that if an application for deferment is made and it appeared in the Canada Gazette for July 1, 1965, there was an automatic deferment of part 1 of the act without any other action by anybody. That automatic deferment could last for no more than 18 months; then the minister is given authority to provide for a further deferment for another 18 months once he has made up his mind on the application for deferment. After that there is provision for a further inquiry in case there is another application for deferment. This, after all, makes the act not a very demanding piece of legislation, despite what the minister boasted about in regard to its provisions. It was not providing

the 40 hour week for employees under federal jurisdiction; it was providing an opportunity for them to get it in 36 months or perhaps a little longer.

This is what my letters to the minister requested him to do, namely to indicate that they would have it at the end of the period of deferment provided in the act. Even that the minister has refused to do. If members are told by anybody who replies, if anybody does reply for the government, that there are other issues, let me say that after long years of experience in negotiations and many conversations with leaders of the negotiating committee of the union in the past couple of months, I am absolutely certain that if the minister had the will to carry into effect the law which his government put on the books, there would be a settlement of this strike within days after his so doing; because the issue about which the membership feels most keenly, and rightly so, is that of the 40 hour week.

When I spoke to a number of these workers last Saturday night in Hamilton the answer invariably was "All the people in the Steel Company of Canada, in Canadian Westinghouse and in every other industry in Hamilton, and the same in Windsor, London and Toronto, work a 40 hour week. This is the standard. The federal parliament passed a law giving us the right to the 40 hour work week. Why don't we get it? And we are 'so-and-so' if we go back to work before we get it."

The members of the negotiating committee have said to me—and I am sure they would not mind my saying it to this House of Commons, even though it is part of their negotiations—that they will not necessarily insist on getting the 40 hour week the moment the agreement is signed; that they are prepared to consider—this is why the earlier motion I moved did not say "the immediate implementation of the 40 hour week" but a "rapid transition" toward it—a rapid transition toward the 40 hour week if the employers were willing to consider it.

I have outlined the facts of this matter, Mr. Chairman. I do not intend to prolong my speech. I say it is in the hands of this government to take steps today which within a week will settle the strike which has now lasted for nine weeks. I say that the government has a duty under its own law to take those steps today, not next month or two months from now after people have suffered unnecessarily for a further eight to nine weeks. The government has a duty to do this today, because the law is there on the statute books. I say if it does that, it will act like a government with conscience and sense of responsibility for the laws of Canada. If it does not, it will show complete callousness and complete contempt for its own law and its duties under that law.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Mongrain: Mr. Chairman, may I put a question to the hon. member for my information?

Mr. Lewis: Certainly.

Mr. Mongrain: Could the hon. member tell the house whether the truckers or employers officially asked the government to intervene in the conflict?

• (12:10 p.m.)

[*English*]

Mr. Lewis: Certainly, Mr. Chairman, they have made many demands for intervention by the federal government. As a matter of fact I am sure the Minister of National Health and Welfare will recall some of these because he answered some of them. I have in my file a copy of a telegram that went to the Prime Minister on October 27, during the election campaign. The reply at that time was suitably honeyed; it did not make any definite promises or undertakings, but it had all the honey that a reply during an election campaign is expected to have. I do not blame the right hon. gentleman for that.

I have in my hand a copy of a reply to a telegram dated November 9 to the president of local 879. There have been other communications from the teamsters' locals to the Minister of Labour. There have been numerous interventions emphasizing the request that the 40 hour week be implemented by the government in accordance with the Canada Labour (Standards) Code.

I want to say one further word about a related matter, one of the other issues in dispute, which again could be settled very quickly by the Minister of Labour and the government. I refer to the problem of owner-operators. This problem can be simply stated. It is possible for an employer to circumvent the legislation by making a legal arrangement, either with his own employees or with someone else's, whereby the people doing the trucking are, under the law, not employees of the trucking firm but independent owner-operators. Every time the laws have pinched

the employers too hard, in their opinion, this is what they have done. In the letter of February 22 to the Minister of Labour, to which I have referred, I said this, Mr. Chairman:

> You could be of similar assistance with respect to owner-operators. Obviously the labour code is not of much value to an industry like trucking if it is possible for the employer to evade the law by the simple expedient of hiring owner-operators or making some technical legal arrangements enabling the employer to transform employees into alleged owner-operators. The obvious way of closing this loop-hole is to amend the act so that it covers owners-operators as well as employees.

The minister, in his reply dated February 28—I am referring to the present Minister of Labour—stated in the last paragraph:

> As regards the inclusion of owner-operators within the scope of the code, this suggestion certainly merits consideration and is one that will be studied when possible amendments to the code are under review.

In this respect, Mr. Chairman, I make this simple suggestion and simple appeal to the minister. If he is studying the proposal and if he is likely to introduce amendments to provide for the inclusion of owner-operators under the code, then let him say so. I appreciate that if it is done it will be done with the necessary qualifications to ensure that we will not be including someone who is really an employer of other people rather than simply an owner-operator. A mere announcement by him that he is giving favourable consideration to that, and that this session or within a short time the act will be amended to cover this loophole, would be sufficient for the unions to give careful consideration to withdrawing their demands in the present negotiations.

These are the reasons, Mr. Chairman, I considered the question one of urgent importance, and why I raised it on the floor of this house. In my submission it is entirely within the hands of this government to end the trucking strike within a few days if the government will act.

Mr. Munro: The hon. member for York South has indicated grave concern for the welfare of the workers in the trucking industry who have suffered from a long period without work. I think we all share that concern. Perhaps the solution is not quite as simple as the hon. member has suggested. I wish it were that simple.

The hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre, who is in the house, will recall that when the labour code was under discussion in the house grave concern was expressed about the effect it would have on the trucking industry because their operations were based on a longer work period. There was also a suggestion that the workers in the trucking industry were not primarily the employees the code was designed to affect. They were not the workers we wanted to upgrade. The workers with whom we were concerned at that time were those receiving ridiculously low wages or ridiculously low hourly rates. The code, which was widespread in application, had to include workers in industries who had collective agreements, and workers who had bargaining agents who had great experience in this labour relations field.

[Mr. Lewis.]

The hon. member for York South refers to the fact that the law sets up a 40 hour week and asks why we are not applying this law to the trucking industry. I wish it were that simple. In so far as certain industries are concerned, such as this one, where serious dislocation would be created by the application of the law, there is a provision for deferment. One of the reasons for deferment is the fact that in many cases unions in these industries have bargained for benefits far beyond those provided under this minimal standards legislation. We did not want to dislocate them too greatly.

Great concern on this point was expressed at that time by N.D.P. members as well as by Liberals and, I believe, members of the official opposition, although I do not have the record before me at the moment. It was felt that if we applied the 40 hour week to these employees without a sufficient interval of time for this arrangement to be worked out between employees, employers and the government, serious loss of wages would result.

I can recall this concern being expressed in this house at the time the code was being discussed. This is one of the reasons this procedure for deferment was provided in the legislation. We all recall that the trucking industry put on a tremendous lobby to have their industry exempted entirely from the legislation. This pressure was resisted, but at the same time there was great concern on the part of employees in the transportation industry that this 40 hour week provision would be applied without any qualification, and too quickly. It was for this reason the deferment period was provided. This was especially true where serious dislocation would be experienced, and wide latitude was given for negotiation between employers and employees.

Mr. Starr: I wonder if the parliamentary secretary would allow me to ask him a question. In view of the fact that time allotted to interim supply is part of the 30 day limit on supply, would he consider postponing his remarks until we are considering the supplementary estimates?

• (12:20 p.m.)

We just have one more speaker who will take five or six minutes, and then we can pass interim supply and get on to the supplementary estimates.

Mr. Munro: Mr. Chairman, I am not going to take very much longer in any event, but I think some of the points raised by the hon. member for York South, who as he said was not in the house at the time the labour code went through, should be answered to clarify the situation.

Some rather strong language has been used, words like "callous," "careless" and "utter disregard for the worker". That is pretty strong stuff. One has to go back to the time the legislation went through to put the situation regarding the passage of this labour code into its proper perspective. With regard to the trucking industry, particularly trucking employees, there was not such a hue and cry over how callous the government was when we put into the bill, the provisions for deferment why?—because they would be just as beneficial to the employees of that industry as to the employers. It was the employees who were concerned about the marked loss in their wage packets received at the end of the week were we immediately to implement a 40 hour week.

There is no question about that, because at the time this provision was put into the legislation I talked to these employees myself. In the interval since that time negotiations have been going on at all levels of government with the employees and employers. Talks have been held throughout this strike in an endeavour to work out some arrangement through the collective bargaining process. This being so, it is a strange phenomenon to me to find the hon. member for York South now advocating that the government step in, ignore the provisions of the law regarding the opportunity for deferment and, in effect, force a settlement. That is what he is suggesting.

Mr. Lewis: No, it is not.

Mr. Munro: It certainly is. The hon. member said that if we were to enforce a 40 hour week tomorrow the strike would be settled immediately.

Mr. Lewis: I did not even say that there should be a 40 hour week tomorrow. I said there should be a rapid transition toward that.

Mr. Munro: As I recall the theme of the hon. member's remarks it looked to me, with some knowledge of the labour code and the background to it, as if the hon. member was making the suggestion that there should be a form of compulsory arbitration, or that the government should come in and settle the strike. But I would point out that there are provisions to enable a union such as this to settle disputes by the collective bargaining process.

Mr. Lewis: Nonsense.

Mr. Munro: The hon. member mentioned that if it had not been for the fact that provision is made in the legislation for a 40 hour week, the unions might not have asked for it at all. That is precisely one of the reasons that we put in this deferment period, in the case of unions in the same position as this particular union, which has developed sophisticated bargaining arrangements. We put in these deferment provisions for the benefit of these particular workers.

Mr. Lewis: Would the parliamentary secretary permit a question? If that was the intent, why did the government not have the frankness to exclude from the code those employees covered by collective agreements? They did not do that. What right has the parliamentary secretary now to interpret the law in that way? The law is there, and he cannot now interpret it in this fashion.

Mr. Munro: The hon. member for York South dealt at some length with his interpretation of the law and I assume that I have the same right, especially when I was in the house at the time this particular law was debated and the hon. member was not. I do not know whether he has read the speeches made during the passage of the legislation, including speeches made by members of his own party, but I think it smacks a little of political opportunism now to stand up and say the government is negligent for not applying this particular section and to suggest that we are not adhering to the law, particularly when it comes to assisting the employees in this industry. It is not prejudicial to them, and the hon. member's party did not object to it at the time.

Mr. Barnett: Mr. Chairman, I should like to raise a question arising from the remarks of the hon. member who has just taken his seat. The hon. member made reference to the position taken by the New Democratic party during discussion of the labour standards code. He suggested that the hon. member for York South was not in the house at that time. I was one of the members who were in the house, and I suggest to the hon. member, if I may, that he had better check the record again. The concern some of us had about these deferment provisions was that the government, with these provisions in the code, would do precisely what apparently it is now doing, namely making the real purposes of the act completely inoperative.

That is the concern which was in the minds of those in this party who were in this house when that code was put through. I myself very clearly remember attempting to suggest that the principle of the 40 hour week was the one which would be applied. We had a lot of discussion on the question of averages, but at no time did we ever suggest that we felt these deferment provisions should be in the code or that they should be used in order to postpone indefinitely the application of the 40 hour week.

The hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre reminds me that we made specific proposals for cutting down the deferment period.

Mr. Munro: My point, which I thought I had made clear, was that there was, of course, concern on all sides of the house. There was concern on this side and in the New Democratic party that any succeeding government might in fact use this legislation to deny the privileges of the act to those employees that it was most desirous they should reach, namely those who were employed earning less than the minimal wage standards. I do not think, recalling what went on at the time of the debate, that our concern was with respect to employees of the trucking industry who had collective agreements and relatively high hourly rates. We were concerned with those receiving the low hourly rates when we passed the code.

Mr. Barnett: I suggest the hon. member speak for himself in this matter, not for the members of this party.

Mr. MacEachen: Mr. Chairman, I should like to make a few comments in connection with the remarks of the hon. member for York South. I regret that he has left the house, but I am sure he has left for a good reason.

[Mr. Munro.]

The Canada Labour (Standards) Code is made up of four components; hours of work, wages, statutory holidays and vacations with pay. Before I get into the provisions of the code may I say it is still the fact that this legislation, providing as it does for a range of conditions in these four fields, has no rival in any country of the world. It is unrivalled in its comprehensiveness and in the extent to which it attempts to apply favourable conditions to the life of the worker.

With respect to statutory holidays there were no deferment provisions. With respect to vacations with pay there were no deferment provisions. Deferment provisions were provided in the case of minimum wages and hours of work. There have been requests to defer the application of the minimum wage but none of these requests has been granted. That fact has not been noted. At least to my knowledge there has been no request granted to defer application of the minimum wage.

• (12:30 p.m.)

With respect to hours of work, two choices were available to the government at that time. One choice was to do what had been done in almost every other jurisdiction, which was to provide for a range of exemptions so the law would never be operative with respect to hours of work. That was the course taken in the United States; it was the course taken in the province of Saskatchewan; it was the course taken in almost every province of Canada where, with respect to hours of work, there were a series of blanket escape clauses so the hours of work would never become applicable.

We resisted that course and provided that within a certain period of time the standard hours, or the 40 hour week, would become applicable. I remember very clearly the pressures that came upon me as Minister of Labour not to maintain that principle, from the trucking industry, from the employers and from the employees in the trucking industry. I had delegations of workers coming to my office asking that this provision not go into effect because they were afraid, as we all were, that the immediate application of the 40 hour week would result in a reduction in take home pay unless there was a supplementary provision proviidng for the maintenance of take home pay, as it had been made available under the previous regime.

We knew the effects of that. It would be very disruptive, especially because our jurisdiction federally is applicable to interprovincial and international trucking, and there were many trucking firms under our jurisdiction which were in competition with trucking firms that were totally within provincial jurisdiction. Provincial ministers of labour and provincial governments were very concerned about the effect of the immediate application of our law with respect to firms that were not within our jurisdiction, and which would be immediately affected.

We took the course that there would be an 18 month provision for deferment upon application, and then, if in the opinion of the minister it were necessary, an inquiry would be held and a further order made in order to determine what ought to be the appropriate regime with respect to hours in any industry.

The trucking industry, of course, provides a classic case. Hon. gentlemen on the other side are complaining today about the effects of the Canada Labour (Standards) Code. I am surprised, because the evidence of the bite, of the effect, of the importance of the Canada Labour (Standards) Code is demonstrated in what is happening in the trucking industry today. In the absence of the Canada Labour (Standards) Code this problem would not arise, and there would be a continued regime of longer hours prevailing in an industry which ought to have reduced its hours a long time ago. In the absence of that code this reduction would not have been effected.

Of course there is disruption. Does the hon. member for York South think social development and social progress will take place without some disruption in normal patterns of counduct and normal patterns of behaviour? If he does, it seems to me he is escaping from his own position as a member in this house.

That is the situation. Undoubtedly, by the Canada Labour (Standards) Code, the government and parliament have tilted the balance in favour of reduced hours. We have left the matter to be worked out, if possible, within the framework of collective bargaining, with the sure knowledge that there is an opportunity within the law, through determined or predetermined procedures by parliament, to induce an appropriate regime of lower hours in this industry.

I am surprised that the hon. member for York South should take this occasion to beat the government over the head with the Canada Labour (Standards) Code, especially when we all know that at the present time very serious negotiations are taking place. Provincial and federal officials are at work in Toronto and other centres in Ontario in order to induce a settlement. Active discussions are taking place in Toronto now, and will take place over this week end, among Ontario departmental officials, federal departmental officials, and representatives of the trucking industry on the employer and on the employee side. They are considering further proposals, and the Ontario department involved is hopeful for a settlement. The federal department involved is also hopeful for a settlement.

I do not think I should add anything further that might frustrate the achievement of this settlement, except that I was persuaded to say something by the remarks of the hon. member for York South who, I think, unfairly used the Canada Labour (Standards) Code to denounce the government for appropriate action being taken at the present time.

This is a good labour bill. The hon. gentleman did nothing to help it by his conduct and his remarks today.

Mr. Coates: I am pleased that the Minister of National Health and Welfare is here, because I should like to have a few words from him on something which happened this morning during the question period, which in my opinion does nothing to strengthen federal-provincial relations between Nova Scotia and the federal government.

The Minister of Transport in a clandestine way, with the hon. member for St. John's West, endeavoured to make a policy announcement in the house, I presume with respect to a grant having to do with the Atlantic Development Board. He did that on orders of the day. During the last election campaign the Minister of National Health and Welfare on numerous occasions asked why—

Mr. Cashin: Mr. Chairman, I rise on a point of privilege arising from the remarks of the hon. member for Cumberland. It has been brought to my attention that he made some suggestion that I was being used by the Minister of Transport. I suggest that the opposite was the case; that I was using the Minister of Transport in order to gain some publicity.

Mr. Coates: That may be true.

Mr. Starr: That is what we call collusion.

Mr. Coates: What was being said with respect to federal-provincial relations certainly concerns the province of Nova Scotia. If this is the case, it is all the more reason for the Minister of National Health and Welfare to be making every effort to see that the province of Nova Scotia is used rightly by the federal government when announcements are to be made that are of direct application to that province and to the people of that province.

Not having Nova Scotia interests looked after is what we get sick and tired of on this side of the house. This is not the sort of thing that happened when the former member for Digby-Annapolis-Kings was the minister.

Mr. MacEachen: What is the hon. gentleman complaining about? Is it the $12 million?

Mr. Coates: There is an example of the attitude evident in the minister's party, about announcements. No, Mr. Chairman, we are not complaining about the $12 million. In fact, we didn't complain about $24 million for Baie d'Espoir, or for more than $20 million earmarked for Nova Scotia. We are complaining about the fact that while $20 million has been earmarked for Nova Scotia, nothing happened; and that the Minister of National Health and Welfare, then the minister of labour, sat in his seat in this house and did nothing for the people of Nova Scotia. That is what I am complaining about.

If the minister thinks just two members from Cape Breton island are going to give him difficulty, I want to warn him now that he has another think coming, because there are ten members from Nova Scotia sitting here in the Progressive Conservative party who are going to create for him a lot more trouble than he has had yet, if he does not smarten up.

Mr. MacEachen: That does not worry me.

Mr. Coates: When he complains outside the house to members of the press gallery that he is not allowed to speak, that is besmirching the record of parliament. You will not get off your seat and get up in the house and answer questions that we demand should be answered. If you were the kind of minister you should be, you would be answering about affairs in Nova Scotia.

• (12:40 p.m.)

Mr. Speaker, I suggest to the Minster of National Health and Welfare that if matters involving Nova Scotia and involving $12 million are to be made public, those announcements should be made in the proper atmosphere. They should be made in an atmosphere which indicates that some weight is given to the announcement that is to be made, an atmosphere which indicates that some importance is attached to the programs to be carried out, and some attention paid to the problems we have in Nova Scotia. No attempt should be made to smuggle these announcements into the House of Commons, through colleagues of the minister, in a clandestine way because members opposite are fearful that some member of the Progressive Conservative party might, in some strange way, get credit for what has been done. It is not a matter of who gets credit for what; it is a matter of keeping federal-provincial relations at a high level.

When we were in office no federal minister was complaining about the kind of treatment he was receiving. No federal minister was complaining about the way the premier of Nova Scotia was doing things. There was co-operation.

I see that our great and true friend, the leading spokesman for the Atlantic provinces, has joined the Minister of National Health and Welfare. Perhaps he will be good enough to rise in this debate and tell the people of Nova Scotia in a straightforward way what the Atlantic Development Board is trying to do, instead of smuggling the announcement into the house in a clandestine manner with the help of the hon. member for St. John's West. Let us have no more of the type of federal-provincial relationship which has been in existence in the past. We are sick of that in Nova Scotia. If this government think they are given rough times by the members of the Progressive Conservative party from Nova Scotia, they have no idea of what is coming.

Mr. Pickersgill: I will be glad to reply to the hon. gentleman.

Mr. Coates: Why don't you do it in the proper way?

Mr. Pickersgill: The hon. member is, of course, an authority on proper conduct.

Mr. Coates: I am just as much an authority on it as you are.

Mr. Pickersgill: I do not pretend to be. I try to keep my own conscience and I find that quite a large enough task. I do not try to

keep other men's consciences, and I think we would have a much better parliament if other members took this attitude.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Pickersgill: There seems to be a notion, one which has not always existed in this parliament, that no private member on this side of the house has any rights. It is also a rule of this house that one cannot reflect on the motives of other members. The hon. member for St. John's West, even though he supports the government, has just as much right to ask a question in this house as has the hon. member for Cumberland. He asked a question, as was his right. The question did not appear to the Speaker to be of a kind which should be answered on orders of the day. On the other hand the hon. member for Cape Breton South asked a question and I was permitted to answer very briefly.

I am very pleased to have the opportunity now to expand on my earlier answer. I am very pleased that the premier of Nova Scotia made this application to the Atlantic Development Board for a new kind of aid. It is true that in the case of Mactaquac and Baie d'Espoir grants were made to assist in the development of hydroelectric power. At that time the government of Nova Scotia took the view that it had no hydroelectric resources which it wished to develop. This was not the kind of government aid the premier of Nova Scotia wanted.

The premier and I had quite lengthy discussions, and the chairman of the board had many more discussions with the premier of Nova Scotia about aid to secondary industries. A good deal has been done in this field, but in the main this kind of activity is taken care of by the area development agency of the Department of Industry. The premier recognized this very well. Though the board had set aside $20 million at the request of Nova Scotia to be reserved for this kind of aid, after the area development agency was established and after certain provisions were made for industrial parks and things of that kind, the premier made this submission to the board which I welcome very much, because it is in accord with what I had suggested when I was on the other side of the house.

It was my view that more coal should be used in Nova Scotia for the development of electric power in that province to promote industrial growth. This proposition was made by the board to the government, and the government gave it the most careful consideration. We came to the conclusion—and we only reached this conclusion yesterday—that in principle this was a very sound thing to do. The Atlantic Development Board is having a meeting in Halifax on Monday, at which time the development of this program will be further considered. There will be discussion, I am sure, between officials of the board and, probably, the chairman of the board and the government of Nova Scotia to achieve an end which I am sure the hon. member for Cumberland has very much at heart, that is the accomplishment of anything we can possibly do to provide an infrastructure and base for greater industrial growth in the Atlantic provinces. It has been a matter of deep regret to me—and I am sure the hon. member will not question me when I say this—that we had not until yesterday been able to find projects in Nova Scotia of the kind that come within the scope of the board on a scale comparable with those in New Brunswick and Newfoundland.

This was only because of the electrical development. As far as other things are concerned there is not much disparity among the three large Atlantic provinces. But these grants of $20 million for hydro development did make the distribution look very unequal. I did not like this any more than the hon. gentleman did, but I also respected the basic principles upon which the board has acted, that we must co-operate with the provinces concerned.

This represents an important proposal for the improvement of the infrastructure of Nova Scotia. It will also do something I have wanted to see done for a long time. I believe that if we can transform the coal in Nova Scotia in such a way that it can be used as electricity in Nova Scotia, or even elsewhere in the Atlantic provinces, as a base for better industrial development there it will be a lot better than paying a big subvention to ship it to Quebec or Ontario. I hope this will be productive of secondary developments which will enable us to go a lot further in this direction.

I go so far as to say I am grateful to the hon. member for Cumberland for raising this matter and giving me an opportunity to say much more than, under the rules, I could possibly have said in answer to a question this morning.

Mr. Coates: I have one question for the minister. Does he think this is the kind of

thing which should be announced by way of question and answer on orders of the day?

• (12:50 p.m.)

Mr. Pickersgill: I think it would have been quite easy for me to issue a press release this morning. I agree with the view about executive actions, that where there is no policy involved—and the policy of aid of this kind was established some time ago—and we merely are carrying out a policy, we should do the things we have to do here, such as pass estimates and legislation, and should not be taking up time in the house with self advertising announcements made on motions in the House of Commons.

When it is a question of a new policy the house is entitled to hear about it first, if parliament is in session; but when one is merely carrying out a policy which is presently well known, the proper thing to do when an announcement is required is to make it in the normal way. In my department, which spreads itself around in many directions—some people think too far—I suppose we issue one or two press releases a day. Most of these are as dull as dishwater. If I were to come in and make statements on motions on each of these things I think the hon. member really could criticize my conduct, and perhaps I should be expelled from the house.

Mr. Lewis: Mr. Chairman, I should like to go back to the issue I raised and in respect of which the Minister of National Health and Welfare and the hon. member for Hamilton East spoke. First may I say that the hon. member for Hamilton East said something about political opportunism, and I would like to say with all the kindness I can that that is an unworthy retort made when there is nothing to be said which is worth saying. I would hope that the young, and I am sure well meaning, member for Hamilton East would not quickly descend to that kind of unworthy reply.

Second, Mr. Chairman, I have always thought I am reasonably able to articulate my ideas, but apparently one fails frequently when exchanging ideas with political opponents. I did not speak from notes, but I would be ready to bet whatever reputation I have on the statement that never did I, in my statement today or at any other time, criticize the code. I did not say that the labour code was bad. I did not criticize any part of the act which the minister introduced, today nor at any other time.

[Mr. Coates.]

What I criticized was the failure of the minister to act in accordance with the code and the circumstances as they require it. That is what I criticized, not the code. I am perfectly well aware that my colleagues who were in parliament when this code was introduced supported it. Any criticism they had was with regard to deferment. So I am aware they support it, and so do I. I do not hesitate for one moment to say to the Minister of National Health and Welfare that it is a useful piece of legislation, even though introduced by a political party which I do not support. I was glad to see it on the statute book. I said it then, and I say it now without hesitation.

I say to the hon. member for Hamilton East that it is wrong to suggest I was trying to do something for political opportunism. Let me tell him why. I spoke to the Minister of Labour on a few occasions and said I did not want to ask a question because I did not want to make this a matter of political controversy on the floor of parliament, knowing that negotiations might be taking place. That is not the way to deal with negotiations.

As I said earlier I wrote the minister a letter a month ago without making it public. The hon. member can think what he likes, but I tell him I desisted from making any public statement except to ask an occasional question, as did the hon. member for Ontario, as to how the negotiations were going on, so long as it seemed to me that the negotiations were taking place. The point I wish to make is that the Minister of National Health and Welfare—and I say this with respect—is mistaken when he says serious negotiations have taken place. The fact, as I am instructed by the leader of the union, is that the negotiations have not been serious and that the parties have met and dispersed.

The fact is that the person who now has become the chief conciliation officer in the provincial government, Mr. William Dickie for whom I have the greatest respect and with whom I have worked for many years, has been unable to get the parties to discuss their issues seriously. My entire point was and is that even though a minister has the right to defer, he has a duty to see what the developing situation is and to take action if the developing situation requires it. In my humble opinion it requires it now.

I did not raise this matter in the first two, three, four or five weeks of this strike; I raised it after the strike had been on for nine or ten weeks. If you let this thing alone it can

drag on and have permanent consequences to the trucking industry. As shippers develop new, alternative ways of shipping goods, both the firms and the employees will be permanently harmed.

I raised the matter today because I see no possibility of a quick settlement which the situation requires. I have no doubt that if you leave it alone it will be settled in some weeks. I raised it today because this mornings' papers carried the news of the Ontario Federation of Labour coming into the picture, because there was news of the Minister of Labour in Ontario saying in the legislature that there was no use his doing anything about it because the major responsibility is that of the federal minister of labour.

These are the incidents and facts in the matter, and it is my submission that it is the duty of a member of this house who has some knowledge of the affair to raise it today and not next week or the week after. I did use strong language, because it seems to me, in my study of political science, there is nothing more reprehensible than a good law which is not implemented. It raises false hopes; the hopes are then dashed because the administration refuses to use the good law which it has. This is the basis of the complaint.

I do not wish to take any more time of the committee. However, I would like to repeat an appeal to the minister. If he is satisfied from his knowledge that serious negotiations are taking place over the week end, then he will not take any action today or tomorrow. If I may say so, I will know on Monday whether they have been serious; we both will know whether the negotiations have been serious. If it should look as though they are approaching settlement then, sure, leave it alone for another day or two; but if it looks, as I am sure it does, that the normal course will take weeks longer, then I appeal to the minister to use the authority he has under the good law—and I use this term deliberately—in accordance with its terms and thus hasten settlement of this regrettable strike.

Mr. Macaluso: Mr. Chairman, I have not taken part in this discussion—

Mr. Starr: Mr. Chairman, may I rise on a question of privilege. I wonder whether this matter could not be discussed further when we reach the supplementaries under the labour item. I asked earlier whether there would be co-operation on the part of government members not to encroach upon the time that is provided for us, where we are limited now, under the new rules, to 30 days for the discussion of estimates and interim supply. What is happening here is that this matter which is being discussed now could be properly taken up, without any wastage of time so far as I am concerned, in the time we have in the future. I wonder whether there could be that co-operation and whether we might pass on to supply and get into the supplementary estimates.

Mr. Macaluso: Mr. Chairman, if I may speak to the question of privilege, I would say to the hon. gentleman that I had not planned to take part in this proceeding whatsoever.

• (1:00 p.m.)

However, the question of the teamsters' strike was raised and I promise the hon. member I will not take more than five or six minutes of the committee's time to refer to it. I have some personal knowledge of this matter which I should like to put before the committee because I may be able to be of assistance.

Mr. Starr: Mr. Chairman, I would ask again that the hon. member defer his remarks until we reach the consideration of the supplementary estimates of the Department of Labour, at which time he can make his contribution.

Mr. Macaluso: When will those estimates be coming before us?

Mr. Bell (Carleton): Why not call them as the first item?

Mr. McIlraith: I imagine they will be reached later this afternoon.

Mr. Macaluso: In that event I am prepared to accept the suggestion.

The Deputy Chairman: I recognize the hon. member for Renfrew North.

Mr. Starr: Mr. Chairman, I rise on a question of privilege. I think the government is now purposely attempting to take up the time that is allotted to the opposition for the discussion of the estimates of the current fiscal year.

Mr. Cashin: I should like to make a few remarks on this point. As a government supporter I have always objected to the suggestion in this house that private members on the government side do not have equal rights to speak. There are many occasions on

which we do not speak for the sake of pacifying the opposition.

Mr. Churchill: Do you not want the estimates passed?

Mr. Starr: Mr. Chairman, I rise on the question of privilege that has now been brought forward by the hon. member for St. John's West. No one disputes the fact that the government backbenchers and frontbenchers have the same rights as anyone else, but we are asking now for co-operation so that these matters can be brought up during consideration of the supplementary estimates.

Mr. McIlraith: Mr. Chairman, I am sure that the opposition house leader did not mean to imply that the government was deliberately taking up the time of the committee.

Mr. Starr: The hon. member for St. John's West implied that. I did not.

Mr. McIlraith: I would hope that the hon. member would withdraw his suggestion. Perhaps there is some misunderstanding among members because of the fact that for the first time we have a time allocation for the consideration of estimates which also covers interim supply but not the final supplementary estimates, the next item of business for today. I think that now we have that misunderstanding cleared up there will be no more speeches made by members on this side.

Mr. Starr: The Minister of National Revenue is trying to get up.

Mr. McIlraith: Perhaps the minister piloting the bill through should be given a few minutes to speak.

Mr. Benson: Mr. Chairman, I have no intention of making a speech, but I am sure the hon. member for Winnipeg South Centre would like me to correct something he said at the beginning of the proceedings. He said it was unusual to ask for two twelfths of supply at this time. I have checked the records for the past 25 years and I find that the first interim supply motion has always been for two twelfths or more except for one year.

The Deputy Chairman: Shall the resolution carry?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Motion agreed to.

Resolution reported and concurred in.

[Mr. Cashin.]

WAYS AND MEANS

INTERIM SUPPLY

The house in committee of ways and means, Mr. Rinfret in the chair.

Mr. Benson (for Mr. Sharp) moved:

Resolved, that toward making good the supply granted to Her Majesty on account of certain expenses of the public service for the fiscal year ending 31st March, 1967, the sum of $870,275,281.00, be granted out of the consolidated revenue fund of Canada.

Motion agreed to.

Resolution reported and concurred in.

Mr. Benson (for Mr. Sharp) thereupon moved for leave to introduce Bill No. C 157, for granting to Her Majesty certains sums of money for the public service for the financial year ending the 31 March 1967.

Motion agreed to, bill read the first and second times and the house went into committee thereon, Mr. Batten in the chair.

On clause 2—*$870,275,281 granted for 1966-67.*

Mr. Churchill: Mr. Chairman, I wonder whether we could obtain an explanation regarding clause 2, and particularly paragraphs (b) to (f) in respect of which instead of granting two twelfths we are being asked to grant nine twelfths, four twelfths and three twelfths in some instances as well as two twelfths for certain departments.

Mr. Benson: Mr. Chairman, I could go into this matter in some detail if the hon. member would like me to. In some instances it has always been the case on interim supply motions that amounts of cash are needed to a greater extent than two twelfths. For example, the total expenditure for a particular appropriation might have to be made in the month of April. The items listed here for which more than two twelfths are being asked are items in respect of which expenditures or large portions of them will have to be made by the end of May. We will therefore have to exceed two twelfths in order to meet current accounts which come due.

Clause agreed to.

Clauses 3 to 6 inclusive agreed to.

Schedules A to D inclusive agreed to.

• (1:10 p.m.)

On Schedule E—

Mr. Churchill: Mr. Chairman, may I ask a question on schedule E? If the minister's

statement of a short while ago was correct—and I am not quarrelling with it—and in view of the fact that it has been customary to pass two twelfths at this period of the year, why in schedule E is the amount being granted only one twelfth of the various totals affecting 11 departments?

Mr. Benson: The reason that one twelfth is being granted, I would presume—and I shall be pleased to look into this question further for the hon. member—is that it is anticipated that for these particular departments only one twelfth will be spent by the end of May. This is exactly the opposite of the situation which the hon. member raised with regard to clause 2.

In some cases you may have to spend a little more or a great deal more than two twelfths because the bills fall due faster. In other instances you are not expecting to make expenditures up to the normal two twelfths so you do not ask for two twelfths. In other words, you are only asking for the amount of money that is absolutely necessary to carry on the business of the country until May 31.

If the hon. member will look at the record of interim supply in previous years I think he will find that exactly the same course was followed in previous years. The departments generally ask for and receive two twelfths. In some instances they ask for more and in other instances less. I could get the explanation with respect to these items for the hon. member.

Mr. Baldwin: Mr. Chairman, I do not want to hold up anything but on this issue can the minister tell us, in order that we may properly carry out our responsibilities, what will be the total amount involved in those items which are for more than two twelfths? If the information is not readily accessible that is all right, but I think this would go to the root of the issue. How many millions of dollars are involved in the items with regard to which we are going beyond the two twelfths which was the basis of the original request?

Mr. Benson: I have now received an explanation with regard to schedule E. The one twelfth in schedule E is additional to the two twelfths generally appropriated. This is to carry over into a schedule the intention stated in clause 2. Two twelfths of all items amounts to $817,997,151 out of $870 million, so the difference between the $817,997,000 and the $870,275,000 is the amount which is in excess of two twelfths.

Mr. Churchill: In other words, in schedule E you are really getting three twelfths?

Mr. Benson: That is right. That carries on from the items the hon. member raised with respect to clause 2, items (b) to (f).

Mr. Churchill: If I may refer back to schedule A, Mr. Chairman, the minister is not asking for any more there than just the nine twelfths or is the nine twelfths in addition?

Mr. Benson: It would be nine twelfths plus two twelfths.

Mr. Churchill: That is eleven twelfths?

Mr. Benson: Yes. If the hon. member reads the item he will see that this money is required in respect of the International Exposition in Montreal for harbour works which have to be completed and are expected to be completed by the end of May. It is a particular item with regard to which the total amount of work will be completed by that time. We are leaving one twelfth so there may be a full debate as to its propriety but these payments have to be made to the contractors of Expo.

Schedule agreed to.

Clause 1 agreed to.

Preamble agreed to.

Title agreed to.

Bill reported.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: When shall the said bill be read the third time?

Mr. Benson: By leave, now.

Sone hon. Members: Agreed.

Mr. Benson (for Mr. Sharp) moved the third reading of the bill.

Motion agreed to and bill read the third time and passed.

SUPPLY

The house in committee of supply, Mr. Batten in the chair.

The Chairman: Order. House again in committee of supply, supplementary estimates E for the financial year ending March 31, 1966; estimates of the Department of Agriculture, vote No. 17e.

Mr. Starr: Mr. Chairman, as an acknowledgement of the good grace of the hon. member for Hamilton West in forgoing his remarks on interim supply, may I suggest that with the approval of the committee we take up the Department of Labour item first. To my knowledge there are a number of members who wish to speak to certain items and in order to give them an opportunity of so doing at the beginning of the consideration of these supplementary estimates I suggest that we then deal with the item under transport, followed by finance, public works, Indian affairs and roads to resources, if this is agreeable to the committee.

Mr. Benson: That is agreeable, Mr. Chairman.

The Chairman: Order. The Chair is in some doubt as to the procedure suggested by the hon. member.

Mr. Starr: Mr. Chairman, I suggested that with the agreement of the committee we proceed with the first item under labour to be followed by transport, finance, public works, Indian affairs and roads to resources and then consider the rest of the departments.

The Chairman: Does the committee agree that we proceed with the estimates of the Department of Labour?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

DEPARTMENT OF LABOUR

1e. General administration, $47,500.

Mr. Macaluso: Mr. Chairman, I should like to thank the house leader and the hon. member for Ontario for allowing me the opportunity to make a few short remarks under the supplementary estimates of the Department of Labour with regard to the trucking strike. I should also like to thank the committee for permitting me to make these remarks.

I have very few remarks to make on the matter raised by the hon. member for York South with respect to the teamsters' strike. I have some personal knowledge of the strike and must admit that I and many other hon. members have been very discouraged by the fact that there has not been a settlement of this very costly strike by management and the teamsters' officials. There is no doubt that this strike is causing hardship to families and is also a serious matter so far as the economy of the country is concerned.

[The Chairman.]

• (1:20 p.m.)

I have discussed this matter with the Minister of Labour. I must agree to some extent with the hon. member for York South when he says that some of the discussions which have been held between management and the teamsters' officials have not been serious. They have broken down continuously. I was pleased to hear the Acting Minister of Labour state today that serious negotiations are now being conducted. I suggest to him that he should keep a close eye on this matter because unless proper negotiations are conducted within the next week the federal minister must take some part in bringing the parties together. He may do this through a conciliation officer or by calling the parties together in his office to discuss the matter. I have some personal knowledge of the problems because my associate in my law office in Hamilton has been doing work for the International Teamsters' Union.

I have asked him from time to time how negotiations were going and have been very discouraged to find that negotiations have been breaking down. There is no doubt that part of the difficulty involved lies in the fact that damages are being claimed against employees in the trucking industry because of what has been termed a wildcat strike. I think management perhaps does bear some responsibility because negotiations have not been handled in a serious way. I do not want anything I might say to jeopardize the situation but I believe the Minister of Labour has to keep a much closer eye on this situation. Perhaps he is doing so now but I suggest to him that if the negotiations which are now going on break down once again he should intervene and take part with the provincial minister in bringing the parties together.

In so far as the application of the Canadian Labour (Standards) Code is concerned, there have been some complaints with regard to the application of the 40 hour week to the trucking industry. There have been cases where the employees have not requested the 40-hour week apply to them. This is only one issue and there are many issues now. I will obtain some knowledge this week end about the advancement of negotiations. I certainly feel strongly that if negotiations break down again management will have to bear some responsibility and be answerable not only to the provincial minister but to the federal Minister of Labour.

I suggest, therefore, that after this coming week end I will have more personal knowledge of this matter, as no doubt the hon. member for York South will as well. As a result of my closeness to the situation I certainly feel that the employees of the trucking industry do have some serious complaints. We must consider the hardship on the families concerned and the possible damage to the economy of this country. Although I may not have contributed a great deal to the solution of the problem with these few brief remarks I say again that I do have some personal knowledge of this matter, and I trust the minister will give consideration to some of the relevant facts I have put forward.

Mr. Orlikow: Mr. Chairman, I should like to say something about this matter. Unfortunately I was not here an hour or so ago when the subject was first discussed. I hope that I do not repeat what has been said. I want to add my hope that the federal Minister of Labour will take a much more active part in settling this dispute which has had and will have very serious consequences for the economy of the province of Ontario. I suggest this not only because I think it is important that everything be done which can be done to settle this dispute but because I feel this dispute has arisen, continues and cannot be solved to a large extent because the federal Minister of Labour has not exercised the authority he now has.

During the last session of parliament we passed the Labour (Standards) Code. According to members on the other side the passage of this act would guarantee to all employees coming under the jurisdiction of the federal parliament certain basic minimums such as $1.25 per hour, time and a half for overtime and a 40 hour week. The 40 hour week was so good, that the government of Canada advertised it in a full page advertisement in the newspapers. Hon. members will recall we raised a question about this because the advertisement included a picture of the former minister of labour, but it was alleged this was just a drawing which looked remarkably like him.

Being a curious member of parliament, I put some questions on the order paper which were answered on February 2, 1966. Hon. members can find the questions and answers on page 573 of *Hansard*. One of the questions I asked was, how much money was spent on an advertising campaign to explain to the Canadian people the provisions of the Canadian Labour (Standards) Code?

The answer revealed that the total amount spent on advertising was $185,000. I then asked for a breakdown of how the money was spent as between daily newspapers, weeklies, radio and so on. I do not believe that is important, Mr. Chairman. What is important is that the people of Canada spent $185,000 to explain what a wonderful act we had. I would not have minded if the Liberal Party had spent its own campaign funds. However, the people of Canada spent $185,000 so that they could be told that this was one of the best acts passed by any government in the world.

This act was passed, as I recall, virtually unanimously. Nobody questioned the fact that it would take some time for adjustments to be made. The minister was given 18 months during which time the industries affected could ask for a deferment and the minister could give them a deferment to work out the details. One reason the teamsters are striking is their desire to have a 40 hour week. I do not know how many times since this session started the Minister of Labour has been asked by the hon. member for York South, by myself, by the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre and members of other parties when he would proclaim this section of the act. Would it take a full 18 months? Would it take less than that or would he come back and ask for an extension of that time? I recall on one occasion asking the minister if he was aware of the fact that his own deputy, in a meeting with the railway unions, assured the railway unions that this section of the act would be proclaimed very shortly. The minister said he was aware of it, but the best answer we have been able to get so far is that he is studying the matter.

• (1:30 p.m.)

There are thousands of people on strike, Mr. Chairman. The whole business of shipping goods in a large part of Ontario is being made extremely difficult owing to the strike. I am not suggesting that the minister proclaim the 40 hour week section right away, though I think he should have done so by now. But if the minister would make a decision and announce that the section of the act will come into force on July 1 or on September 1, then the workers concerned, their union and the industry would know. I believe this problem would then no longer be part of the difficulty and differences between the workers and their union on the one side

and the industry on the other side. I think it is a disgrace and negligence of the worst kind that the minister has not only not proclaimed that section of the act but, more than that, has refused to give any indication when he will act in that regard.

The minister is not in the house at the moment and neither is the acting minister, but if they have not recently done so I think they should take another look at the speeches which they made when the legislation was introduced. They should note the importance which they gave to the act and should look at what they promised the people of the country who would be affected by the act. I suggest they stop studying questions which they surely must have studied in detail before introducing the code; otherwise they would be guilty of a most cynical attitude toward both this house and the people of Canada. I cannot believe that they really did not study the implications of the legislation which was introduced with such great fanfare. I cannot believe that they did not have a pretty good idea that it would affect both the workers and the companies involved. I am sure they did.

I do not know what pressures are being exerted on the Minister of Labour to postpone the implementation of the provisions of the code but I think he should do the job he is required to do by law and either proclaim this section now or announce the date when its provisions will come into effect.

If he does that, Mr. Chairman, I am sure, echoing the sentiment expressed by the hon. member for Hamilton West, that the chances for an early settlement will be immeasurably improved. I hope that before many days pass we will get some action instead of the kind of stalling we have had from the Minister of Labour.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Caouette: Mr. Chairman, just a few words following the remarks made by the hon. member who has just resumed his seat and also those made at noon by the hon. member for York South (Mr. Lewis) about the teamsters who are on strike in Ontario.

Both hon. members concerned urged the government and the Minister of Labour (Mr. Nicholson) to enforce the section of the federal legislation concerning the 40 hour week.

I asked the hon. member for York South what were the hours of work before the strike.

They varied between 42, 43 and 48 hours a week. What I find strange is that not so long ago, about a week ago or at the beginning of this week, both hon. members protested against the increase in the cost of living and asked that a price control board be set up in Canada to prevent such increases. Today, the government is urged to intervene in that labour conflict which has been going on for nine weeks, so that the regular work week will be reduced to 40 hours and time and a half will be paid after 40 hours.

How can they reconcile their anti-inflation policy in their opposition to increases in the cost of living and their price and salary control policy, on the one hand, and their asking the government to help increase the salaries and income of the workers, in this case truck drivers in the province of Ontario, on the other?

Those people often like, Mr. Chairman, to quote as examples countries like Russia and Czechoslovakia where everyone works, where there is full employment. Well, I went to Russia and Czechoslovakia last year and I found that, after 50 years of communist rule in Russia, the work week was 46 hours and the right to strike did not exist.

When the workers protest against the boss which is the government everywhere, they can be condemned to hang or to other forms of punishment by that same government.

Mr. Chairman, the Ralliement Créditiste is certainly in favour of workers living decently and enjoying better working conditions throughout Canada.

Although this question of labour is primarily one of provincial jurisdiction, Quebec coming under the provincial government of Quebec and Ontario under the provincial government of Ontario, first representations should be made to the provincial authorities and not to the federal. The federal authorities should be called upon last but not with a view to initiating certain steps or recommendations.

The member for York South made another point this morning, to the effect that after nine weeks of strike, they complain that their wives and children are suffering hardships. That is not the fault of truck owners, the Ontario government, nor that of Ottawa. I say and I repeat, that the ones to be blamed are those labour leaders who spend their time rousing employees against the employers. Instead of acting as conciliators between labour and management, they distribute boxing gloves to both groups, so that hatred is

fostered as much as possible between employers and employees.

If strike promoters in Canada could prove to me that a strike has solved labour problems, then I would fall into step with them. Never, anywhere in the world, has a strike solved any labour problem. Still, labour leaders strive constantly to maintain misunderstanding between management and labour. To what advantage? To whose advantage? For the benefit of people who, as in Russia, have established a government which is the absolute master of all and without whose permission no one can act freely or decide for himself.

Mr. Chairman, many people contended in the past, that I was opposed to trade unions, that I fought them. No. I am all for unions, but I say that blue-collar and white-collar workers, in short all social classes must be represented by a competent union, to speak on their behalf. I am not for certain organizations working against others. No. I favour an organization which serves the best interests of its membership, which assists its membership, which, in short, is a conciliatory organization, not a boxing or wrestling organization. Those class struggles are what we are strongly against, in any province, indeed in Canada.

We also oppose those allegations or those positions adopted by the members of the New Democratic party, who often advocate salary increases and higher standards of living for workers. We agree, but let them try to reach agreement, to submit a logical policy of what they want for the worker, for the Canadian people as a whole.

We cannot, on the one hand, raise the price of goods and, on the other, say that we want to fight inflation, just as we cannot keep on raising salaries, which enter in the cost of operations, of merchandise or consumer goods, without causing inflation or without going around in circles, as I said recently. Mr. Chairman, let those people try to be logical with themselves, in their proposals.

Unions are necessary, but there are union leaders in Canada who are less than necessary, who are even detrimental to understanding in this country, who spend their time stirring the various classes of the population, instead of enlightening them. As a matter of fact, all strikes, without exception, have been detrimental to those who took part in them or supported them. And strikes have been occurring in every sphere of the economic activity of our country.

• (1:40 p.m.)

In fact, there almost was a strike of Quebec civil servants which was fortunately averted at the last minute. However, this strike will result in higher taxes in the province of Quebec. Because of this increase in taxes, some people—and we too—will cry out against the higher cost of living and the threat of inflation. Why? Because we know that under our present system, it is impossible to find an acceptable solution likely to improve the standard of living of Canadians without increasing the cost of living.

The standard of living of Canadians is being raised today, but immediately or within a few days or a few weeks, the cost of living will be just as high as before. So, nothing has been gained, and we have been going around in circles like this for at least 25 years.

It is funny, Mr. Chairman. While no solution has been found to help our workers, our organizations, our industrialists, in short, the entire population, in the same breath, the government, through the Departments of Public Works, of National Revenue or of Finance, when it is not the Prime Minister (Mr. Pearson) himself, comes to the assistance of underdeveloped countries.

This morning, I asked the government where will be found the funds required to loan $1,717,000, without interest, to the government of Ceylon in order to help or complete the modernizing of an airport in that country.

We can do it for others, and I wonder why it cannot be done for our country. Why is the government powerless to help the municipalities, the provinces, the school boards of our country, in short, to help the workers, the white collar workers, the Canadians who toil and build this country?

It seems that when we put a question to find out the reason for the government's inaction or why they do not use the Bank of Canada to finance without interest the needs of the provinces and the municipalities, as they do for other countries, it seems that we never have the right to ask these questions.

We can ask questions about the teamsters, about the truck drivers who are not making enough wages, who are working too many hours, but we may not ask questions concerning our financial or monetary system, which is very well operated to help the underdeveloped countries of the world but is not at all suitable to help the Canadian people.

Mr. Chairman, I have no further comments on item 1e of the labour department, but I

trust that in the future, the government will act in accordance with the needs of our population and that we will not give credence to the attitude of those who on the one hand, show their opposition to increased cost of living but who, on the other hand, will in no way prevent an increase in salaries which bears directly on the cost of operations or goods in Canada.

Mr. Chairman, the Ralliement Créditiste is proposing a solution just as logical as that of the present government which has set up a program to assist certain underdeveloped countries of the world. We do not intend to minimize what the present government is doing for those countries. In fact, kindly note that we are not objecting to helping others, but we are objecting to the failure to help, first, Canadian citizens who are building and developing this country. We believe that we should legislate to their benefit and to ensure security on a par with the utmost freedom.

[*English*]

The Chairman: Shall the item carry?

Mr. Howard: Mr. Chairman, we are hopelessly lost. We are shooting through this very rapidly. Can you tell us where we are?

Mr. Benson: Under the Department of Labour there is only one vote, vote 1e in the supplementary estimates.

Mr. Starr: Mr. Chairman, I think the committee is agreed that we should take the supplementary estimates under the headings I suggested, namely, Labour, Transport, Defence, Public Works, Indian Affairs and so on. So that the committee will know exactly what item is being called, I wonder whether the Chair would be good enough to call out the number of the vote and the department because we are jumping from place to place. I suggest that that course be followed.

The Chairman: Order, please. It was the understanding of the Chair that the agreement was that we should deal with the estimates having to do with the Department of Labour. Up to this point the Chair has called nothing but the Department of Labour. If the committee wishes to do anything else the Chair would be very pleased to be so advised. Until the Chair is advised differently by the committee the committee is still on the Department of Labour.

Mr. Starr: Mr. Chairman, you called a number of items and carried them. So far as these supplementary estimates are concerned there is only item 1e under the Department of Labour. What were the other numbers that the Chair was calling?

The Chairman: Order, please. After item 1e of the Department of Labour item 15e was called which has to do with Central Mortgage and Housing Corporation. This is under the Department of Labour. It was my understanding that we were to complete the supplementary estimates of the Department of Labour.

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Mr. Starr: Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman. Because we are jumping from page to page of the estimates, would the Chair be good enough to call the particular heading of the department concerned and the vote number?

The Chairman: May we proceed again to make sure that we are correct?

Item agreed to.

• (1:50 p.m.)

CENTRAL MORTGAGE AND HOUSING CORPORATION

15e. To reimburse Central Mortgage and Housing Corporation, pursuant to section 35 of the National Housing Act, 1954, for expenditures incurred during the period January 1, 1965 to December 31, 1965, for housing research and community planning as contemplated by Part V of the National Housing Act, 1954, $1,489,905.

Mr. Cameron (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands): I am confused. I cannot find this vote at all.

Mr. Benson: The difficulty arises because Central Mortgage and Housing Corporation is listed in the final supplementary estimates under Post Office.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh.

Mr. Benson: This was necessary in order to conform with the original estimates for 1965-66 when the present Minister of Labour was Postmaster General. Central Mortgage and Housing Corporation was under him. If the hon. member will turn to page 13 I think he will find the vote.

Item agreed to.

The Chairman: This completes the supplementary estimates of the Department of Labour for the year ending March 31, 1966.

An hon. Member: And Post Office.

The Chairman: As agreed earlier the committee will now proceed to the consideration of the estimates of the Department of Transport vote 5e.

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORT

Marine services—

5e. Administration, operation and maintenance, $210,000.

Mr. Howard: Mr. Chairman, I wish to raise an extremely important matter arising from an event which took place in Montreal harbour on September 14 of last year when in the early morning a ship of Canada Steamship Lines, the *Fort William*, lost her equilibrium—I think that is the proper term—or lost her stability and capsized. As a result there was a movement in the steel which was part of this vessel's cargo. This caused sparks and resulted in an explosion. The ship sank and the lives of five of the seamen aboard the ship were lost. Even though there was a commission of investigation into this tragedy I submit there is a certain guilt devolving upon Canada Steamship Lines and upon the Department of Transport and the government in general in connection with this tragedy.

It may be mere coincidence that for the past two days the house has been talking about murder. The circumstances of the event which took place on September 14 when the *Fort William* sank were not very far short of murder. Later I will make a few brief quotations from the report of the committee of investigation to indicate the extent of the guilt which I think exists with respect to this tragedy and the loss of the lives of these five sailors.

A court of investigation or committee of inquiry was set up under Mr. Justice H. F. Gibson. Before I read from the report of his findings I should like to make a comment or two about certain general matters which are also applicable to this particular investigation. In the first place, the unlicensed personnel of the ship, that is, the sailors, were not parties to the inquiry. It is true that some of them were called as witnesses but there is a distinction between being a party to an inquiry and simply appearing as a witness. The only parties to this formal investigation were Canada Steamship Lines, the master of the ship, Samuel Wilkinson, and the first, second and third mates.

Since the sailors were not parties to the inquiry they were not entitled to be represented by counsel and they were therefore not permitted the protection which counsel offers or should offer to people who appear before such inquiries. Because they were denied the right to their own counsel they were not able or may not have been able to tell the story of the tragedy from their point of view inasmuch as they were limited to answering questions by the commission and by counsel for the parties, namely, Canada Steamship Lines and the officers aboard the *Fort William*. Yet one of the individuals who appeared as a witness before this inquiry was on watch at the time the tragedy occurred and played an important role in it. This was the situation in the case we are considering and it is the situation with respect to other similar cases where sailors, unlicensed personnel, are denied the right to have counsel represent them at hearings of this kind. I say their rights and freedom are not fully protected.

Similarly, the widows of the five seamen, not being parties to the investigation, were unable to be represented by counsel even though the activities of their late husbands aboard the ship might have been brought into question. I think this is another failure on the part of the laws of Canada and in my opinion such groups should have the right to be parties to investigations of this kind and to be represented by counsel.

While we are dealing with this matter involving the widows in this particular tragedy there is something else I should like to bring to the attention of the committee, something which I think is a damnable insult to the widows of all sailors in Canada. It is something which should have been expunged from the statute books many years ago.

• (2:00 p.m.)

I should like to quote from the Merchant Seamen Compensation Act, Revised Statutes of Canada, 1952, chapter 178, section 41.

Where it is found by the board—

The board is the Merchant Seamen Compensation Board established under this act.

—that the widow to whom compensation has been awarded is a common prostitute or is openly living with any man in the relation of man and wife without being married to him, the compensation to such widow may be discontinued or suspended—

And so on. I Think it is most insulting that this should be found in the statute law of Canada because the implication is too clear to escape, namely, that all wives of sailors in this nation might become, as the act says, common prostitutes or might enter into a relationship with another man without being married to him.

That sort of archaic provision in our law should be removed. The Department of Veterans Affairs took steps in this direction some years ago not only to bring their law up

to date but also to recognize for the purpose of pensions the social fact in our society that men and women sometimes do live together without benefit of clergy. I say that all sailors' wives are placed in a position where a stigma is attached to them by this very section of the act. The widows of these unfortunate men who lost their lives because of the stinginess and lack of action on the part of the Canada Steamship Lines also are placed in the position of having this stigma attached to them. If we could repeal this provision now it would not be too soon.

So far as the amount of money accruing to the widows is concerned, $75 a month, it is insignificant compared with what is payable under the compensation laws that exist in my own province and other provinces.

I have expressed certain thoughts about the sinking of the ship itself. I should now like to refer to a few sections in Mr. Justice Gibson's report where he refers to the cause or causes of the capsizing and sinking and certain events leading up to it. With regard to the stability of the ship Mr. Justice Gibson says at page 6 of the report:

> —it is probable that this vessel was properly loaded when it left Hamilton which is the last port at which cargo was taken aboard prior to its voyage to Montreal—except that too much weight was stowed in 'tween deck and on the spar deck with a minimum of ballast on board making the vessel tender and giving it a GM of 7 inches when it left Hamilton.

This is a technical reference to its degree of stability or instability. The reference to "tender" here is a common one when referring to a ship which is unstable or is on the verge of being topheavy and thus difficult to control. In subsequent parts of his report he deals more fully with this matter indicating that the ship listed to starboard and then to port and back again and this was corrected as a result of a considerable amount of effort in pumping water into the ballast tanks.

On page 8 of his report Mr. Justice Gibson has this to say with regard to the ballast. This is important and it is a contributing factor to the cause of the ship sinking. He speaks first about certain statistical information relating to the drums or tanks numerically and other matters. Then he says:

> These facts are particularly significant as will appear later in this report because the action taken in respect to discharging some of this water ballast together with the opening of certain of the cargo doors in conjuncture was the cause of this casualty.

[Mr. Howard.]

I should point out that the cargo doors to which he refers are 10 feet by 11 feet in diameter, that there are four of them on each side of the ship, that they are located in such a way as to be relatively close to the water line rather than on the top of the deck as is the case with ships that load and unload through cargo hatches, and that this was quite a contributing factor to this tragedy.

I want to point out now what occurred just prior to the ship capsizing and sinking. First, it pulled into the dock at Montreal in the early hours of the mornng around three o'clock. It takes about 20 minutes to tie up a ship of this kind. The crew is aroused from bed to come out on deck and assist in tieing up the ship, which they did. Canada Steamship Lines, by policy direction to its master, decided that they would use the seamen who had already been aroused to tie up the ship to open the cargo doors also, and they opened four on one side and two on the other. In this way Canada Steamship Lines got around having to pay extra for the opening of the doors.

Mr. Justice Gibson goes on to point out that it was this opening of the cargo doors which contributed to the sinking of the ship. I submit that Canada Steamship Lines was stingy in trying to save $12 which is what it would have cost to have left the cargo doors closed until such time as the load on the top deck had been taken off which affected the potential topheaviness. They should have left the doors closed at that time and waited until the longshore crew were there in the morning to open the doors after the load of steel on the top deck had been taken off. Twelve dollars equated with the lives of five Canadian sailors does not balance the scales so far as I am concerned.

One of the questions which the commission had posed to it related to the matter of the culpability which might be assessed to any person. Question No. 16 was:

> Was the capsizing, fire and subsequent sinking of the *Fort William* caused or contributed to by the wrongful act or default of the owners, the master or any other person or persons?

• (2:10 p.m.)

Mr. Justice Gibson's unequivocal answer was:

> The owner for the reasons more specifically set out in the main body of the report.

He refers not to the master or any other person but to the owner, Canada Steamship Lines, which contributed to the capsizing, the

fire and the sinking of this ship by a wrongful act or default. There is no question in his mind at all about that aspect of it. Later he goes into this question further, as if there was any doubt about it, by referring to the opening of the cargo doors at the same time as the water was being pumped out of the ballast tanks in order to raise the ship in the water so the cargo doors and the top deck would be at the same level as the area of the dock for unloading purposes.

In regard to the pumping out of the ballast tanks in order that the ship would rise in the water Mr. Justice Gibson has something to say at page 21. Incidentally, in pumping out the water from the ballast tanks the ship not only rose but it became top heavy and consequently became unstable and tipped over. Mr. Justice Gibson says:

> While the pumping abovementioned was taking place the cargo doors should have been left closed. It is of vital importance that the cargo doors be left closed and in the instant case even though the above suggested procedure of pumping tanks was not carried out, it is the opinion of R. P. Burnside, the expert called from the Department of Transport, that probably the vessel would not have capsized.
>
> The assessors also advise and I accept their opinion that in the instant case also before any pumping was done and before the cargo doors were open the spar deck cargo should have been discharged first.

There is absolutely no question about that. He follows that up later by talking about the matter of pumping and the effect this had on the ship. On page 8 of the report he says:

> As will appear later in this report it is what took place in connection with this pumping which created free surface water and caused this vessel to lose its equilibrium.

Let us consider what he means in terms of the construction of this ship. In the first place, it was built in a shipyard owned by Canada Steamship Lines, the same company which owned the vessel. It is interesting to note in this regard that the steamship line is going to be one of the greatest beneficiaries of the government's decision to reduce the vessel construction subsidy.

James Richardson and Sons refer to Canada Steamship Lines in dealing with this situation in a report in March, 1966, and state:

> The government shipbuilding subsidy was reduced this January from 35 per cent to 25 per cent. Beginning January 1st, 1969, further reductions of 2 per cent will be made annually until the subsidy is reduced to 17 per cent. The cuts will place severe pressure on marginal yards and improve Canada Steamship Lines' competitive position.

Canada Steamship Lines owns the shipyard that built the *Fort William*.

It is considered normal and safe practice to have baffles placed in the ballast tanks in such a way that they are parallel to the keel of the ship. In other words, they run longitudinally so that when the water is in the process of being pumped out of the ship there will be an even distribution of weight contributing to the stability of the ship.

Mr. Justice Gibson says that as water is pumped out of the ballast tanks there is free surface water in the ballast tanks concentrated at one side of the bottom in the angle created by the keel and the hull of the ship. He says that this contributed to the list of the ship, be it on the port or starboard side. The free surface water would tend to move by the force of gravity to the side of the ship which was listing, thus contributing to its capsizing. So in effect the pumping out of these ballast tanks, because of faulty and unsafe construction of the ship, actually contributed to the ship capsizing by reason of the additional amount of weight on the listing side.

A very interesting part of this report deals with the loading of the ship. At page 10 and subsequent pages Mr. Justice Gibson points out that the master of the ship has no knowledge whatever of the loading of the ship, its cargo, the weight of the cargo or the manner in which the cargo is loaded. No officer is in a position to have sufficient knowledge about the cargo to assess the degree of stability or instability of the ship as a result of the loading of the cargo.

Mr. Justice Gibson refers to the loading and stowing of cargo and on page 10 he says:

> The evidence clearly indicates that the shed formen and the terminal superintendents at the various ports in the waters where this vessel traded loaded this vessel and all vessels of the owner. The vessel's officers in the practice of this trade carried on by the owner had practically nothing to say about the loading of cargo on this vessel. Clearly the vessel's officers did not know at any time prior to visiting any port the nature of the cargo to be loaded or its weight.

He expands on this point and states at page 11:

> As a consequence, the seaworthiness of this vessel at any material time after loading was for all practical purposes assumed by the shore personnel.
>
> As a result, the master or the first mate at any material time was left in almost difficult if not an impossible position in so far as being provided with adequate information to enable them or either of them to make any precise calculation of the stability of the vessel.

At page 12 in reference to written orders as to loading of the vessels he states:

> There were no written standing orders regarding the loading of the vessel or the seaworthiness of the vessel after loading. The only written orders from the owners were concerning proper stowage of cargo to avoid claims for cargo damage from third parties.

There was no concern about the seaworthiness of the ship. There was no concern about the lives of the people who sailed her and no concern whatsoever about humanity. Apparently the only concern was in respect of dollars and cents. As the result of the exercise of that selfish attitude Canada Steamship Lines participated in the murder of five sailors on September 14, 1965.

I could go on and read other extracts from this report about loading and causes contributing to this accident, all of which would be expansions of those factors to which I have referred.

There is another matter regarding the manning of this ship to which I want to refer. Up until three years ago there was a certain minimum standard in regard to ship personnel. Three years ago Canada Steamship Lines decided that it had sufficient crews on its ships if they had one deck officer, which is all they had in this case, one wheelsman, which is all they had in this case, and one engineer, which is all they had in this case. They only had three officers, the deck officer, the wheelsmen and the engineer.

• (2:20 p.m.)

Let us see what happened after the ship had tied up. Orders were issued to start pumping out the ballast tanks in order that the ship would rise and be level with the area of the dock for purposes of unloading. Unloading was to start at seven o'clock that morning, some three hours later. The wheelsman, who I think had worked four days for that company, was on deck supervising the pumping of the ballast tanks. The engineer was down in the engineroom operating the pumps. There was a telephone at the control panel in the engineroom. There are sets of pumps in the engineroom for the ballast tanks, one set on the port side and one on the starboard side.

When the instructions were given to start pumping certain tanks, because the ship was so tender, in other words, so close to its equilibrium being upset because of the topheaviness of the cargo, the wheelsman on deck by telephone communication with the engineer—incidentally, the deck officer was not paying any attention to what was going on; he was carrying out his duties and making up the manifest—said that the engineer could start pumping a certain tank. The engineer had to take that communication on the telephone, go down some steps in the engineroom and proceed to the particular area where the controls for the pumps were located.

As the engineer started to pump on one side the ship heeled over because as water was removed from the ballast tanks the ship rose in the water, lost its equilibrium and the topheaviness of the ship became more pronounced. The order was then issued by the wheelsman to stop pumping on that side and start pumping on the other side.

The engineer had to run up from one set of pumps, answer the telephone, go down to the other set of pumps and start them and carry on this process, all the while contributing to the death of five people because of the instructions and the stinginess of Canada Steamship Lines. I will not go into any more detail on this matter because I am sure it is easy for hon. members to see that with the deck officer busy with the manifest, one man up on deck watching the ship from side to side and one engineer in the engine room trying to operate the pumps, the ship being in a condition of tenderness which was known ever since the ship had left Hamilton, they could do nothing else but capsize the vessel if they persisted in carrying out the order to pump out those tanks, which they did. When the vessel listed over far enough on one side water entered the open cargo hatches and contributed further to the capsizing of the vessel. Canada Steamship Lines, guilty as they are, did not even have their wrists slapped because they were simply ordered to pay money.

The Chairman: Order. The time allotted for the hon. member's speech has expired.

Mr. Hopkins: Mr. Chairman, I am glad we have got the cargo loaded and unloaded on that particular ship. I have been waiting for two and a half hours to try to start building an airport. In previous speeches I have had the opportunity of delivering in this house I have outlined many of the problems that exist in the upper Ottawa valley in general and in Renfrew county in particular. I should like to say that I appreciate the sympathetic hearing I have received from the ministers concerned with these matters.

At Chalk River in Renfrew North we have the plant of Atomic Energy of Canada Limited. Because of the nature of this plant many scientists find it necessary on various occasions to travel to and from conferences at the plant. Personnel come to the plant from various universities not only in Canada but abroad. This necessitates a requirement for an improvement in transportation and particularly more rapid transportation. An airport is the transportation facility which I have in mind.

Twelve miles from the Atomic Energy plant at Chalk River there is the Petawawa military camp which is now the home base for the special mobile force. The existing facilities at Petawawa military base are being improved and repaired but there is a great possibility that more adequate air facilities will be needed for a camp such as is planned at Petawawa. In previous speeches I have also informed the house that we lack adequate transportation into and out of the area. This is a great hinderance to the business community.

With all these factors in mind, more adequate transportation for Atomic Energy of Canada Ltd., more adequate transportation for the military base at Camp Petawawa —both these enterprises are of great importance to our area—and the need for more rapid transportation for the business community, I should like to impress upon the Prime Minister, the Minister of Transport, the Minister of National Defence and the Associate Minister of National Defence the importance of this facility and ask them to take into very serious consideration the establishment of perhaps a joint Department of Transport-Department of National Defence airport in the Pembroke-Petawawa-Deep River area.

At the present time there is a small airport in this area but its facilities are certainly not capable of handling traffic of the nature that I have been discussing. I do not know whether there have been precedents in the past whereby governments have entered into arrangements with private enterprise to develop air bases, but if this is the case there is certainly the potential in the area to warrant such a development. The management are more than willing to expand their facilities and co-operate in any way possible. If the Prime Minister and the ministers concerned would take this suggestion into consideration and at some future date put it into effect, the people of Renfrew county would indeed be grateful.

Perhaps, Mr. Chairman, as a new member of the house I may take a minute of its time to deal with a matter of a different nature. I should like to address my remarks to every member in this chamber. As a new member I should like to compliment my colleagues upon the greatly improved attitude of mind that has existed here during the past week. It would be a wonderful situation if we could at all times sit in this house and make progress in matters that vitally affect our nation such as national unity, the future of the Canadian people and the dignity of this nation in the eyes of the world. These matters should be taken to heart by us at all times.

• (2:30 p.m.)

As a young member of the house I should like to appeal to all my colleagues to face up to 1967 with a co-operative, humanitarian attitude, one that has only the best interests of our nation and the future of Canada and her people at heart. After our one hundredth birthday the people of Canada can then look back and say that while the twenty seventh parliament ran into some severe difficulties the members of that parliament had the ability to pick up the pieces and go on in a spirit of co-operation and national unity for the benefit of Canada as a whole and that they did indeed show the world that the Canadian people have initiative and drive and that we can live up to the humanitarian principles involved in the various religious faiths to which we belong.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Mongrain: Mr. Chairman, I am sure that my colleagues were touched by the passionate appeal from the hon. member who just resumed his seat.

For my part, you may be assured of my co-operation if ever you should need it.

With regard to the estimates of the Department of Transport, I should like to make a few comments that could apply to all departments, all crown corporations and all public corporations.

[*English*]

For the last 15 years, Mr. Chairman, the municipal councils, Chambers of Commerce, both junior and senior, and the school boards of my home town and riding have been writing to the various federal departments to underline the fact that the name of my home city is Trois-Rivières. This is true even in

spite of the English version because the city is incorporated under the name of Trois-Rivières. A proper name is not translated and it is a grammatical error to translate a proper name. For instance, the name of our Speaker is Mr. Lamoureux but I would not speak of him in English as Mr. Lover. Mr. Batten is an English name but I would not call him Mr. Planchette if I were speaking French to him. We have a minister by the name of Mr. Winters but I would not call him Mr. Hiver if I were speaking to him in French. The name of my riding is Trois-Rivières and I do not know how many hundred times we have to emphasize that fact.

Mr. Deachman: May I ask the hon. gentleman a question?

Mr. Mongrain: Yes, sir.

Mr. Deachman: I wonder why it is then that so many people from the province of Quebec insist on calling my fair city "Vancouvair"?

Mr. Mongrain: The hon. member should realize that this is perhaps because they are not used to the English pronunciation. When I speak English I call it Vancouver. I say "Paree" in French but I say "Paris" in English. If I want to speak to Mr. Lamontagne I do not call him Mr. Mountain in English, This is a mistake.

I know that many people from my riding have written to ministers about this name. I have several times communicated with the Minister of Transport about this mistake. I should like the ministers to give their departments instructions about the proper name.

Mr. Howard: May I rise on a question of privilege? My question of privilege relates to the hon. member for Renfrew North. I wanted to ask the hon. member not to leave his place because he made some comments at the opening of his speech with which I feel I must deal. I should like to have him present when I reply and I see he is about to leave. I would appreciate it if he remained.

The Deputy Chairman: Order. May I suggest that there is no question of privilege here? If the hon. member wishes to communicate with another hon. member he should do so by some other means rather than through the Chair.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Mongrain: Mr. Chairman, I wish to point out that the comment I have just made was not inspired by narrow-mindedness. My hon. colleagues will realize that, even if our city is the second largest French speaking city in North America, its people took the trouble to learn English and to speak it well enough to communicate with our fellow-citizens in all the other provinces.

But the pride we show in wanting our city's name to be expressed in our mother tongue should not be held against us.

If I mention that while the estimates of the Department of Transport are being discussed, it is because I am afforded the opportunity. However, I should like to make the same comment with regard to all departments and I shall deem it my duty, in the next few days, to send a letter or memo to all ministers asking them to kindly give the required instructions so that the name of my home town and of my constituency are not to be changed at every opportunity.

You see it on trucks, in literature, in correspondence, and it does not please the people, even those who are English speaking.

Mr. Chairman, I listened a little earlier to the hon. member who was asking the Department of Transport to give him an airport in his region. I told him he could count on my co-operation, if it could be useful to him; it was promising him a lot. I just want to say that he is perfectly right. We are getting deeper and deeper into the century of aviation. I say that not only to support his request, because I know very well that it is important for the economy of the country, but also to point out that I have had previously the occasion to mention that we have a magnificent airport in Trois-Rivières and that it would be important to extend the runway in the months to come, in view of Expo '67, as mentioned a little earlier by my hon. friend.

The airport in Trois-Rivières will necessarily become an auxiliary airport for Montreal because the airports in Montreal will not be sufficient while Expo '67 is on.

We are about 80 miles from Montreal but there is no doubt that the big airliners coming from all over the world will be rerouted either to Trois-Rivières or Sherbrooke.

The runway at our airport is 6,000 feet long. It is known that a length of 8,000 feet is required to accommodate some of those big airliners.

I would ask the Minister of Transport (Mr. Pickersgill) for the second or third time to grant special attention to that request to

extend the runway in order to improve the situation in view of the needs for Expo '67.

I have something else to say but I will not be long. It is about the problem—and again I am bringing it up for the third time, I wrote and will write again about it until the problem is solved—which concerns my riding as well as the country's economy, since it is about our elevators and our grain which is shipped throughout the world, that grain which comes from the west and is shipped by railway. Operations have been going on at full capacity for several years. But over the last few months a misunderstanding has been dividing the administrators of the grain elevators and the municipality of Trois-Rivières, concerning which the Minister of Transport has already intervened, since a delegation of the National Harbours Board came to our city to meet the municipal council and the parties concerned.

But things drag on. We have yet to find a solution. Not that I want to insinuate that the Department of Transport or the National Harbours Board are solely to blame. It is possible, though I do not wish to pass judgment, that the municipality did not act as diligently as it should have, but the fact remains that the problem with regard to the operations of our grain elevators is acute.

An important sector of our economy in greater Trois-Rivières and the area, as well as an important part of the services which export western wheat through our area, are being jeopardized by this imbroglio.

I should like to insist again with the minister that he use all his influence with a view to expediting, if at all possible, the solution to the problems of grain elevators at Trois-Rivières.

Another point, Mr. Chairman, and I shall resume my seat. I apologize for insisting, but we, newcomers, are precisely taking advantage of the fact that our audience is enthusiastic in the house to express our complaints.

We already had the opportunity to refer to an appointment made by the National Harbours Board. The manager of national harbours was appointed and, at the time, I maintained the appointment smacked of patronage or protection if you prefer. I am of those who believe appointments should be made according to certain standards.

For instance, I feel that within the public service qualifications and seniority should be taken into account. But if they are not, Mr. Chairman, if there is to be patronage in my riding, then, I want to be the one to dispense favours, and I do not want to leave it to public servants; my stand is as simple and clear as that.

But still I advocate the observance of some standards which, for instance, are accepted in the civil service, that is that account be taken of the experience, education and number of years of service of the candidate. With this, I agree.

Now, I say that, until otherwise proven, this is not what was done in the appointment of a national harbours board manager at Trois-Rivières.

There are, at the national harbours board, several employees with 10, 15 and 20 years of service, while the appointee had only five.

I was told, on one occasion, that he was an engineer and that, because of developments in the port of Trois-Rivières, it was imperative that he should be an engineer.

I know engineers with 10, 12 or 15 years experience at the national harbours board who would have filled that position more ably.

There is something I do not understand about this appointment, and I intend to talk about it, not because I have something against the present incumbent—I realize he must make a living like everybody else—but because I know that there is involved, Mr. Chairman, a matter of principle that has always been recognized in this house, that is promotions and appointments must be on the basis of qualifications, experience and seniority. And I would like the same process to apply in this case as in all other cases. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

• (2:40 p.m.)

[*English*]

Mr. Howard: Mr. Chairman, I want to make one comment on the remarks made by the hon. member for Renfrew North and ask, him to reflect, if he would, on what he said at the beginning of his remarks. I say this for fear of his own safety. I have been dealing with the matter of safety on ships but if his comments remain on *Hansard* in the way he said them I think they could leave him open to a great deal of criticism. I am sure he did not meant to impart what I took from his remarks.

I think I have almost his exact words. He said he was glad that the ship to which I had been making reference had had its cargo loaded and unloaded because he had been waiting for some two and a half hours to

make a comment about an airport. I would simply point out to the hon. member that I would not want the impression to get abroad that he was disdainful of or disinterested in this ship and what took place with regard to it. I point out to him that the cargo of that ship was unloaded but in a most tragic fashion.

The ship listed to one side, dumping some of the cargo into the water and the rest of it between decks to one side of the ship thus bringing about sparks, an explosion, the death of five people and the sinking of the ship. That is the manner in which the cargo was unloaded and I merely mention it in the hope that the hon. member will, if he so desires, reflect on what he said and at some subsequent time clear up what may be a very bad interpretation placed on his remarks. I would not want people to think unkindly of him as a result of those remarks having appeared on *Hansard*.

Before my time expired earlier I had got to the stage of the imposition of penalties by the court of investigation into the sinking of the *Fort William*. A penalty was imposed on Canada Steamship Lines which was found to be negligent in its operation of the ship. As a penalty the court ordered the owner to pay part of the costs of investigation up to $10,000.

I submit that that is not even a slap on the wrist to a company like the Canada Steamship Lines with profits ranging into millions of dollars. That sort of penalty for its actions is really nothing more than a licence fee for that company to carry on in the same fashion of having its ships loaded at ports without the master or the mates of the ships having any knowledge of the distribution of the weight load. It is a licence fee for that company to continue to cut back on the manning of its ships and the watches on those ships to the point where they are manned by skeleton crews. It is a licence fee for that company to continue to build ships which are unsafe and in some conditions unmanageable. It is a licence fee for that company to continue to exploit its sailors all for the almighty buck. It is a licence fee for that company to continue its composite practices to the end that we may have another tragedy such as that which struck the *Fort William* and the people who worked upon her.

Perhaps no retroactive action can be taken but something can be done for the future. I said earlier that there was guilt on the part of the company. The court of investigation

[Mr. Howard.]

under Mr. Justice Gibson proved that conclusively, and their guilt was set out throughout his report. I also think there is guilt on the part of the Minister of Transport and the government.

I notice that the hon. gentleman who in *Hansard* is referred to as Member of the Administration but who in common parlance is referred to as Minister without Portfolio, the hon. member for St. Lawrence-St. George, is in the house. I understand that somehow he is an adjunct to the Minister or to the Department of Transport, so I hope that some time during the consideration of these estimates he will make some declaration of policy and interest on behalf of the government with respect to this matter.

• (2:50 p.m.)

I think that the government and the Minister of Transport are at least guilty of disinterest in having refused so far to promulgate regulations under section 410, if my memory serves me correctly, of the Canada Shipping Act in connection with manning requirements on ships. I think that the tragedy to which I have referred today shows conclusively that if there had been a sufficient minimum watch requirement on ships and one further unlicensed member of the crew had been on watch at four o'clock on the morning of September 14, perhaps this tragedy would not have occurred. Perhaps the lives of the five sailors would have been saved.

The statement of the wheelsman who was on watch was to the effect that if there had been one other person on watch with him he would have sent that other person to awaken the crew and prepare them to abandon ship because he sensed very clearly the tragedy which was about to happen. In his statement he indicated, as others had, that he was very scared. Some members of the crew were not even desirous of going to bed that night because of the situation which had prevailed on the ship ever since it left Hamilton. The situation was such that when they pulled up at the dock at Iroquois locks they were ordered by one of the officers controlling the locks to pull alongside and stabilize the ship or they would have to weigh anchor. He would not let the ship go through the locks. The crew had to pump all the ballast tanks full in order to put the ship low enough in the water for it to be stable.

The wheelsman and other crew members knew of the instability of the ship. They

knew of the potential danger and expressed concern when the order was given to pump out the ballast tanks with the cargo doors open. They knew what might result. If there had been one other person on the ship, if minimum manning requirements on a minimum basis had been established by the minister and the government under section 4(10) of the Canada Shipping Act, which specifically gives the government the right to make such regulations, perhaps the lives of five people would have been saved.

I say that the government is guilty of disinterest, if not of outright negligence, in procrastinating on the question of manning requirements under the Canada Shipping Act. I say that the government is guilty of disinterest in allowing an almost archaic Canada Shipping Act to remain on the statute books. The Canada Shipping Act provisions are responsible partly for the type of court of investigation. The act is responsible for the fact that certain unlicensed personnel on that ship were not permitted to appear before that court as parties and accordingly were not permitted to have counsel represent them. This is partly the result of having a Canada Shipping Act which is long overdue for overhaul.

To give an example of what I mean, I was reading a section of the act in which there is reference to certain types of screwdriven and other steamships which, on August 26, 1889, had certain factors attributable to them and the section specifies that they shall be dealt with in a certain way. Mr. Chairman, 1889, is a long time ago. I doubt that any ships that were plying the lakes in 1889 are currently plying the St. Lawrence or any of the waters of Canada or any other trade routes. Provisions of this sort are found in the Canada Shipping Act. The one to which I have referred is indicative of sections throughout the act which are absolutely archaic and which relate to the time of Admiral Nelson of the British navy.

The act is completely out of date. It does not take cognizance of current day shipping factors and it should be overhauled. The act should be cleaned out from stem to stern and brought up to date.

I say that there is a clear and unequivocal responsibility upon the shoulders of the government to do this. The Minister without Portfolio is here and, to use his own words, he was seconded by minister or by the department. I do not know which statement would be more applicable. I think there is a responsibility upon the hon. gentleman to give some indication to the committee what the government's or his own intentions are with respect to studying and modernizing the Canada Shipping Act.

I think there is also a responsibility devolving perhaps not on him but on the government with respect to the Merchant Seamen Compensation Act which in a denigrating way refers to the widows of sailors and classifies them as potentially common tarts. This is the sort of inheritance in our law that should be removed so that we can have an up to date Canada Shipping Act which takes cognizance of the matters I have mentioned with which we are concerned. In particular and overriding all else, there must be established some sort of accident prevention rules or safety precaution methods. The lives of Canadians are involved in the Canada Shipping Act. Five lives were lost on September 14, 1965, because of arrogant stinginess and negligence on the part of Canada Steamship Lines and because of disinterest on the part of this and other governments.

Mr. Peters: Mr. Chairman, I should like to say a few words to endorse what has been said by the hon. member for Skeena and also to indicate that members of the house are going to have to give consideration to safety on the Great Lakes. The Minister without Portfolio has spoken to the house about the problem of safety and that, of course, is probably where I came in.

I attended a meeting not long ago that the minster arranged. It was of a fairly technical nature and the discussion concerned safety on the Great Lakes. I was surprised to find that the shipping companies, the pilots, the representatives of the S.I.U., the tug boat companies, the representative of the people concerned with shipping on both the Great Lakes and the seaway, were pretty well in agreement as to what should be done. They said what ought to be done was going to cost the government some money. They were talking of providing v.h.f. radio equipment immediately for the beginning of the season.

What really surprised and shocked me was that the Department of Transport said, "No, no, no" or "but, but, but". Everybody else agreed that certain things should be done in this way or that way. However, immediately that was said the deputy minister jumped up and said: But we cannot do it for this reason or for that reason. Finally he made the idiotic

statement that we did not own the waterway, that everything below Montreal is in international waters and the government of Canada can do nothing about it.

If this is true, I think the hon. member who spoke—I believe he is from Three Rivers—will find himself in one of the areas far beyond—

Mr. Mongrain: May I ask a question?

Mr. Peters: Wait till I finish—he will find himself in the position of being on the international waterway and not on what we consider to be the St. Lawrence Seaway. If we cannot call it the seaway we can call it the St. Lawrence riverway, which we believe falls within the jurisdiction of the government of Canada.

Mr. Mongrain: Would you please allow a question? When the hon. member referred to Three Rivers did he mean my constituency? As I said when I spoke, it is Trois-Rivières.

Mr. Peters: I stand corrected. It is Trois-Rivières. If what the deputy minister said was true I presume that the hon. member for Trois-Rivières, being in an area below Montreal, would obviously be outside the federal jurisdiction. This might not matter to many members of parliament because most of them do not represent maritime areas. However, I was shocked to find representatives of the S.I.U. saying something which nobody has corrected if it is wrong. They said that over 10 per cent of S.I.U. members working on the Great Lakes last year were casualties. In other words, there were accidents to more than 10 per cent of all the people that the S.I.U. represented.

• (3:00 p.m.)

Can you think of any other group of workers in any other field of endeavour who would accept one out of every ten employees in that industry being injured?

I think this is a record of which we certainly cannot be proud. The first thing is to convince the Department of Transport of the need to do something about it. I have listened to the technical arguments. I am no expert but I do know what was said was really an excuse for inaction. We were talking about something which would cost, at the extreme, not more than $50,000. I do not know how much the Minister of Transport considers the life of one seaman to be worth, but on this one ship which my hon. friend from Skeena was talking about, five lives were lost and I do not think anyone here would wish to put a price on those lives. I am not saying, of course, that expenditures in the interest of safety could have prevented this particular tragedy. Nevertheless I have read reports which strongly suggest that safer conditions generally would be brought about if there were a more positive program on the part of the department.

It surprised me to learn there are no logs kept on ships engaged in Great Lakes traffic. If I were, say, an able seaman on a ship sailing outside the Great Lakes I would be in a position to make a complaint about the condition of any part of the ship which fell within my own responsibility. I could have an entry made in the ship's log accordingly and my own responsibility would be removed or diminished. The subject of the complaint would then become a matter for investigation and action by a higher authority. But the Department of Transport does not license ships on the Great Lakes. Mr. Chairman, your wife could go down and become a helmsman on the Great Lakes as long as somebody would hire her. And if the price was right, they probably would.

If I had sailed for 20 years on the lakes and it appeared to me that a certain ship was unsafe, do hon. members know what I would have to do? I would have to go to a customs officer, ask for an inspection and deposit total demurrage in respect of the time the ship was laid up awaiting and undergoing inspection. I would have to put up $20,000 in cash before I could ask for an inspection, no matter what my qualifications might be.

My hon. friend from Skeena has pointed out what happens when an inquiry is held. The seamen have no right to counsel; they have no right to cross-examine. This has been the case for years under the mining act in Ontario which has long been considered to be an archaic piece of legislation designed to protect the companies rather than the workers. Under that legislation, too, the miners were never asked the questions necessary to elicit answers upon which a reasonable conclusion could be based. They were asked questions by the inspectors, who were always considered to be acting in the interest of the mining companies rather than of the miners. They only asked questions which were likely to produce the answers they wanted to hear. In the case which was brought to our attention by my hon. friend, the employees are similarly not given any right to cross-examine and the information they are able to give

is seldom presented, unless by accident when an inquiry officer makes a mistake.

This is an important topic. Canada is becoming more and more dependant each year on trade through the Great Lakes. This trade is increasing rapidly, yet we are unwilling to face the fact that the Canada Shipping Act belongs to the old sailing days rather than to the modern diesel age or even to the age of steam. Everything but cutlasses is discussed in this legislation. It should be amended, and amended immediately. I am sure that after listening to this debate the minister will tell us that though he is in favour of doing something we should first consider the matter for a very long time. But if the unions are not to be forced into taking drastic action by supporting a walkout every time they consider conditions to be unsafe, we ourselves must introduce the changes in the shipping act which will enable the Department of Transport to do the policing which it is now charged with doing, but which it is incapable of doing. There are only 11 inspectors, I am told, to deal with all the shipping on the Great Lakes. Thus, if an inspection is called for it may be several days before an inspector can get to the port, and the demurrage charge makes the whole procedure impractical.

I was interested to hear that officials of the department are interested in this v.h.f. equipment which they feel constitutes a useful safety measure. It was pointed out that this year an international safety agreement has been negotiated to which Canada is a signatory. We were told a meeting will take place in the near future at which Canada will be represented by the deputy minister of transport. I believe that, whoever represents Canada, this meeting should urge that a change be made as soon as possible to allow Canada to have some control over the type of equipment being used on the St. Lawrence River, particularly in those areas not now served by v.h.f.—the area below the port of Montreal. Unless we are able to put before that meeting specific information as to what changes are considered desirable so that shipping from all parts of the world may be able to equip themselves with the necessary permanent radio installations, there cannot be much hope of early success and Canada will be bound to find some loophole, some means of bringing about this result by subterfuge. And I do not think this is the way in which this objective should be reached.

I hope the minister, when he replies, will tell us that the wishes at the safety meeting which I had the opportunity of attending will be communicated to this forthcoming conference by Canada's representative. I hope the views expressed at that meeting will be put forward in the strongest terms in order that some consideration may be given to the installation this year of permanent v.h.f. radio equipment on shipping not only in the lower St. Lawrence but throughout the Great Lakes, as is now required after joint negotiation between Canada and the United States.

I hope also that the minister is in a position to say that there will be amendments to the Canada Shipping Act—that the entire act will be revised and brought up to date, taking into consideration the many changes that have taken place and the obvious agreement which existed between the shipping companies and all parties interested in safety on the lakes, and in developing a much safer waterway this summer.

• (3:10 p.m.)

Mr. Hopkins: Mr. Chairman, at this time it to say that there will be amendments to the hon. member for Skeena. I wish to assure him that I am sufficiently humanitarian and pride myself on having enough of a conscience that I never would make the interpretation or deliver the insinuation he suggested I may have meant. Sitting over here I was under the impression, Mr. Chairman, that the hon. member for Skeena ended up his speech talking about ships and conditions in general. I hope I am right in that. Hence, since my speech was dealing with airports I used this merely as an introduction to move from ships to planes. I can assure the hon. member and the committee that I had no intention whatsoever of giving the impression about which he commented after my address.

Mr. Howard: Mr. Chairman, in response to this, may I say that in no way did I wish to cast reflection upon the hon. gentleman, or make as he said any insinuation. I merely pointed out what others may take as an interpretation of what he said, and I did not want that interpretation to go abroad.

Mr. Hopkins: Mr. Chairman, just to clarify this whole matter, I should say that I appreciate the comment by the hon. member for Skeena, and certainly must say in closing that I appreciate the fact that he brought this to my attention, because I certainly would not want that thought to remain on *Hansard*. I thank him very sincerely.

Mr. Cameron (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands): Mr. Chairman, I also wish to deal with the matter of safety, and deal with a situation which may cause tragedies even more disastrous than the ones to which my colleague for Skeena referred earlier this afternoon.

On March 4 I first raised this matter in the House of Commons in the form of a question to the Minister of Transport. I raised the matter as a result of numerous telephone conversations and correspondence from air line pilots of my acquaintance, and later from official correspondence from the Canadian Airline Pilots Association, protesting against the decision of the International Civil Aviation Organization of last January to narrow the air lanes across the North Atlantic from 120 miles to 90 miles.

At that time the minister told me he would look into the matter and answer my question later. Ten days later, on March 14, he very kindly sent me a memorandum from the department in explanation of the position of the Canadian government in this dispute between the International Civil Aviation Organization and the Canadian Airline Pilots Association and the International Federation of Airline Pilots Associations.

In this memorandum, Mr. Chairman, there is this, which I find rather difficult to understand:

> At the present time those pilots of international flights operating across the North Atlantic who accepted the new international standard of 90 miles, and I can assure you that they constitute a significant majority—

The reason I later attempted to ask the minister again another question in this regard is that the next day, on March 15, I found a report in the *Globe and Mail* of the meeting of the International Federation of Airline Pilots Associations in Auckland, New Zealand, at which they unanimously rejected this regulation as unsafe and decided to tell the 27,000 members of the various international airline pilots associations to refuse to comply with the new measures.

Now, Mr. Chairman, it would appear to me that the Minister of Transport has been receiving some rather faulty information. I would like to know who in the Department of Transport told the Minister of Transport that a significant majority of the air line pilots were prepared to accept the 90 mile air lane in the North Atlantic, because in the correspondence I have from the Canadian Airline Pilots Association, which substantiates the

news report, it becomes perfectly plain that unanimously this has been rejected.

I think this poses a very serious problem for this parliament. In this memorandum it says that at the meeting of the international aviation organizations—

> —the meeting concluded that reduction of the standard to 90 miles could be accomplished with safety and incorporated in the report of the meeting and appropriate recommendation. This recommendation, supported by Canada, was subsequently endorsed by the ICAO Air Navigation Commission and finally approved by the council of ICAO. The new standard became effective on January 13, 1966.

So, we have here the evidence that our government has agreed to this narrowing of the air lanes across the North Atlantic from 120 miles to 90 miles in complete defiance of the decision of the only people whose opinions are worth a damn, and these are the jet pilots who fly these lanes; these are the men on whom the safety of the air line passengers depends.

I can only conclude, Mr. Chairman, that the government of Canada once again is following its usual policy of pusillanimous subservience to the wishes of an important major power which lies alongside of us, and its commercial representatives, and is callously indifferent to the opinions of the men who have to carry out this injunction or lose their jobs, and risk not only the lives of their passengers but also their own lives.

I suggest it is time this government learned to have a little courage and intelligence. The Airline Pilots Association agreed that the lanes could be narrowed to a very limited extent; they agreed it might be possible to narrow them by six nautical miles. The commercial interests are determined to narrow them by 30 miles, when there is ample evidence that in the best of conditions a jet plane flying at the immensely high rates of speeds at which they fly today can, say in the course of a split second, easily move up to 30 miles off course because of temporary failure of instruments. Yet our government by its own confession is prepared to fly in the face of this recommendation, the recommendation of the only people whose opinion is worth listening to, and the only people to whom we should listen.

• (3:20 p.m.)

I would implore the Minister without Portfolio to convey to the Minister of Transport the necessity of examining this matter very much more closely than he appears to

have done to date, and to listen very carefully not only to our own Canadian Airline Pilots Association but also to the international body, although I would like to note that our air line pilots have a reputation unsurpassed in the world for safety. It may well be that the government of Canada would be well advised to listen to these men rather than to commercial interests who want to increase the possibilities of making profits on North Atlantic flights.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Ricard: Mr. Chairman, I do not want to delay the business of the house, but I feel duty bound to take part in the discussion, since I have been asked to make representations in favour of Montreal harbour.

There now exists a situation which is detrimental to Montreal harbour and should be corrected, it seems to me, as soon as possible.

Arbitrary restrictions now being imposed by the Winnipeg Grain Exchange affect very unfavourably Montreal harbour's economy and thus, that of Montreal generally.

As a result of the restrictions laid down by the Winnipeg Grain Exchange, some grain elevators in Montreal remain empty for a long period at the beginning of the shipping season.

For instance, last year, because of those restrictions, elevator No. 1 was not in use for nine days, while elevator No. 3 was empty for eight days. Elevator No. 5 did not operate for nine days and elevator No. 4 for eight days.

The restrictions imposed by the Winnipeg Grain Exchange could have been explained by the situation which prevailed in past years, but since 1963, the building of an additional elevator in Montreal allows grain from foreign countries to be handled in the harbour.

I simply wish to ask briefly the Minister without Portfolio (Mr. Turner), who is surely aware of the situation, to make the necessary representations in order to avoid any further inconvenience to Montreal harbour.

This discrimination against Montreal harbour has been going on too long to be tolerated any longer. Last year the Minister of Finance (Mr. Sharp) I believe, had given the undertaking that negotiations would be continued to correct this situation but it seems that the staff of the Montreal Harbour board has not obtained satisfaction since their grievances are being made public.

I read in the Montreal *Gazette* for March 23, the following heading:

Unfair to Montreal harbour.

And the article relates the discrimination which is going on through a body completely foreign to the economic life of Montreal harbour.

With my last words I would ask the Minister without Portfolio to do everything in his power to have this situation remedied.

[*English*]

Mr. Davis: Mr. Chairman, I should like to say a few brief words about the supplementary estimates for the Department of Transport. I want to make it quite clear that I am speaking in my capacity as a private member, as a member who represents a coastal constituency with a number of shipyards and as a member from a part of Canada which pays a considerable volume of tax into the federal treasury.

We on the west coast are proud of many things, one of which is the new ferry system which the provincial government has built and has been operating since 1960 between the mainland and Vancouver Island. Many members on both sides of the house were concerned earlier this year when the announcement on shipbuilding subsidies was made. There was reference to a 25 per cent subsidy which would apply in respect of categories of ships operated by private enterprise, but government ships were specifically excluded. This change not only excluded vessels built on the federal government's account, but vessels built by provincial governments as well. Since the province of British Columbia is the only province which enters substantially into the construction and operation of ferries, this change appeared to many people to be a measure aimed specifically at British Columbia.

Let me point out another aspect of this problem. If the ferry system in the province of British Columbia was still operated by private enterprise that system would now be receiving the 25 per cent subsidy. In other words, as a result of this exclusion and because the provincial government moved into this area of activity, the people of British Columbia, who use this ferry service extensively, are being denied federal government tax support in respect of the construction of these ferries.

Over the past six years the federal government has committed more than $15 million of federal tax money to the construction of

these ferries in British Columbia. Approximately one third of their total cost has been met by the federal taxpayers. This program is nearing an end. Only one or two more ferries remain to be built and it seems to me to be a shame that the federal government has seen fit to cut off the subsidy when, for a modest additional amount of money, it could complete that program and take full credit for very substantial assistance in the creation of an important and very effective ferry system.

The number of dollars involved is large in the eyes of private individuals, but small relative to the total number of dollars being spent by the federal government in respect of similar services both within certain eastern provinces and as between various provinces on the Atlantic coast.

In this regard I need only refer to the recent report of the Auditor General in respect of intraprovincial ferry systems. At page 78 of the Auditor General's report he refers to terminal facilities which the federal government paid for at Matane and Godbout in Quebec. He states:

> This acquisition has now brought to six the number of locations where the federal government has provided terminals at both ends of cross-river ferry services in the lower St. Lawrence river. The total expenditure over the years for these terminals, which in some cases form part of shipping wharves, had exceeded $7 million at March 31, 1965.

The federal government has also been providing substantial ferry services between the provinces in eastern Canada. This is a constitutional responsibility of the federal government and I certainly am not critical in that regard. Indeed I believe the federal government should assume responsibility in this regard and carry it out in an energetic way.

• (3:30 p.m.)

But the order of magnitude of these amounts spent for ferry services is interesting. The Newfoundland ferry terminals deficit, for 1966-67 is shown in our estimates as $11.9 million as opposed to the sort of subsidy which would be required in British Columbia of the order of $2 million a year for ship construction. The Prince Edward Island car ferry and terminals deficit was $4.4 million. The cost of a ferry vessel for service between North Sydney and Argentia, Newfoundland, was $2.5 million. The cost of the ferry vessel for freight service between North Sydney, Nova Scotia, and Port aux Basques was $7.9 million. I could refer to numerous other items, and still not include the more than $10 million for construction of dock and terminal facilities at places like Port aux Basques, Newfoundland, and North Sydney, Nova Scotia. These are very large amounts of money that run into tens of millions of dollars, and we are only asking for one or two million dollars a year for a couple of years in order to round out the federal subventions for transportation on the west coast.

Finally, Mr. Chairman, I should like to indicate the nature and scale of steamship subventions paid by the federal government for eastern local services. For 1966-67 they are estimated to be $8.7 million. For local services on the west coast of Canada the amount is $412,000; in other words, less than half a million dollars.

We in British Columbia pay taxes. Our costs and wages, generally speaking, are higher. We pay more taxes per capita. Most British Columbians feel they should get a fair shake in respect of the variety of services supplied by the federal government. Ferries perform a service in which we have considerable interest—an interest akin to that of people who live on our east coast. As both taxpayer and, in this instance, a member of parliament from the west coast I feel strongly that we should be treated on the same basis as those on the east coast.

I noticed with considerable interest that the Minister of Transport, when his main estimates were before this committee a few weeks ago, stated that it would not break his heart if he had to alter the regulations in so far as they apply to federal government assistance for provincially owned and constructed ferry systems. I am quite sure that if he would relent and modify these regulations he would gladden the hearts of a great many people in British Columbia. He would give the impression in British Columbia—and this feeling is quite widespread in certain circles—that British Columbia is not being discriminated against in this way.

I know that such modification of the regulations would also gladden the hearts of members on all sides of this house, regardless of party. Therefore I plead with the Minister of Transport and the Minister without Portfolio to take another hard look at the ship subventions, or ship subsidies, and permit the payment of these subsidies in respect of ferry vessels built on provincial government account.

Mr. Herridge: Mr. Chairman, I rise briefly to support the remarks made by the hon. member for Coast-Capilano. This is an indication of our changing society. Here is the Parliamentary Secretary to the Prime Minister of Canada—

Some hon. Members: Not now.

Mr. Herridge: —openly and willingly advocating the subsidization of publicly owned transportation. I think we can safely say that this means the Liberal party is now 50 per cent socialist, and I congratulate them on that account. I think the hon. member's argument was sound. It is not a question of the amount of money; I think it is the principle behind it. There is a feeling in British Columbia, regardless of party affiliation, that the provincial government should receive the same treatment as private companies building ships in this country.

I mention this, Mr. Chairman, because the government of British Columbia also builds ferries which operate in the Kootenays on the Arrow and Kootenay Lakes, and these ships would also come under subsidy if they were built in B.C. shipyards. With those few remarks I resume my seat, but I could not help congratulating the parliamentary secretary in view of the high position he holds in this land.

Mr. Turner: Mr. Chairman, I should like to comment briefly on some of the excellent contributions made during the discussion of these supplementary estimates, as they apply to the Department of Transport. I listened of course with great interest, as I always do, to the hon. member for Skeena. I am not going to comment on the report of the judicial inquiry into the tragedy of the *Fort William* except to deal with one particular aspect that was not really *sub judice,* but was a comment by the hon. member to the effect that the seamen involved were not allowed counsel at the inquiry.

I want to make it clear to the committee that it has been the practice at these inquiries to allow only those parties to appear who may be subject to sanctions or criticism, and since the seamen involved, and certainly their families, were in no way responsible for the tragedy that occurred, they were not intimately involved as parties to the inquiry. The owners and the officers whose certificates were subject to cancellation were involved as direct parties to the inquiry. There was no restriction, nor is there ever a restriction, on seamen being represented by counsel with a watching brief. If at any time in the course of any inquiry it should appear that such seamen are likely to become blameworthy or in any way involved in a liability arising under such inquiry, then of course such counsel could at that time apply to the commissioner or the judge to have the seamen named as parties to the inquiry. Thereupon counsel have the right to participate in all the examination and cross-examination of the witnesses who appear before the inquiry.

I now leave that matter and come to the general subject of the Canada Shipping Act. I shall not go into detail in regard to that rather voluminous statute and deal with it section by section, except to say that it is under active review by the department. As far as my personal interest is concerned, having had on many, many occasions to try and interpret that statute in private practice, I could not agree more with the hon. member when he said that in several of its parts and sections it is entirely outmoded and ought to be revised. I was shocked to listen to the text of section 41 of the Merchant Seamen Compensation Act, which I agree is in terms highly insulting to seamen and their families. I must confess this was the first time that section had ever been recited to me.

On the general question of marine safety on the lakes, the St. Lawrence river and the channel out to the ocean, I would say in answer to the hon. member for Skeena and the hon. member for Timiskaming that we have now reached a stage where it is no longer a question of policy but rather one of technicality and technique in working out the best means, in co-operation with industry and the unions, to achieve by way of a reasonable set of priorities as quickly as we can a safer sea lane and river lane into the heart of this continent.

I want to say that progress cannot be made, as I am sure hon. members will realize, in all directions at once. We have therefore laid out what we think is a reasonable set of priorities, hoping to achieve as soon as we can those systems of traffic information and traffic control which we believe have the earliest chance of success. It is because we now feel that in the realm of communications and traffic information we are in the position to instal a permanent system of v.h.f. radio on the river from Les Escoumains right up to Montreal that we intend to instal such a system.

• (3:40 p.m.)

Some members may know that on an experimental and temporary basis over the past months there has been a mobile radio communications network on the river. It has proved to be successful and we are now in the position to instal it on a permanent basis. This means that there will be available a series of concurrent, very high frequency radio communications systems up and down the river which will be available to all ships going up and down the channel. That is merely a first stage. It allows every ship to pinpoint its position as it goes up or down the channel. It enables the Department of Transport to advise every ship as to the positions of other ships either below or up river. In that sense, traffic information will be the first step toward achieving, I hope, a better safety record on the St. Lawrence river.

Now, of course, the obvious question that members of the committee would ask me, Mr. Chairman, is: If there is going to be v.h.f. radio on the shore, how will the department be able to communicate with those ocean-going vessels which are not equipped with such an installation? As mentioned by the hon. member for Timiskaming, it is compulsory for ships plying the Great Lakes and the seaway to use v.h.f. radio. This is the result of a treaty between the United States and Canada which was excepted from the provisions of the IMCO treaty already mentioned. However, the compulsory features of this agreement excepted under the United Nations agency are not applicable below Montreal, so the compulsory features with regard to v.h.f. radio stop at the seaway and at the Great Lakes.

The difficulty Canada faces is that, being a party to the IMCO agreement, we have to persuade the other maritime nations of the world to adopt the use, on a compulsory basis, of v.h.f. radio on their vessels so that we can communicate bridge to bridge and shore to ship, thus rendering effective all the precautions we are taking on the river. The suggestion the hon. member made that at the next meeting of IMCO Canada take a very strong position in this respect is, of course, already part of our own thinking. I can assure the house that the assistant deputy minister of transport, marine, will take with him to that meeting the instructions of the Canadian government to achieve if he can the consent of the international body to the installation on a compulsory basis of v.h.f. radio on the bridges of all ships. However, this provision needs the ratification of over two thirds of the signatory nations to the treaty. I cannot, at the moment, forecast how quickly we will be able to achieve that majority.

In the meantime, the department has been experimenting with portable v.h.f. radios which can be brought on the vessels by the pilots as they enter the river. The fee for the use of the radio would, of course, be added to the pilotage fee which the owners or charterers of the vessels would have to pay. The difficulty at the moment is that the range of these portable radios is still very limited, not more than five miles, although we are hoping that a new type of instrument has been developed which will give us more range. I hope that we can foresee the day when either we will have this type of portable equipment which we can make compulsory by way of pilots taking it on board vessels, or that we can achieve the co-operation of owners of vessels that ply the St. Lawrence river into Montreal, or that eventually we can persuade the other maritime nations of the world to accept this kind of equipment on a compulsory basis.

Once we have compulsory high frequency radio installed, then not only will we have a means of ship-to-ship and ship-to-shore communication all the way up and down the river, but we will have an information centre operating on the river advising the position of every vessel thereon. We will be able to achieve then what I think is absolutely necessary in view of the tremendous increase in traffic, namely a traffic control system whereby we will be able to say to the various vessels either "Hold your position until the channel clears," or "You may now proceed". In other words, we will have a series of red and green lights by way of high frequency radio up and down the channel.

There were many representatives of maritime interests at the meeting with their own particular briefs. The two-channel concept was stressed very strongly. The Dominion Marine Association and the Seafarers International Union pressed this point. As a result of the meeting which we had in Montreal, I think all parties agree now that it would be better to widen the channel from Montreal to Quebec rather than to put in a two channel system. This is true not only from a safety but from a hydraulic point of

view. We are deeply concerned that if we double the channel in the river between Montreal and Quebec we will accelerate the flow to such an extent that the water level at the port of Montreal could not be maintained. We are looking into these factors by means of our new hydraulic model at La Salle which we hope to open next month. We will continue our studies of the water level and the double channel problem.

Below Quebec and Île d'Orléans, there is a problem in using the south channel. We are using our engineering data now, but as soon as the ice clears up we intend to carry out a survey of current and tide and the texture of the soil to see if this idea can be implemented from an engineering point of view. I just want to say here that I take a most serious view of the situation on the St. Lawrence river. The Minister of Transport and I intend to continue our series of meetings with interested parties in the maritime business. We intend to hold another meeting at the end of April to discuss possible channel problems and we hope that by implementing these ideas, in co-operation with the industry, with the underwriters, unions and other parties involved, we will be able to improve the record of safety on the St. Lawrence.

I wanted to deal briefly with a comment made by the hon. member for Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands about the narrowing of the air lanes over the North Atlantic from 120 to 90 miles. This provision of course was implemented by the International Civil Aviation Organization with the consent, as I understand it, of all the major air nations of the world. I am advised that the reason behind the move is the tremendous increase in the volume of traffic crossing the Atlantic and the limited space available. Some changes had to be made if traffic were to continue to move. I am advised that all the evidence points this amendment as safe.

In any event, I am personally going to look into the brief of the pilots association which was referred to by the hon. member, to see what merit there is in it. I am advised that the majority of international pilots have not objected to this particular measure.

In answer to the hon. member for Saint-Hyacinthe-Bagot—

[*Translation*]

I may say that on April 4, a delegation from Montreal will come here to the capital city to meet with the Minister of Finance (Mr. Sharp), the Minister of Transport (Mr. Pickersgill), the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Greene) and myself to discuss, before the official opening of navigation, the system of priorities used at present for Canadian grain.

[*English*]

I want to say that I have spent a good deal of my time in the last few weeks looking into this problem of the relative priorities of export grain from the port of Montreal. At the moment, absolute priority is given by regulation of the Board of Grain Commissioners for the export of Canadian grain prior to the opening of the season at the Lakehead. There is a strong argument to be made, and it has been made on behalf of the port of Montreal, that with the capacity of the elevators there and the fact that private elevators at other ports along the river now are not subject to the same absolute prohibition but are allowed to take in grain on a 60-40 ratio, Canadian-United States, this regulation should be annulled. However, I am not in a position to say more.

• (3:50 p.m.)

Mr. Howard: Mr. Chairman, I listened with interest to the comments of the Minister of Transport.

Oh, I am sorry; I listened with such interest that I assumed that he was the Minister of Transport, so I will not apologize for my incorrect description of the Minister without Portfolio.

However, I would ask him to consider one further matter with regard to any formal investigations conducted under the Canada Shipping Act, with specific reference to the *Fort William* to which he has just referred. I am talking about something more than inquiries; I am talking about formal investigations which the act refers to as being conducted as a court. The act refers to a commissioner who shall, for the purposes of the act, be a court and who has the right to impose penalties, sanctions and the like on individuals who may be found culpable.

I submit there is an analogy to be drawn between this sort of court and a court which delves into matters between a prosecution and a defence, although it is true that this court is more of an investigation and is not exactly on all fours with a court dealing with litigation. However, the commissioner is given the powers of a court and he can impose certain penalties against individuals.

In this connection, Mr. Chairman, I think that people appearing as witnesses before

such a court should be in the same class as those appearing as witnesses in cases falling within the normal operations of our courts, such as witnesses for the prosecution or witnesses for the defence. These people are witnesses who express themselves either on one side of a case or the other and are thereby entitled to the protection that a lawyer can afford them. They are also open, of course, to the approach of the attorney for the prosecution or the defence who endeavours to break down the evidence they give, if the attorney so desires.

I think a comparable situation exists here. Individuals called as witnesses, even though, under the act as it now stands, they do not have the protection of a lawyer, should be entitled to protection, and the act should be altered to enable a person called as a witness before a formal investigation of this sort to have available to him the right to choose a lawyer to protect his rights, thus ensuring that his rights are not encroached upon.

I just press that on the minister for his consideration. Perhaps while he is making this detailed study of the Canada Shipping Act, which I am sure will be concluded during the next few months, he will include a provision along this line which will then bring the act up to date.

Mr. Groos: Mr. Chairman, I should like to rise briefly to support the remarks which have just been made by the hon. member for Coast-Capilano. He represents, as I do, an important shipbuilding riding in western Canada. There is no doubt that the people of British Columbia feel discriminated against in the exclusion of their ferry system, a very popular and good ferry system, from the benefits of the government's subsidy program announced in the house last January. Make no mistake about it, Mr. Chairman, the lack of a subsidy, if it persists, will result in higher costs for travelling on our ferry system.

I think I should point out to the committee and the minister that transportation is the essence of life in British Columbia. One has only to look at our mountains and islands to see we have a special problem and to realize that it means more to us probably than to any other province.

Other provinces benefit from the terms of union, Mr. Chairman, and I sometimes wish that when British Columbia entered confederation we had had a more far-seeing team

[Mr. Howard.]

negotiating on our behalf, in which case perhaps we too would have federally subsidized ferry operations, as do other provinces. I do not think we object to what other provinces are receiving, but we do think we should be allowed to have a fair share of federal money for this purpose.

I know that the hon. member for Coast-Capilano has asked the Minister of Transport and the Minister without Portfolio to take another look at the government's shipbuilding policy, but I would stress the urgency of taking a look now. With the completion of the ships already contracted for by the British Columbia ferry system, there is now a lack of work in our shipbuilding yards. If any future construction is held up, as I understand it will be, because of the lack of a government subsidy, then now is the time to grant a subsidy and get more ships built.

In my riding, where the yard which has just finished building the largest ferry for the B.C. ferry service is situated, some 350 men are at this moment being displaced from their work. Therefore I ask the Minister without Portfolio, if he does take another look at the policy, as I feel sure he will, to please urge his colleagues to look hard and to look now.

The Deputy Chairman: The hon. member for Halifax.

Mr. Bell (Saint John-Albert): Mr. Chairman, I do not mind being referred to as the hon. member for Halifax because it so happens that I am going to say a few words of interest both to Halifax and to Saint John. We have heard a great deal this afternoon from members who have been speaking on behalf of Montreal and Vancouver. Lest my silence here on this peaceful Friday afternoon be taken to mean that am in agreement with everything they said, I want to point out that we have two national ports, Halifax and Saint John, which are just as important to this nation as Montreal and Vancouver.

The Minister without portfolio gave us a rundown on the navigational problems in the St. Lawrence waterway system, but let me tell him that one of the easiest ways he can solve those problems of navigation is to use the ports of Halifax and Saint John a little more. We have the seamen who can keep accidents to the minimum. We also have the facilities, though they may need a little attention, and we are looking for business. In this way we would avoid a lot of this discussion this afternoon and, more particularly, the spectacle of senior government members and

parliamentary secretaries trying to talk out their own supplementary estimates.

Mr. Peters: Mr. Chairman, I should like to ask one question of the minister. I too listened very attentively to his remarks and I appreciate the attitude he has taken, but is it his intention when the Canada Shipping Act is rewritten to consider the establishment of a special committee of the house for this purpose? This would enable the whole act to be studied, particularly as it affects safety. Witnesses and other interested parties could be brought before the committee, with the end result of having a broad discussion of the problems facing the industry. This would enable any changes made to be complete and long lasting.

• (4:00 p.m.)

Mr. Johnston: Mr. Chairman, I should like to take a few minutes of the committee's time to express the appreciation of the Social Credit party here for the very kind words said about the Social Credit government of British Columbia and its vigorous policy of ferry construction. We did not see this as being particularly socialistic, but rather as a step that was necessary for the completion of our highways system. Perhaps if Vancouver Island had not joined with British Columbia to make one great province—and we are celebrating this as a centenary this year—but had remained isolated, there might have been a federal approach to build a causeway to link the island with the mainland. The funds for that construction have not been forthcoming. With the very vigorous highway development program the government was undertaking, it became essential for it to go into the ferry business also, to link the island with the mainland.

We have been very pleased this afternoon to hear the presentations made from the government side of the house, because those of us in this section of the house have made these presentations earlier, and we hope that we now have made some headway on this subject. Certainly, the reply of the Minister of Transport, that it would not break his heart to take a second look at ferry subsidies, is not good enough. That ought not to be allowed to stand as the last word of the government on this question. We are looking forward very eagerly to a more definite word that there will be federal participation in the subsidizing of ferry construction in British Columbia. Too much of the co-operation with the provinces in this country has tended to be a sort of salvage operation to improve a bad situation.

I think it is time the federal government was concerned also with improving situations in provinces that are going ahead.

Item agreed to.

107e. Payment to the St. Lawrence Seaway Authority, upon application, approved by the Minister of Transport, made by the Authority to the Minister of Finance, to reimburse the authority in respect of the Welland Canal deficit incurred by the Authority during the calendar year 1965, $8,250,000.

Mr. Bell (Saint John-Albert): May I ask the minister a question. Under the St. Lawrence Authority, does the minister happen to know if there is any federal authority now to begin these extra expenditures in connection with the Welland canal, or will further legislation be necessary? A large amount has been allocated for extra work in the Welland canal. Is there any authority under the act or under any legislation by which this can begin, or does this have to be referred to parliament?

Mr. Turner: I will answer that question later. Perhaps I could take it as notice, and get in touch with the hon. member.

Item agreed to.

The Deputy Chairman: The estimates for the Department of Transport are completed. We shall now proceed with the Department of Finance.

DEPARTMENT OF FINANCE

Administration—

1e. Departmental administration and grants as detailed in the estimates, $123,900.

Mr. Nesbitt: Mr. Chairman, I just want to make a brief remark to the acting minister, in the minister's absence, with respect to grants which are made through his department.

We are all looking forward to the celebration of the centenary next year. A great many grants have been made through the Department of Finance to other departments, commissions and committees, which are all very commendable. I am sure that these will help to improve the centennial celebrations.

Mr. Chairman, I suggest that the acting minister forward to the Minister of Finance this suggestion, that the minister should consult with his colleagues in the cabinet and with representatives of the government of Ontario, with a view to recommending that a

grant be made to the city of Ottawa, so that for the centennial year when people come to visit our national capital they avoid the danger of breaking the axles of their cars when they drive down the streets in centre town. I know that this is a sensitive subject for some aldermen of the city of Ottawa. I am in full agreement with the hon. member for Skeena, in the remarks he has made on a number of occasions, to the effect that something ought to be done.

Seriously, Mr. Chairman, the streets of our national capital are a national disgrace. There are a great number of holes, both potholes and mudholes, in the streets of downtown Ottawa. We all know that the city is under a considerable handicap. It does not have industries from which it can derive taxes. We know that the government gives a grant in lieu of taxes with respect to government property. But I would ask whether, for the sake of the many thousands of people expected to come to Ottawa to celebrate the centenary, something could not be done to repair the streets in the centre of the city. It would not cost that much money; and I think nobody in Canada would disagree with me, and particularly those visiting Ottawa, who would probably appreciate this, when I say that the streets ought to be repaired.

There is another matter which is to be considered, and I do not know whether it should come under the National Research Council, or some other body of that nature. The minister could decide the details of this with his appropriate colleagues. Perhaps it could be taken up with the provincial governments of Quebec or Ontario. What I refer to, Mr. Chairman, is this: Some means should be found of removing from the air of this fair capital of ours the sort of pollution that does exist. At one time I thought it was caused by one of the large manufacturing plants in the area, The E. B. Eddy Company. I am told that one or two other companies may be involved.

I think any hon. member of this house, and indeed anybody who has ever visited Ottawa has been greeted on awakening in the morning by the sulphurous fumes that so often pollute the city. That is a national disgrace in the capital of a land that has gone to great expense advertising itself as a land of fresh air, lakes, waters, and woods. It is a disgrace that such a state of affairs should be permitted in the capital. There is no reason why this cannot be cured, and if some moneys are allocated to help alleviate some of these problems and get rid of these noxious fumes, that will be of assistance, may I put it this way, toward the celebration of our centennial year.

Mr. Sherman: Mr. Chairman, I rise at this particular juncture to make a special eleventh hour appeal to the Minister of Finance to review in his conscience once again, on this eleventh hour week end, the financial straits of hundreds of thousands of Canadians.

I submit this is the proper place for such an appeal to be made, because we are considering supplementary estimates, and because the Minister of Finance is scheduled to bring down his 1966-67 budget in this house just four days from now.

Because the new budget is so near at hand, this current week end is indeed the eleventh hour for those many thousands of Canadian families and households that are casualties of a taxation and food price juggernaut in this country that has been running wild for the past three years.

These Canadians, many of them lonely pensioners, many of them widows, many of them youthful breadwinners and housewives struggling to feed and clothe young families, have high and trusting hopes for Tuesday night. They are looking to the minister's budget that night to introduce a ray of blessed relief into their troubled economic situations.

They are looking for help to get out from under the crushing burden of prices and taxes that today saps them of their dreams, their energies and their peace of mind, and bows them under a weight as oppressive as that described by the poet's classic man with a hoe.

• (4:10 p.m.)

Mr. Chairman, I suggest that for all our material affluence in Canada today, for all the sheen to our society, for all the triumphs in the realm of gross national product, there are tens of thousands of Canadian homes in 1966 in which economic survival is a continuing struggle and a continuing worry. The tightrope walk from pay day to pay day has become a way of life in Canada—the way of life, I submit, for far too many Canadian households. The Canadian householder, in far too great numbers, needs help. He needs the help of the Canadian government, and he needs the help of every man and woman in this chamber. Caught in an economic crossfire of costs and taxes, he is starting to get hit. If he is mortally wounded in that crossfire—if he

should stumble and go down—where then is the great Canadian experiment that plunges ahead today at such perilous speed? What price the glories of legislative programs which go too far, too fast? What the average Canadian is most concerned about today is the surge in the prices he meets on every hand together with the increasing bite in taxes that anywhere from two to four levels of government take out of every dollar he earns.

For my part, although I do not minimize or disparage the importance of responsible programs of social welfare, I do not believe that a country can go on ad infinitum slapping a heavier and heavier burden on the backs of its responsible, industrious citizens. They are the ones who carry the load, to be sure. They will always carry the load and, up to a reasonable point, they will do so cheerfully. But in this exercise as in many others, there comes a breaking point, and I suggest the time has come when it would be judicious and expedient for legislators in Canada to ask themselves whether they perhaps are straining the average Canadian wage earner very severely.

One cannot go on forever shifting initiative, and expect one's people, young or old, to shoot for the stars. One cannot go on forever penalizing excellence, and expect one's people, young and old, to develop Canada the way all of us wish to see her develop.

We can talk all we like about our mineral wealth and our forests and all our other fabulous natural resources. But our mightiest resources, by far outshining all others, like the north outshines the tepid tropics, are our human resources—our men and women. These are the resources we must mine. These are the crops we must harvest. We do the Canadian nation a vast and potentially fatal disservice if we blunt the ambitions of our citizens and crush their spirits, by making daily life so expensive—by making taxes so oppressive that they can never get out from under their current financial burdens, can never know freedom from worry and thus can never truly enjoy our Canadian heritage or devote their energies to participating in it creatively.

Thus I urge the minister, if he has not already done so, to provide in his budget for four measures at least: first, repeal the 11 per cent building sales tax; second, make realty taxes deductible for income tax purposes in owner-occupied homes; third, raise the basic income tax exemption level, especially for widows with children to support; and, fourth, increase the old age pension along the lines this party has been asking.

Nor, I suggest, is this latter proposal necessarily inconsistent with what I have said already about the need for fitting a clamp on our soaring tax rates. I submit that no increase in taxes is necessary to support the increase we have been asking in the old age pension. The last Auditor General's report provides examples of ample sources of revenue. The annual report of the Auditor General for the year now ending, March 31, 1966, cites no less than 450 specific findings of the Glassco royal commission on government operations which were designed to eliminate wasteful practices and result in substantial savings of public funds.

In that respect I should like to quote from the following editorial in the February 10, 1966, edition of the Winnipeg *Free Press*. The editorial was headed "A Matter of Responsibility". With reference to these 450 recommendations, it says:

> Each of these findings was followed through by the staff of the audit office to determine what action had been taken since the royal commission reported. It was found that no less than 73 per cent had not been acted upon. The most important recommendations, those which would result in the greatest savings to the treasury, remained unimplemented because of the failure of senior government officials to make the necessary decisions: "We found no lack of awareness at the various departmental levels of the need to deal with the situations. It was explained to us, however, that few changes could be made without instructions from top management."
>
> By top management, of course, Mr. Henderson can only mean cabinet ministers, deputy ministers and heads of crown corporations who, through inertia, ignorance or sheer disinterest, have failed to take the necessary steps to implement the Glassco recommendations. The cost of their procrastination is illustrated by the fact that when the commission made its report three years ago the administrative overhead of government departments and agencies was approximately $1 billion. Today it is $1.2 billion, an increase of 20 per cent despite the implementation of about one quarter of the Glassco suggestions.

I ask: Are these not adequate and reasonable sources of revenue from which to supply the funds needed in the interests of old age pensioners to supply them with the increases which this party has been seeking. In my view the picture is clear, and the government's responsibility is clear: It is the responsibility to cope, this coming Tuesday, with the situation I have described—with the economic plight of many thousands of hard-working, constructive, valuable Canadians. Hence, my appeal at this juncture. The eleventh hour is

at hand. If the minister has not already provided for these hard pressed households in his budget to be presented on Tuesday night, I submit with all humility and respect that he still has his week end in which to do so. And I urge him with the same humility to search his heart on this point. Households all across the land are watching this situation with hope. So are hon. members on this side of the house.

Mr. Peters: I would be prepared to make my pre-budget speech, too, if I had one. But I expect to be here for the budget, so I shall wait for it.

I would ask the Minister of National Revenue to give his consideration to a matter which has been raised in letters and submissions from my own area in recent weeks. It relates to the fact that Canada intends to strike a gold coin to mark the centenary in 1967. The Minister of Finance has indicated that these coins will be included in a mint set. The request coming from many of the gold mining communities is that a single coin, the gold coin itself, be separated from the mint set so that it can be used for purposes connected with the centennial. The township of Teck in particular is interested in having a number of these coins for presentation to children in the schools, and for making other presentations. It is felt it is not too much to ask that some of these municipalities, particularly when they are so closely related to gold production, should have an opportunity of acquiring single coins for this purpose.

Mr. Benson: I can only say that I will bring this matter to the attention of the Minister of Finance for his consideration. It would simply mean turning out more gold coins which would not be included in the sets.

Mr. Peters: I might add that some of the mining companies in my area did supply the gold used for the minting of sovereigns in 1912 and 1913. It is possible that they will be doing so again.

Item agreed to.

11e. To deem former members of the Senate who are in receipt of an annuity pursuant to Part III of an act to make provision for the retirement of members of the Senate and dependents of such members to be, for purposes of Finance Vote 20b of the Appropriation Act No. 10, 1964 and the regulations made thereunder, former members of the Senate who are in receipt of an annual allowance pursuant to the Members of Parliament Retiring Allowances Act or dependants of such members, as the case may be, $1.

[Mr. Sherman.]

Mr. Bell (Carleton): This is one of some 13 one dollar items which are included in these estimates. It was my intention to make a major presentation on these dollar estimates and, in particular, to launch an attack on those which are legislative in character. I will, however, bear in mind that the committee is somewhat pressed for time.

• (4:20 p.m.)

Mr. Chairman, I would like to draw to the attention of the minister and to the attention of the distinguished secretary of the treasury board the speech made in the other place by Hon. M. Wallace McCutcheon, which I endorse fully. I should say to the Minister of National Revenue that I hope in the future he will give consideration to those $1 items which are legislative in character, and introduce a statute law amendment which would be carried at the same time and which would be an amendment to the various statutes which are legislative in character. Had we not been crowded for time I would have made a rather considerable presentation on this subject.

Mr. Benson: Mr. Chairman, I simply would like to point out that in considering the estimates this year, while I was vice chairman of Treasury Board, we indeed took out many $1 items which appeared to be legislative in nature with the feeling that it would be better to introduce bills. I am generally in agreement with the supplementary estimates as submitted. Many of the items are not legislative and are merely a transfer of amounts in particular votes, and the ones which are legislative are of an emergency nature.

Mr. Knowles: Mr. Chairman, would the minister now explain.

Mr. Benson: This particular item simply is to allow senators who are retired to carry on with their health insurance. If this were not passed it would mean they would lose their coverage, and as the hon. gentleman knows, in respect of anyone at age 70 or 75 who loses it is very difficult for him to get it again.

Item agreed to.

Government Administration—

Vote 15e—Contingencies—Subject to the approval of the Treasury Board, (a) to supplement the paylist provisions of other votes; (b) for miscellaneous minor of unforeseen expenses; and (c) for awards under the Public Servants Inventions Act; including authority to re-use any sums repaid to this appropriation from other appropriations, $5,000,000.

Mr. Olson: Mr. Chairman, in respect of this item are there some negotiations or discussions under way now for the adjustment of salaries that would be retroactive to 1965-66, or why do we need this $5 million for a period which is going to end within a few days.

Mr. Benson: As you know, there were group B revisions which were approved during the past year and these have to be finished up. There also are some other areas under negotiation which may come due, although mainly this is to complete payments in respect of groups B and D which have been negotiated and settled.

Mr. Olson: If that is true, why is it under contingencies?

Mr. Benson: The reason for doing this is that generally salary revisions of the civil service are handled through one vote rather than changing all the estimates of all the departments. This particular vote is in the Department of Finance. It always has been the practice that the departments generally make provision for salaries, but if there is a salary change in the year you do not go back and attempt to change the estimates of all the departments. The salary revisions are charged to this particular vote in the Department of Finance.

Item agreed to.

Vote 16e—To authorize the Treasury Board to delete from the accounts certain debts due, and claims by, Her Majesty, each of which is in excess of $1,000, amounting in the aggregate to $1,084,556.60—$1.

Mr. Bell (Carleton): I believe the practice in the past has been that a list of the claims being written off is provided in detail to the opposition. It may be that the Minister of National Revenue has provided this to the hon. member for Perth; if not, would he undertake to provide to the opposition the full list. I can recall that being the practice in the past, because very often when I was in the minister's position I have done so.

Mr. Benson: If this has been the practice, and has not been done, I would be pleased to do it, and also I would be pleased to show the list to other members. Hon. members will note that the largest amount being written off is in my department. I can assure you that every effort was made to collect this amount. The people in my department I find are very efficient in attempting to collect the money before these write-offs occur, or in making sure that the statutory limitation has expired before the write-off actually takes place.

Mr. MacLean (Queens): Would the minister give us an explanation in a general way of what we are doing here.

Mr. Benson: As you will notice, the major item here is in my department, in the amount of some $868,000. In my department this would arise through an income tax assessment, for example, where the person died and his estate was not sufficient to cover his indebtedness to the crown. It also would occur where there are claims against limited liability companies and they go into bankruptcy so that we cannot collect the money due.

In the Department of Veterans Affairs there are veterans loans outstanding, and the veterans die, thus ultimately the amount has to be written off because the estate is not sufficient to cover it. This generally is the sort of thing which is involved.

Mr. Baldwin: Could the minister indicate whether this particular item in respect of his department would include cases where settlements on occasion have been made.

Mr. Benson: No; this would not be the case. Where settlement is made there is a reassessment issued.

Mr. Knowles: Mr. Chairman, are any of these items the kind where the name is supposed to be listed in the public accounts? I am thinking of the kind of item which is provided for in one of the sections in the Financial Administration Act.

Mr. Benson: I am not certain of the particular section of the Financial Administration Act. I know I have lists here. The requirement by statute is that every write-off in excess of $1,000 be approved by parliament, and these items here are debts in excess of $1,000 which are being written off. If they do have to appear in the public accounts, I can assure my hon. friend they will.

Mr. Knowles: I think the section I had in mind is one in the Financial Administration Act which requires the publication of the name where there is forgiveness of an amount over $1,000. The minister may remember that this issue arose in connection with the export-import matter a few years ago.

Mr. Benson: These are not debts which are being relieved under section 22 of the Financial Administration Act, which is the remission section open to Treasury Board.

Mr. Herridge: Can we assume that all these are debts which are written off as a result of the departments in question practising sound business principles? Would any ordinary businessman write them off under similar circumstances?

Mr. Benson: Yes, I think I can give the hon. member that assurance. As a matter of fact in ordinary business you would have written them off probably sooner than you do in the federal government, because in the federal government you wait for the expiry of the statutory period under which the debt is outlawed.

Mr. MacLean (Queens): Would the minister indicate what the debt is which is mentioned under the Department of Agriculture. This seems to be the largest of the lot, at least on the average. It is $15,000 only, but it seems to be quite a large amount for the government to allow to become a bad debt.

Mr. Benson: This debt, which in this particular case was a single debt, arose as a result of the manipulation of payrolls which was undetected until a successor was appointed following the employee's death. I gather this was a civil servant who had manipulated payrolls, and this was not discovered until a new employee took his place. The employee had died and his estate was insufficient to cover the debt owed to the Crown.

Item agreed to.

• (4:30 p.m.)

L101e. Advances in respect of a toll bridge across the harbour of Saint John, N.B. in the current and subsequent fiscal years, in accordance with terms and conditions set out in an agreement relating to the financing, construction and operation of the toll bridge to be entered into between Canada, New Brunswick, the city of Saint John and the bridge authority, with the approval of the governor in council, (a) to the Saint John harbour bridge authority established by c. 150 of the statutes of New Brunswick, 1961-62; or (b) to a trustee for the holders of securities issued by the authority; the total amount of advances in each such fiscal year to be based on the difference for the year between the operating and financing costs of the toll bridge and the actual revenue of the bridge authority, as determined pursuant to the agreement, repayable when the actual revenue of the bridge authority for a fiscal year exceeds the amount of the operating and financing costs for such year, $10,000,000.

Mr. Bell (Saint John-Albert): Mr. Chairman, hon. members will understand my interest in this advance in respect of the toll bridge across the harbour at Saint John, New Brunswick. Having made critical remarks of the government a few minutes ago, and knowing there will be more critical remarks made this afternoon, I want to take this opportunity to compliment the government on their perseverance in going ahead with this item, which will make it possible to have a bridge across the harbour at Saint John. We have been talking about such a project for many years. I am not suggesting that the generosity of the government is very great in this regard; I am simply giving them full credit for persevering, particularly on the part of the Minister of Transport and the Minister of Finance who have continued their interest in this project.

We know the government finally will not be involved at all financially and that the bridge will be a success, but I felt that everyone would want me to say that we appreciate the interest that has been taken in this project. We hope this interest will be continued in respect of the many other problems we have in our community.

Mr. Benson: We are always interested in the problems of Saint John.

Item agreed to.

The Chairman: We have now completed the supplementary estimates of the Department of Finance.

DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC WORKS

1e. General administration, including grants as detailed in the estimates, $44,500.

Mr. Cowan: Mr. Chairman, I wish to participate in the discussion of the supplementary estimates of the Department of Public Works and return to a subject that I am almost convinced there is no use talking about because of the attitude of the government towards this question. I have been speaking in this house in bits and drabs, because that is the only way made available to me, about the illegal filling taking place on the north side of lake Ontario opposite the shoreline of lake Ontario as it abuts the riding of York-Humber and the riding of York West.

Before somebody starts to say that this is a local politician rising on a local question regarding an area that is only four miles long, along the waterfront, I should like to emphasize that, while I speak because of the interest of the property owners along that shoreline and because of my constituents and

the voters of West York, I am speaking primarily because of the fact that a precedent will be established here if this practice is not stopped. I have almost abandoned hope that it will be stopped, in view of the history of my representations in the matter.

Lake Ontario is "a navigable water". There have been many, many court cases that have established the fact that the St. Lawrence river and the Great Lakes system are "navigable waters", and come under the International Boundary Waters Treaty and the Navigable Waters Protection Act. Under those headings they come within the purview of the Secretary of State for External Affairs, the Minister of Public Works and the Minister of Transport. The Minister of Public Works comes into the act by virtue of Part I of the Navigable Waters Protection Act, Revised Statutes of Canada 1952, revised in 1953, 1954 and 1956.

I first spoke on this question of illegal land filling by asking a question of the Secretary of State for External Affairs on March 23, 1965. At that time I asked if we could get an interpretation from the Supreme Court of Canada with regard to some of the terms used in the International Boundary Waters Treaty and the Navigable Waters Protection Act. I informed the house about three weeks ago that 11 months had gone by and I still had not received a reply from the Secretary of State for External Affairs, although the question was asked publicly in this house and recorded in *Hansard*. Hon. members will be interested to know that I have now received a reply from the Secretary of State for External Affairs. You will realize how hard he has studied the question, because it took him 11 months to get the reply for me.

On March 4, 1965, I asked the Minister of Justice to make a reference to the Supreme Court of Canada with regard to a word used in the International Boundary Waters Treaty which states that you cannot erect any works in international streams that would "materially" affect the level of the water on either side—that is, on the United States or Canadian side. This question was put down for discussion at ten o'clock in the evening of May 4. At that time I brought out the question regarding patented waterlots. I pointed out at that time that in the afternoon I had asked whether the government would make a reference to the Supreme Court of Canada in order to obtain a definition of the word "materially", and how this might affect the waters of the Great Lakes or other boundary waters.

In the evening during the ten o'clock show on May 4, 1965, as recorded at page 937 of *Hansard*, I added:

> While I am pressing upon the Minister of Justice (Mr. Favreau) the necessity of having a definite reference to the Supreme Court for an interpretation of the word "materially", might I suggest that he also seek an interpretation of the phrase "patented waterlot"?

The phrase "patented waterlot" is a bone of contention along this four mile stretch of lake Ontario, and it will continue to bother this government until there is a definite legal interpretation of that phrase. I say it will bother the government, because we have over 4,000 miles of water along the shores of the St. Lawrence river on the Canadian side and on the Great Lakes right up to Pigeon river in this Great Lakes system. If there can be patented waterlots on the four mile stretch between the Humber river and Etobicoke creek, there can be many more waterlots throughout the entire system.

Members of parliament who are taking an intelligent interest in this matter have advised me about what they call patented waterlots on lake St. Clair, on the Detroit river and on the St. Mary river at Sault Ste. Marie. I would point out that between the Humber river and Etobicoke creek there are approximately 150 of these so-called patented waterlots lying underneath the water in that four mile stretch.

At this point I should like to pay tribute and express my appreciation to Hon. Kelso Roberts, the Minister of Lands and Forests in the provincial government Hon. John Robarts, for the several hours of time that he has given me on this subject, and for the very careful surveys that the Ontario surveyor general has prepared with regard to the waterlots in that area. I did not ask to see the patented waterlots in other areas, but in that section there are approximately 150. Hon. Kelso Roberts provided me with a detailed map showing the names of the owners and detailed histories of the lots.

This question of patented waterlots comes up in this way. Since this Liberal government came into power in April of 1963 we have had three ministers of public works, the first of which was Hon. Mr. Deschatelets, for whom I have the highest regard. Under the

Navigable Waters Protection Act it is stated specifically that:

No work shall be built or placed in, upon, over, under, through or across any navigable water unless

(a) the site and plans thereof have been approved by the minister; and

(b) the work is built, placed and maintained in accordance with the plans and the regulations.

I am not a lawyer so the words appear to be perfectly plain to me. If one is a lawyer he becomes filled up with the belief that everything is indistinct, hazy and fuzzy, and that one cannot assume a word means what it is supposed to mean. Otherwise lawyers would not get their fees, if they did not get into court and fight with one another about the interpretation of words.

On May 4, 1965 when I asked the then minister of justice about the word "materially", and the phrase "patented waterlot" the then parliamentary secretary to the minister of justice, Mr. Donald Macdonald, the hon. member for Rosedale came to the late show and read this statement:

• (4:40 p.m.)

Mr. Speaker, hon. members will recognize at once that this is an important and very serious question in respect of which the hon. member for York-Humber (Mr. Cowan) and the hon. member for York West (Mr. Kelly) have been very active. I think it is very clear from the presentation this evening by the hon. member for York-Humber that both as a matter of fact and as a matter of law this is an exceedingly complicated question. It is a very difficult situation which involves an interpretation of a federal statute, the Navigable Waters Protection Act, as well as an interpretation of the Boundary Waters Treaty. This will involve very difficult questions of law. The Department of Justice will want to give serious consideration to both the suggestions of the hon. member, that binding interpretations of the relevant provisions be sought from the appropriate authorities.

That was May 4, 1965, approximately 11 months ago. I would ask why it is such a difficult matter for this government to interpret the Navigable Waters Protection Act when everybody else seems able to understand the works without all this fuss and bother of interpretation. Hon. Mr. Deschatelets was Minister of Public Works in 1963 when I was fortunate enough to be asked to sit on a small committee. At that time he was disturbed about an application from some real estate developers in the city of Montreal who were anxious to build a bridge from the north side of the St. Lawrence to the Island of Ste Thérèse, which is in the riding of Mercier represented by my good friend Prosper Boulanger. Mr. Deschatelets, then the Minister of Public Works,

[Mr. Cowan.]

realized that "no work shall be built or placed in, upon, over, under, through or across any navigable water unless the site and plans thereof have been approved by the Minister; and the work is built, placed and maintained in accordance with the plans and the regulations."

Mr. Deschatelets spent a great deal of time worrying about this application because I believe he thought that, being a member with a Montreal seat, if he granted permission somebody would say he was showing favouritism to the municipality from which he came. But we on the committee said to him, "This is a matter that can be decided, as to whether or not this is interfering with navigation and whether or not the plans have been filed in advance with you and approved by the engineers of the department." After some weeks of discussion, during which time people came up from Montreal and objected to the bridge being built on the ground that it world interfere with their activity in sailing dinghies around the island, it was decided that because the number of people interested in establishing homes on the island of Ste. Thérèse was greater than those who might be inconvenienced in their sailing activities, and since it did not interfere with navigation as generally understood, permission should be granted.

Mr. Deschatelets granted a permit for the construction of this bridge over the St. Lawrence between the north shore and the Island of Ste Thérèse. Interestingly enough, while the permit has been granted, no bridge has been built as yet. But I will come back to that.

I hold in my hand the plans that were submitted by the Ontario Hydro Electric Power Commission to the Department of Public Works. Surely to heavens they are a big enough outfit to know what they are doing. I am an Ontario resident and taxpayer, and I know how many lawyers the Ontario Hydro have in their employ. It was their desire in 1958 to erect a coal unloading dock in lake Ontario at Lakeview, Ontario, just about half a mile west of Etobicoke creek in the riding of Peel. This coal unloading dock is a vast structure extending out into the lake some distance so that coal boats can come in and unload on to the mechanical conveyors of the great plant at Lakeview owned by the Ontario Hydro Electric Power Commission. This coal is used to build up steam so that the plant is able to function 24 hours a day.

If this is such a great question of law and everybody on earth has to ask, "What does it mean?", why did the Ontario Hydro Electric Commission ask the Department of Public Works for permission to erect the wharf? The application was made in May, 1958 and was accompanied, as the law requires, by detailed plans and blueprints. I have here the approval of the application granted on August 20, 1958, and signed by H. A. Young, deputy minister of public works. There is nothing in here about this being a great, hazy question. Everybody knew exactly what they were doing and they did it properly. As a result we have a fine generating plant in Lakeview.

I hold in my hand an application by the municipality of Metropolitan Toronto. This application was filed on August 16, 1963, and is addressed to the chief of legal services, Department of Public Works, Ottawa, Ontario. The application had plans attached to it. It was to build a bridge from Olympic Island to Centre Island in Toronto harbour. This bridge is a small archway with about 16 feet clearance from the water. When this application came forward Hon. Mr. Deschatelets was again quite disturbed because he was concerned over the words of the Navigable Waters Protection Act.

The committee met with him in his office on more than one occasion. People came down from Toronto who operated small pleasure boats, and they maintained that they put their boats at anchor every night between Olympic Island and Centre Island and felt that the bridge should not be erected. But after full and due consideration Mr. Deschatelets, as Minister of Public Works, granted the municipality of Metropolitan Toronto the right to build this bridge from Olympic Island to Centre Island with a clearance of 16 feet above the normal water line. The application was dated August 16, 1963, and the permit was granted on August 17, 1964.

In connection with this application nobody said they did not know what the law was, or what it should be, or how it should be done, or asked whether they were going to consult the privy council in Great Britain or the high court of France. They just followed the law as it is set out in the Navigable Waters Protection Act.

I also have in my hand a letter from the Toronto Harbour Commissioners. They are a smart organization of able men. The general manager is a lawyer, but in addition they have legal counsel. They wanted to build what you or I might call a spit of land or a spit of rock to the east of Toronto Island, down near Cherry street, so that they could extend the size and scope of Toronto harbour. They knew about the Navigable Waters Protection Act which says that "no work shall be built or placed in, upon, over, under, through or across any navigable water unless the site and plans thereof have been approved by the minister". So the Toronto Harbour Commissioners, understanding English when they see it and not realizing what a terrifically difficult problem this was, filed an application with the Department of Public Works for a filling operation and the construction of two headlands on the shoreline of Lake Ontario between Cherry and Leslie streets, Toronto, province of Ontario.

The application came in on December 29, 1964, and was granted under date June 8, 1965, after five months consideration. The Toronto Harbour Commissioners are not the type of people who will proceed unless the law is clear. If they do not know what the law is, they do not proceed. I have given the examples of the real estate developers in Montreal, the Ontario Hydro Electric Power Commission, the municipality of Metropolitan Toronto and the Toronto Harbour Commissioners, all of whom followed the letter of the law, submitted plans in advance, had them approved and then went ahead and lived up to the plans as submitted and approved.

• (4:50 p.m.)

What have we got in the ridings of West York and York-Humber? We have people there dumping thousands of tons of fill along the shoreline of Lake Ontario in order to extend the length of their property out into the lake, without submitting any proper plans to the Department of Public Works, without asking for consent, and simply getting it ready for real estate development. In the township of Etobicoke, in that portion of it which is in my riding, private developers have gone to a point where over the years they have thrown thousands of tons of fill into lake Ontario. Now, they have gone before the Ontario Municipal Board and have had the area zoned for apartment house buildings, for motels and for restaurants. This is made land that has never been approved by the federal Department of Public Works.

When I have spoken in the past about Millgate Park development off Long Branch, people seemed to rush to the conclusion that there was only one case in point. I have said before, and I can only repeat, that I am using

Millgate as an example. I could give you another 20 cases by measurement and location if you wanted. I give you Millgate because it is the clearest example at the moment. There are about 20 similar cases in that four-mile stretch. Millgate have a lawyer, Mr. James F. McCallum, whose clients simply went to work and threw in earth obtained from the building of the subway in the city of Toronto to build up this piece of property. The property now extends 450 feet into the lake, is 330 feet in width and stands eight to ten feet above the water level of Lake Ontario.

The Millgate people have based their action in dropping this fill into Lake Ontario without the prior consent of the Department of Public Works on the ground that they own the waterlots. They are, therefore, they claim able to fill them in, as they very much wish to do as owners. As I have said in this house before, and as I repeat, we in the area have communicated with the ablest lawyers in the country. One of them in particular, in whom I have 100 per cent unbounded confidence, has told us that waterlots should not be filled, that this is an interference with navigation. He points out that the bed of the lake belongs to the province of Ontario and they can sell it to whom they wish. Once you have acquired a waterlot, you are the owner but you are only allowed to build on it such appurtenances as are required for the handling of ships which you may wish to tie up for the night.

The waterlot idea developed 100 years ago when people had boats and when, instead of beaching them each night, because of the weight which would require great strength or some mechanical means to pull them in, people began to buy waterlots to tie up these boats. Having informed the government that they wished to anchor a boat, they were not allowed to obstruct other boats crossing the waterlots.

Now, when I raise the point that this Millgate land development is being filled in, and filled in without any prior consent from the Department of Public Works, I have to emphasize that I am talking about private property. These public bodies such as the Toronto Harbour Commission, the Ontario Hydro Commission and the municipality of metropolitan Toronto are public bodies and the federal government grants them the permission they seek because it is in the public good. Why are the private owners of waterlots allowed to get away with a false claim that they own the waterlots and therefore can fill them in, whether or not they constitute a detriment to navigation.

I have raised this question of the Navigable Waters Protection Act many times in connection with this Millgate development. I have raised it times without number in the moment or two you are allowed for a question, or during the seven minutes you are allowed on the late show. Hon. members may say that I spoke on this matter during the interim supply debate on February 10, which is not too long ago. I want to say to you that I spoke at length at that time. If you want a perfect example of how much attention this cabinet pays to a private member who raises a matter, then I refer you to a letter sent to the Millgate development people and dated March 3.

I have mentioned this matter time after time. On February 10 I spoke at some length and asked the Department of Public Works not to grant approval of the application for a retaining wall around this illegal fill because I maintain, and I think quite properly, that this illegal addition should be nationalized by the crown. It could be turned into a public park for the people of the area. This would also kill a precedent that is now being built up to the effect that if you have a waterlot you can do what you like with it.

I spoke on February 10, 1966 and I just want hon. members to know the attention the cabinet pays to anybody objecting to private desires—or perhaps they are only subject to the blandishments of friends other than me. Under date of March 3, the department wrote as follows:

> Re: Application for approval of a proposed retaining wall (around fill) (in Lake Ontario in front of Lot 9, broken front con., Township of Etobicoke, County of York), Province of Ontario.
>
> Dear Sir:
>
> I acknowledge receipt of proof of publication of the necessary advertising relating to the above application.
>
> Approval of this application is being delayed pending full investigation and report of complaints received against approval of the sea wall.
>
> Yours very truly,
>
> Peter Sorokan,
> Chief of Legal Services.

Now, this letter must have filled Millgate Park investment people with a great deal of pleasure because it says that "approval" of this application is being delayed. They could not use a phrase such as, "Consideration will be given to this application during the next few weeks". No, these private developers,

evidently with an approach to the government not generally known to the public, are told, despite all the times we have drawn attention to it, that "approval of this application" is being delayed pending full investigation and report of complaints received against approval of the sea wall.

Under date of October 22, 1965, the Department of Public Works wrote to Millgate Park Investments Limited, 2788 Bathurst Street, as follows:

Dear Sir:

Our engineers now report that the plans and description which accompanied your application are considered satisfactory. It will be in order for you, therefore, to proceed with publication of the necessary advertising in the *Canada Gazette* and two local newspapers, and submit proof thereof upon completion on the form attached hereto.

This was two or three weeks before the general election on November 8, and there was no publicity given to that letter in the riding of West York or in the riding of York-Humber, I can assure you. This letter is signed, Peter Sorokan, Chief of Legal Services. The point I am desirous of making is this: Why is it that public bodies fill in applications in advance, accompanied by the necessary plans and the necessary advertising, but private developers are allowed to get away with whatever they want to do. They can throw tons and tons of fill into the lake. Is it because of the lawyers they hire? Is it because of the people they know, or what? Why are private developers allowed to fill in Lake Ontario? I don't get the idea. You can still buy lots from the government I believe. There were 150 private, patented waterlots along that shore.

It is the Ontario government that has sold the private waterlots. Who is to stop the Ontario government from selling more of these lots. Once they have sold the lots, is a precedent now being established that private developers can fill in the waterlots and get a screwball answer from the Department of Public Works that there is no substantial interference with commercial navigation. The law does not read that way, it says "interfere with navigation". The present Minister of Justice who was formerly Minister of Public Works, made the announcement that Millgate Park did not interfere with navigation at all. This was quite an answer, and was given to us on February 1, 1966.

Of course, there is no obstruction to navigation created by this 450 foot spit of land on which they are hoping to build two 18 storey apartment houses. Anybody can understand that when you have a piece of land projecting 450 feet into Lake Ontario, with water on three sides of it and two 18 storey apartments going to be erected on it, this constitutes no obstruction to navigation. I never heard of such an answer.

• (5:00 p.m.)

I do not believe the government even knew about the plans. The Navigable Waters Protection Act says you cannot interfere with navigation. It does not refer to commercial navigation, which was another answer we got on June 1, 1965. The Department of Public Works announced that this was no interference with commercial navigation. But the act says "with navigation" and does not have the adjective "commercial" in the text.

I do not know what action we can take to nationalize this land. I have asked the government time and again on different occasions, and I ask them once more, whether they will make a reference to the Supreme Court of Canada to ascertain what are the legal rights of owners of patented waterlots. These patented water lots do not give the owner the right to fill them in with earth without the prior consent of the Department of Public Works; and I doubt whether the Department of Public Works would approve the application of a private individual made on behalf of a private citizen.

I would ask the government once more whether they will make a reference to the Supreme Court of Canada to clarify this matter, and whether they will delay the approval they seem determined to give to this applicant until such time as a decision has been handed down in the matter by the Supreme Court of Canada.

The Chairman: Order. I must advise the hon. member that the time allotted to him has expired.

Mr. Herridge: Is it five o'clock, Mr. Chairman?

Some hon. Members: Carried.

The Chairman: It being five o'clock, and in order to permit the house to proceed to the consideration of private members' business, shall I rise, report certain resolutions, and request leave to sit again later this day or at the next sitting of the house, as the case may be?

Resolutions adopted in committee of supply this day reported and concurred in.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order. It being five o'clock the house will now proceed to the consideration of private members' business as listed on today's order paper, namely public bills and private bills.

Mr. Benson: Mr. Speaker, I wonder whether the house might not be inclined to revert to committee of supply for a few minutes in the hope of cleaning up the final supplementary estimates. Of course, if there are a great many more members who wish to speak I would not ask that this be done.

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Réal Caouette (Villeneuve): Mr. Speaker, I would be inclined to comply with the request of the Minister of National Revenue (Mr. Benson) that we proceed with the study of supplementary estimates. However, since Liberal members are the ones who are delaying the passage of those estimates, and also since Bill C-10 is to be considered at five o'clock—I shall not be here next week—I feel we should follow the orders of the day and proceed with public bills.

[*English*]

BRITISH NORTH AMERICA ACT

AMENDMENTS RESPECTING SENATE REPRESENTATION FROM QUEBEC

Mr. Réal Caouette (Villeneuve) moved the second reading of Bill No. C-10, to amend the British North America Acts, 1867 to 1965, with respect to representation of the provinces in the Senate and qualifications of Senators.

He said:

[*Translation*]

Mr. Speaker, the purpose of Bill C-10 is to amend the British North America Acts, 1867 to 1965, with respect to representation of the provinces in the Senate and qualifications of senators.

This bill mainly suggests amendments to sections 22 and 23, as well as the repeal of sections 26, 27 and 28 of the present act.

Mr. Speaker, section 23 reads as follows:

> The qualification of a senator shall be as follows:
> (1) He shall be of the full age of thirty years;
> (2) He shall be either a natural-born subject of the queen, or a subject of the queen naturalized by an act of the parliament of Great Britain, or of the parliament of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland, or of the legislature of one of the provinces of Upper Canada, Lower Canada, Canada, Nova Scotia, or New Brunswick, before the Union, or of the parliament of Canada, after the Union;

[The Chairman.]

The purpose of Bill C-10 is simply to give a more Canadian character to those sections of the British North America Acts, 1867 to 1965, to repeal section 23 and substitute the following therefor:

> The qualification of a senator shall be as follows:
> (1) He shall be of the full age of thirty years:
> (2) He shall be a Canadian citizen:
> (3) He shall be resident in the province for which he is appointed.

Now, if we consider section 22 of the British North America Acts, 1867 to 1965, we find that paragraph (6) section 23, the repeal of which is also being proposed, was inserted in our constitutional act at the time of confederation to protect the English speaking protestant minority, mainly grouped in the eastern townships of Quebec at the time. Of course, no such provision was made to protect the French speaking Catholic minorities in the other provinces.

It seems to me that, at this time, when bilingualism and respect for the founding races, not only of one province but of Canada as a whole, are in the fore it is time the provisions of the British North America Acts (1867 to 1965) be amended and adapted to 1966, to the time in which we are living.

Mr. Speaker, if we look at the representation of every province, in the Senate, we find that Ontario, which is entitled to 24 senators, has only two French speaking members. For the province of Quebec, four Senators are English speaking, compared with 20 French speaking for a total of 24.

For Nova Scotia, not one French speaking senator among the ten.

For New Brunswick, three out of ten senators are French speaking; for Prince Edward Island, none out of four; for British Columbia, none out of six; for Manitoba, one out of six, for Saskatchewan, one out of six; for Alberta, none out of six, and for Newfoundland, none out of six.

Mr. Speaker, a senator for Alberta died recently, Senator Aristide Blais.

• (5:10 p.m.)

Then, pressure was brought to bear by various Alberta associations.

I have here a letter from the president of the French Canadian Association of Alberta, which says:

> Dear Sir:
> You will readily appreciate how disappointed the Franco-Albertans were when they learned that hon. Senator Aristide Blais' successor was not a French Canadian. We find it difficult to understand this decision taken by the Prime Minister of Canada

and we hope that he will correct this omission at the earliest opportunity.

We presume that you share our views on this matter and that, in due course, you will make the proper representations.

You will find enclosed copy of a resolution which was passed by the members of the general council of the French Canadian Association of Alberta and which was sent to the Rt. Hon. Lester B. Pearson on March 7, 1966.

We expect that, in the not too distant future, a few vacancies will occur in the representation of Alberta in the Senate and we deem it most advisable to continue asking what we began to ask immediately after Senator Blais' death, in November 1964. We are counting on your support and we thank you in advance.

Mr. Speaker, this stand taken by the French Canadian Association of Alberta should surprise no one in this house.

In the province of Quebec, we have always accepted that English speaking senators be appointed to a seat in the Senate to represent the Protestant Anglo Saxon minority of our province. The province of Quebec never raised any objection whatsoever about the representation which is quite normal and respectable and which we respect.

I make it four provinces out of ten which do not have a single French speaking representative in the Canadian Senate, and that seems quite illogical to me.

We suggest that this lack of logic be remedied and that is why I introduce Bill No. C-10 which asks that senators be Canadian citizens.

I will add, in passing, that the bicultural character of our country must be taken into account, not only in one region but throughout the country, in all the provinces; what we accept in the province of Quebec should be done in the other provinces.

It was rather surprising, in the circumstances, to see appointments such as the ones which were made quite recently and for which the Prime Minister of Canada did not take that fact into account.

Mr. Speaker, it seems to me that the Prime Minister, who likes to champion the rights of the two ethnic groups which founded Canada, should take that fact into account, not only when he makes a speech in the house but when he makes appointments.

Mr. Speaker, the proposed change is motivated mainly by the fact that Canada is no longer a colony, and therefore only Canadians should be eligible for the Senate.

You know that, under the present act, a senator can be appointed from Great Britain, Australia or any commonwealth nation.

In my opinion, Mr. Speaker, only Canadians should be eligible for the Senate because we live in a country which is now sovereign.

Let us add also that, if it is most difficult for a rich man to enter the Kingdom of Heaven, a poor man should not be prevented from entering the democratic Senate of the kingdom of Canada.

Paragraph 6 is deleted for the reasons given in the explanatory note opposite Section 1.

With regard to Sections 26, 27 and 28 of the said act, no use has ever been made of these sections since confederation, that is 1867. They are therefore antiquated, useless, and I suggest we simply delete them, so that they might not cause inconvenience to anyone at a later date, especially from 1966 on.

In Section 4, I request that this act be cited as the

British North America Act, 1966 and the *British North America Acts, 1867 to 1965* and this Act may be cited together as the *British North America Acts, 1867 to 1966.*

Mr. Speaker, I believe this bill is prejudicial to no one. On the contrary, it confirms the fact that ours is a sovereign nation; its purpose is to establish clearly that to become a senator, one must be 30 years of age, a Canadian citizen and a resident in the province for which one is appointed.

That is the purpose of the bill and I trust that the house as well as the members are wise enough to understand the importance of proving to Canada that our country is sovereign and that we can act, in all consciousness, and freely, in favour of Canada, with Canadians.

Mr. L.-P. Neveu (Shefford): Mr. Speaker, as this is the first time I have the honour to participate in the discussion in this house, I hope my colleagues will grant me the privilege of giving my speech to the end.

I am particularly fortunate to speak on a much discussed subject of major significance. In the past, many members have seen fit to rise to move amendments concerning the honourable members of the senate.

Mr. Speaker, we have before us a bill introduced by the hon. member for Villeneuve (Mr. Caouette) who thinks it is proper to suggest also changes which directly affect our colleagues of the upper house.

I am very proud to follow my hon. friend because I have high regard for his oratory,

for his devotion to his work, for his fighting spirit and for his perseverance.

I sincerely believe that the whole of our population deserves to be well informed on the important role played by the members of the Canadian senate.

But since this is my maiden speech, I also want to say that I will respect the rule of progression, to wit that one must walk before one can run, but while making steady progress in accordance with the policies laid down by my Liberal colleagues. Philosophy states that nature does not leap. Nevertheless, I intend to follow my own course of action resulting from sustained toil.

I also wish to add, Mr. Speaker, that I intend, together with my French and English speaking colleagues in the house, to remain objective in my remarks and my discussions. I also would express the hope that we may experience Canadian unity to its full extent.

• (5:20 p.m.)

I also want to say that, if I intend to work in close co-operation with one and all, it is because this is my way of proclaiming proudly that I wish to be among those who will say, with dignity and enthusiasm, that French speaking Canadians certainly intend to co-operate, but they also want their rights to be respected. I want to be among those who will be able to say: French Canadians no longer intend to symbolize the sheep, but the Precursor.

Allow me, Mr. Speaker, to make a review of that place we call the upper chamber. Naturally, Massieu said: gratitude is the heart's memory. That is why, with the permission of the house, I should like to assess properly the part played by the hon. members of the Senate.

Mr. Speaker, our upper house is now made up of 102 members appointed by the governor general under the great seal of Canada.

It is in order to mention here that the act contains a special provision under which four or eight additional senators can be appointed to represent the four great regions of Canada. However, as far as I know, that provision has never been used since confederation.

Considering that, in the last several years, the number of our members has increased and that our population keeps increasing and that its needs should be better met, and that some regions are not represented, I ask, Mr. Speaker, that the provisions of the act be applied and that the Northwest Territories for instance have a member in the upper house because all Canadians, whether English or French speaking, whether they belong to one ethnic group or other, deserve to be represented not only in this House of Commons but also in the upper house, so that all Canadians are represented.

According to constitutional tradition, the Prime Minister has the power to appoint senators by sending a recommendation to the governor general who accepts it.

I would hope however that in the future it might be possible to suggest an amendment to the effect that the Prime Minister, in agreement with the members of the Privy Council, could recommend the appointment of senators, to avoid any purely political discussion or nomination, and to enable all Canadians who built our economy in all sectors, whether they are in politics or not, to represent us permanently in the upper chamber.

As you know, Senate representation is the following in Canada: Ontario, Quebec and the Maritimes each have 24 senators; Nova Scotia and New Brunswick, 10 each; Prince Edward Island, four; Newfoundland, six; and western Canada, 24, each of the four western provinces being represented by six senators.

In the case of each division of Canada, excluding the province of Quebec, senators are named without any designation of constituency, that is to say they represent the whole of the region for which they are appointed.

As far as Quebec is concerned, one senator is provided for each of the 24 electoral colleges of the territory which made up the old Lower Canada. Personally, I favour maintaining that particular system because it better identifies our province which was one of the two pioneers and, therefore, proves clearly its role as one of the founding nations.

That formula is fair and most praiseworthy because it enables our various regions to depend on one representative who keeps constantly in mind the problems which concern more particularly the constituency he represents.

Mr. Speaker, I think it is appropriate to review the qualifications of a member of the upper house.

As was said earlier, one must be over 30 years old and be a British subject. On that last point, I feel that, because of the amendments which gave our country its independence, qualification should be changed from British subject to Canadian subject. That

provision would help to a certain extent to recognize an adult Canada, therefore more modern, considering the powers put at our disposal.

One must also own, in the province for which one is appointed, real estate of a minimum value of $4,000 over and above debts and liabilities, and real and personal property of a minimum value of $4,000 also over and above debts and liabilities. In the case of Quebec, one must reside in the province or own real estate valued at $4,000 in the riding for which one is appointed.

The Senate was never meant to compete with the House of Commons in the field of legislation. It was created as a second house and as Sir John A. Macdonald said, it can give "sober second thought" to bills introduced in the house. That has been, generally, its role.

By virtue of the constitution, financial bills, that is bills which entail any expenditure of public funds or which levy taxes, must first be introduced in the House of Commons, as is done in the United Kingdom.

In every other respect, the Senate is the equal of the House of Commons, as the two must agree in the enactment of any legislative measure.

Finally, the Senate has an absolute right of veto over all bills, a right it has exercised from time to time. It has also claimed, and in fact exercised, the right to amend money bills when such amendments decreased the amounts involved, or the taxes levied, and did not increase the burden placed upon the taxpayers.

Confederation had barely been signed when clamours for Senate reform started and continued periodically. On several occasions it was the target of severe criticism, often of a contradictory nature. It was accused of not being responsible to the people of being a possible menace to the supremacy of the House of Commons, of being a mere rubber stamp for the House of Commons, of comprising too great a number of representatives of one political party or the other, of not bearing its rightful share of the legislative burden.

Moreover, it has been said on various occasions that an age limit should be set for senators. An amendment was passed and enacted to this effect on June 2, 1965 and it now appears in Chapter 4 of the Statutes of Canada 14, Elizabeth II, under the title: An Act to make provision for the retirement of members of the Senate. Under this amendment, the age of retirement of senators appointed after this date has been set at 75.

Nevertheless, many factors were against any appreciable change in the composition, the method of appointment and operation of the Senate.

First of all, there has been a tendency to expect too much of that institution. Numerous critics were based on a misconception of the proper duties of the Senate, as mentioned previously. The role of the Senate was never to compete with the house of commons nor, as Sir Robert Borden said "to make use of its powers to the limit of the law." Thus, it never opposed passage of a bill for which the government had received a mandate from the people at a general election.

Traditionally, the Senate has always been conscious of the special role it has to play in the enacting of legislation, and of the fact that it must check but not obstruct measures sent to it by the house of commons. Indeed, no attempt has been made until now to restrict its powers although, under the Imperial Parliament Act, the powers of the house of lords, the equivalent of the Senate in the United Kingdom, have been considerably curtailed.

Second, let us note that public opinion has never reached a consensus as to the means of reforming the Senate, as previously mentioned; there are many conflicting possibilities in this regard, and the views of the government, and those of the opposition differed, understandably, with regard to both the urgency of reform and the points which should be subjected to reform. These differences depended on whether or not the majority in the Senate was of the same political stripe as the government.

Third, political parties in this country seem to agree on the fact that the basic provisions of the British North America Act in regard to the composition, the method of appointment and the duties of the Senate cannot be amended, without prior consultation with the provincial governments, although, in strict accordance with the law, parliament could probably take several steps on its own under the 1949 constitutional amendment previously referred to in my remarks.

• (5:30 p.m.)

Finally, let us not forget any proposed reform requiring the intervention of the

Canadian parliament must be approved by the Senate itself.

In spite of periodical reform proposals, no one should be under the impression that the Senate has nothing to do in the making of our laws. However, in the red chamber there is neither the animation of the Commons, nor the climate of political rivalry which prevails here. Debates are sober, speeches are short and concise. As an outstanding parliamentarian once said: "It is a workshop, not a theatre".

In the Senate, discussions which are purely political in character, procedural disputes and filibustering are held at a minimum. Legislation is put forward and debated usually in a calm atmosphere. During parliamentary sessions, therefore, the Senate meets less often than the house, and its sittings are shorter than those of the house where, as can be seen constantly, there is always a current, or at least a strong undercurrent of political emulation, because members must always look after their own chances of re-election and that of their party.

In fact, the Senate performs carefully and efficiently, mainly through its committees, a great deal of parliamentary work without being given much credit for it and without getting much publicity.

Sponsors of bills have to prove their case before the appropriate Senate committee, and a private bill passed by the Senate is very seldom significantly or repeatedly amended by the House of Commons. Finally, the Senate discusses and considers regularly various matters of public interest and reports to the house. In this connection, the wishes of the Senate are often reflected ultimately in government legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I feel that the distinguished members of that house are really objective; most of them have a wide experience in the judicial, political and social fields, as well as in the business world. Many of them have an extensive knowledge and have distinguished themselves in this house. They are quite familiar with our statutes and understand thoroughly the proper functioning of our society.

In the past few years, the numerous general elections have brought about radical changes in the representation within the House of Commons. As you know, Mr. Speaker, the human element has always played a major role in human relationships.

[Mr. Neveu.]

The members of the Senate are permanent members of parliament who, the year round, work in teams and study dispassionately the bills presented to them.

This parliamentary stability makes for solid friendships based on the recognition of others. These men ceaselessly learn to respect one another because they know how to respect.

Mr. Speaker, during the critical times we are living through, our distinguished members of the Senate are playing a magnificent role in enabling our two founding races, our two languages, our two cultures, to be accepted everywhere in our beautiful country.

The members of the upper house can set for the people of Canada an example that unity must necessarily be prectised through constructive dialogue so that there may be a real possibility of solving the many problems that occur in our time.

Representing all the provinces of Canada, our honourable colleagues may from the same starting point, disseminate the message of unity to which all right-minded citizens of Canada sincerely aspire.

The example of the members of the upper house must be followed and I express the hope, Mr. Speaker, that all my colleagues maintain such objectivity. Our soldiers, whether French or English speaking, laboured together for a common goal and many of them spilled their blood to preserve our freedom; they did so in order that all Canadians labour together in peace, to build a new Canada that will set forth, all sails to the wind, toward continued progress.

Mr. Speaker, the members of the Senate make up a huge laboratory from which came out the experience and the means to help us strengthen the ties which will serve as an example for all Canadians. And before concluding my remarks, I would like to quote two great men. In 1959, Dr. Schweitzer said:

> One must never hurl unfounded rumors against an opponent or impute motives to him because he, like anyone else, is inhabited by the spirit.

In closing, I would like to strike a note of friendly unity by quoting from Saint-Exupéry's book *Terre des Hommes*:

> To love is not to look at each other but to look together in the same direction.

[*English*]

Mr. Grant Deachman (Vancouver Quadra): Mr. Speaker—

Mr. Knowles: En francais.

Mr. Caouette: Très bien, très bien.

An hon. Member: He would, only you would not understand him.

Mr. Deachman: Mr. Speaker—

[*Translation*]

Mr. Speaker, as requested by hon. members, I can speak a little French. You will excuse me if I continue in English, because I can express my thoughts more easily in that language.

Mr. Knowles: Fine.

Mr. Caouette: Very good.

[*English*]

Mr. Deachman: Mr. Speaker, when I was asked whether I would take part in this debate I gave some period of study to this bill, and I found some things which I do not think I knew about previously concerning Canada's constitution and about the Senate. What I found, something which I thought was most interesting, is that at the time of confederation Quebec was the only province entering confederation which had a singular arrangement in respect of the appointment of senators. In that province, as has been explained well in the bill presented by the hon. member for Villeneuve (Mr. Caouette), they appointed their senators on a geographic basis, based on the irregular boundaries or counties of the old province of Lower Canada. However, my friend says this was done with a view to providing an adjustment between the English and the French population of that day, and it did indeed have a considerable amount to do with the fact that the eastern townships at that time were more heavily populated with English speaking persons than they are today.

To go to some of the texts which describe this, I think it would be of interest to hon. members if I quoted a few remarks from some authorities on this subject, to shed a little more light on why this was done and exactly how it was done. I refer to a book by Robert A. MacKay, entitled "The Unreformed Senate of Canada", in which he says:

> The basis of representation in the upper house was the great compromise of the conference, just as it had been in the convention of the American States at Philadelphia. At Philadelphia the compromise was equal representation in the upper house for the states, at Quebec it was equal representation for the three sections.

• (5:40 p.m.)

That is to say, the country was divided into three sections; the maritimes with 24 senatorial seats, Quebec or French Canada with 24 senatorial seats and Upper Canada, which at that time had not expanded westward, with 24 senatorial seats.

He then says:

> It was the key to federation, 'the very essence of the compact,' said George Brown. 'Our Lower Canadian friends have agreed to give us representation by population in the Lower House, on the express condition that they could have equality in the Upper House. On no other condition could we have advanced a step.'

That is another question which the hon. member takes up in his bill. That is, the question of property ownership as being a requisite in order to qualify for a senatorship.

Mr. MacKay then states:

> This provision, which was of concern only to Canada, seems to have been worked out among members of the government representing Lower Canada. Its purpose was to assure to both the French speaking Roman Catholic majority and the English speaking Protestant minority their fair share of representation in the upper house. It applied and still applies, only to Quebec.

Let us now turn to the confederation debates, and I am sure all hon. members have a copy of them in their own libraries. We find at page 236 the words of the hon. Sir E. P. Taché who said in 1865:

> Perhaps it is well that we have now responsible government, because responsible government is a cure for many evils. Well, the bill to give Protestant dissenters—

Perhaps my hon. friend will be interested in that phrase. The English were referred to as "Protestant dissenters" in Lower Canada.

Sir E. P. Taché continues:

> Well, the bill to give Protestant dissenters in Lower Canada certain rights was opposed again and again in the Legislative Council of Lower Canada, and opposed by English Protestants. But this was no less a proof of the liberality of the French Canadians.

At this point in brackets are the words "hear, hear". That is one of the things we miss in our *Hansard* today, these little interjections which tell us when there was laughter and applause in the house.

An hon. Member: Hear, hear.

Mr. Deachman: I hope that comment has been taken down and will appear in *Hansard*.

Sir E. P. Taché then states:

> The honourable gentleman behind me is not at all satisfied with the electoral divisions as they stand in Lower Canada. He says there is no security whatever afforded by them to the

Protestant community. But I wish that honourable gentleman had taken the trouble to look a little into the facts upon which he had based his conclusions in regard to these very electoral divisions.

I will not continue to read his words, but he does go on to say how he had taken part in setting up this peculiar difference in the selection of senators from Quebec, on the county basis rather than on a regional basis as was the case in the rest of the country.

I am a little surprised that my hon. friend would want to give up the territorial distribution of senatorships in the province of Quebec even though, as he said, the English element has to a considerable extent now left the eastern townships. Do the geographic districts for the distribution of senatorships not protect the French speaking citizens of Quebec? If they were not there, would it not be possible, for example, for a prime minister to appoint all his senators from the area of Montreal or, indeed from the city of Westmount? Under the system as it now is the senators of Quebec, more so than in any other province or area of Canada, must indeed be appointed from a specific area and must give representation to a geographic area of that province.

While I am referring to this subject, I should like to skip a little bit in the member's bill and point out to the fact that an individual, in order to qualify for a senatorship, must also possess property. It was part of the constitution at confederation that at the same time geographic distribution of senatorships in the province of Quebec was established, the appointees had also to possess property in the districts they were to represent.

In my province of British Columbia we divide up the senatorial appointments among the island, the lower mainland or metropolitan area and the interior of the province. I do not think this is done on any constitutional basis, but simply as a long-standing practice in distributing the six senatorships to which the province of British Columbia is now entitled.

The difficulty in this regard is this. As soon as we go to the interior and appoint a senator he moves from the area into the city and we seldom see him back in the interior again. If he sells his property he disappears almost entirely from that area and cannot, therefore, give the kind of representation to the area that he might otherwise give if he were constrained to keep property in that area as the senator representing the geographic location.

[Mr. Deachman.]

Far from being a hindrance or something that a person would want to rid himself of in a bill of this kind, I would think the hon. member would want to retain this requirement in the bill in order to encourage senators not to give up their farms and move into flats here in Ottawa, seldom going back to the communities from which they had been sent as representatives in the Senate. It seems to me this would be a very desirable feature and one which we might wish had been included in the arrangements at the time of confederation for other provinces as well as Quebec.

I now want to turn for a moment to the subject of Canadian citizenship, because this is one subject about which I heard the hon. gentleman speak. I know a little bit about his views regarding Canadian citizenship and, indeed, a bit about his views regarding French and English speaking Canadians. But, of course, there has always been a great struggle in Canada in the making of appointments to the Senate, because there is always an attempt to make them not only on geographic lines, as set out for us by the constitution, but on ethnic, religious and class lines. In that regard I mean classes such as individuals who come from the country, from the city and from labouring sections of the community as well as those from managerial and professional sections. All those considerations must be looked into when the Prime Minister comes to the permutations involved in choosing Senate appointments.

Mr. Johnston: Why do you ignore them all?

Mr. Rapp: What about Hazen Argue?

Mr. Deachman: I am surprised at that remark.

I want to read a few items from a book entitled *The Modern Senate of Canada*, written by Mr. F. A. Kunz and published by the University of Toronto press. He says at page 50:

• (5:50 p.m.)

Another group that has a well-articulated claim to representation in the Senate on the ground of their distinct identity is the English speaking Catholics in the English speaking provinces, particularly in Ontario. They try to secure a balance in Senate membership between English and French, Protestant and Catholic. The difficulty of course is that Protestants look upon a French Canadian appointee as a Catholic appointment, whilst French Canadians look upon the appointment of an English speaking Catholic as an English appointment. So between the French Canadian Catholics on the

one hand and the Protestants on the other, English speaking Catholics are ground between the upper and nether millstones.

He goes on to say at page 51:

The French Canadians of Ontario and western Canada seem to attach the same kind of political-social-psychological significance to representation in the Senate. When J. H. G. Lacasse from Ontario was summoned to the Upper House in 1928, Casgrain made a special point during the Address debate in the House of Commons: "I am pleased to observe," he said, "that the government has fulfilled a duty: they have acknowledged the rights of the French Canadian minority in Ontario, by calling to the Upper House one of its distinguished citizens—and I think all the French Canadian people of the province of Quebec, as well as those of other parts of Canada, will give credit to the government—for such a fair and just act."

A little further on he says:

Claims of this nature are of course not restricted to the major minority groups. Indeed, there are nearly as many claims to representation in the Senate as there are minorities of whatever complexion. Thus, for example, the Hebrew Conservative Political Association, Montreal, said in its resolution, June 28, 1926, that, "Whereas from a national and political point of view the time has arrived when it would be highly desirable that the Conservative party should give due prominence and recognition to a member of the Jewish race by an appointment to the Senate of Canada ...be it resolved that we...hereby unanimously recommend the appointment of Isaac Lande to the Senate of Canada."

Then the writer of this book says:

Again, when Mr. J. Hnatyshyn was summoned to the Senate in 1959, the Saskatoon *Star Phoenix* commented: "The appointment of Mr. John Hnatyshyn, Q.C., as a Senator of Canada is a meritorious one and is so acclaimed in Saskatoon and beyond, and regardless of party affiliations and party considerations—the underlying importance of this appointment to the Red Chamber is in the fact that Mr. Hnatyshyn is a native of the Ukraine, and his choice—as the first of his race in Saskatchewan to go to the Senate is a recognition of the great role Canadian Ukrainians have played, and are continuing to play in this growing country."

So it is that prime ministers in the past have attempted in their choice of Senators to give recognition to walks of life in Canada and representation to the wide diversification of ethnic groups which have made up this great country. They have even gone outside the boundaries of Quebec to select senators and give representation to French Canadian minorities outside that province, just as my hon. friend has asked this house to provide by way of constitutional amendment.

In his remarks the hon. member for Villeneuve said there had not been, for example, a French Canadian appointment from the province of British Columbia. I should like to remind him that the late Senator Turgeon, who died only a very few years ago and whose appointment has not been filled, represented the province of British Columbia for many years as a French Canadian senator. It is true that the Turgeon family moved to the west in early days and were perhaps westerners rather than easterners or members of the province of Quebec, but the great Turgeon family graced many public posts in the west during its early days and are to be numbered among our judges, chairmen of various boards, commissioners of royal commissions and senators over that period. Senator Turgeon himself I believe served in the legislature of the province of British Columbia before he was appointed to the Senate in Mackenzie King's day to represent the interior and Cariboo district of British Columbia. So it is—

Mr. Barnett: Mr. Speaker, may I ask the hon. gentleman a question?

Mr. Deachman: Yes.

Mr. Barnett: Is the hon. member not in error when he suggests that the late Senator Turgeon was a member of the legislature of British Columbia? My recollection is that he was a member of this house—that indeed at one time he was my member of parliament.

Mr. Deachman: I stand corrected, Mr. Speaker. I am sure the hon. member is quite correct. In conclusion I would say about this bill that while it suggests that some changes be made in the geographic representation system which is unique to the province of Quebec, there is perhaps some reason to give pause before we leap into passing a bill which would amend the legislation.

The appointment of Senators, as has been pointed out in the quotations I have read to the house, has been carried out by every Canadian prime minister as fairly as possible on ethnic lines, whatever other considerations a prime minister may have had in making senatorial appointments. Finally I would say that in regard to the appointment of only Canadian citizens as senators—

Some hon. Members: Six o'clock.

Mr. Deachman: —I think it would be very difficult indeed to find a member of the Senate today, or perhaps any senator in the past, who is or was not a Canadian citizen. Therefore I do not think we need worry about the section which the hon. member wishes to have amended. Mr. Speaker, may I call it six o'clock?

Supply—Items Passed

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order. The hour for the consideration of private members' business has expired.

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE

Mr. MacLean (Queens): Mr. Speaker, I should like to ask whether the acting house leader could give some indication of the business for at least the first part of next week, or can he make any statement at this time?

Mr. Hellyer: Mr. Speaker, I understand we are to discuss the question of capital punishment on Monday. I do not know whether there is agreement on that, but I will bring it to the attention of the house leader in the hope that he can work out a satisfactory schedule with the leaders of the house.

Mr. MacLean (Queens): I just wanted to have confirmed that no change had been made in the understanding that the question of capital punishment would be debated on Monday.

Mr. Knowles: It was a house order.

Mr. Hellyer: I think it was a house order and therefore it would only be possible to change it by another order of the house. But subject to that caveat and to any arrangements that might be made among the leaders of the parties between now and Monday, I would think the agreement would stand.

At six o'clock the house adjourned, without question put, pursuant to standing order.

[The following items were passed in Committee of Supply this day:]

DEPARTMENT OF LABOUR

1e. General administration, $47,500.

Central Mortgage and Housing Corporation—

15e. To reimburse Central Mortgage and Housing Corporation, pursuant to Section 35 of the National Housing Act, 1954, for expenditures incurred during the period January 1, 1965 to December 31, 1965, for housing research and community planning as contemplated by Part V of the National Housing Act, 1954, $1,489,905.

20e. To reimburse Central Mortgage and Housing Corporation, pursuant to Section 5(5) and Section 24(b) of the Central Mortgage and Housing Act, for net losses resulting from the sale of mortgages from its portfolio during the calendar year 1965, $685,562.

25e. To reimburse Central Mortgage and Housing Corporation for losses sustained by it during the calendar year 1965 as a result of the operation of public housing projects undertaken under Part VI of the National Housing Act, 1954, $1,976,649.

[Mr. Deachman.]

30e. To reimburse Central Mortgage and Housing Corporation for amounts loaned under Section 36H of the National Housing Act, 1954, to any province, municipality or municipal sewerage corporation, and forgiven by the corporation during the calendar year 1965, pursuant to Section 36G of the Act, $10,513,153.

35e. To reimburse Central Mortgage and Housing Corporation for grants charged to the consolidated revenue fund as established by Section 23E of the National Housing Act, 1954, in respect of contributions made during the calendar year 1965, to any province or municipality for the preparation or implementation of an urban renewal scheme or pursuant redevelopment agreement, $4,902,418.

Loans, investments and advances—

L62e. Advances charged to the special account in the consolidated revenue fund established by subsection (4) of Section 35A of the National Housing Act, 1954, in respect of housing and land development projects undertaken jointly with the governments of provinces during the calendar year 1965, $4,500,000.

L64e. Advances charged to the special account in the consolidated revenue fund established by subsection 2 of Section 36H of the National Housing Act, 1954, in respect of loans to any province, municipality or municipal sewerage corporation, for construction or expansion of municipal sewage treatment projects during the calendar year 1965, $30,500,000.

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORT

A—Department—

Marine Services—

5e. Administration, operation and maintenance, $210,000.

Railways and steamships—

15e. Payments to the Canadian National Railway Company (hereinafter called the Company) upon applications approved by the Minister of Transport made by the Company to the Minister of Finance, to be applied by the company in payment of the deficits, certified by the auditors of the Company, arising in the operations in the calendar year 1965 in respect of the following services: Newfoundland ferry and terminals; Prince Edward Island car ferry and terminals; Yarmouth, N.S.-Bar Harbour, Maine, U.S.A. ferry services, $2,000,000.

25e. Payments in respect of the Maritime Freight Rates Act and for supplemental pension allowances to railway employees in the amounts and subject to the terms specified in the sub-vote titles listed in the details of the estimates, $1.

27e. Canadian National Railways deficit, 1965—Amount required to provide for payment to the Canadian National Railway Company (hereinafter called the Company) upon applications approved by the Minister of Transport, made by the Company to the Minister of Finance, and to be applied by the Company in payment of the system deficit (certified by the auditors of the company) arising in the calendar year 1965, subject to recovery therefrom of accountable advances made to the Company from the consolidated revenue fund, $34,718,000.

Air services—

35e. Construction or acquisition of buildings, works, land and equipment, $3,000,000.

General—

74e. Reimbursement of the Department of Transport Stores Account for the value of stores which have become obsolete, unserviceable, lost or destroyed, $100,000.

C—Board of Transport Commissioners for Canada—

84e. To increase from $70,000,000 to $95,000,000 the payments authorized by Vote 84d of supplementary estimates (D) 1965-66 to railway companies to maintain the rates of freight traffic at a reduced level and to extend the purposes of the said vote to authorize payments to the said companies in respect of the calendar year 1964, $25,000,000.

D—Canadian Maritime Commission—

85e. Administration of the Commission—To extend the purposes of Transport Vote 85 of the main estimates for 1965-66 to include federal assistance towards the cost of ice-breaking in the Miramichi River, N.B., $45,500.

90e. Steamship subventions for coastal services as detailed in the estimates, $523,000.

E—National Harbours Board—

102e. To authorize, in accordance with terms and conditions approved by the Governor in Council, special assistance to firms displaced as a result of construction of the Saskatchewan Wheat Pool elevator in Vancouver Harbour, B.C., $75,000.

F—St. Lawrence Seaway Authority—

107e. Payment to the St. Lawrence Seaway Authority, upon application, approved by the Minister of Transport, made by the authority to the Minister of Finance, to reimburse the authority in respect of the Welland Canal deficit incurred by the authority during the calendar year 1965, $8,250,000.

Loans, investments and advances—

L82e. Advances during the 1965-66 and 1966-67 fiscal years to Canadian National Railways and to Air Canada in such manner and subject to such terms and conditions as the Governor in Council may approve and to provide for the purchase during such fiscal years and holding by the Minister of Finance of 4% preferred stock of the Canadian National Railways and the subsequent disposal thereof, $35,000,000.

DEPARTMENT OF FINANCE

Administration—

1e. Departmental administration and grants, as detailed in the estimates, $123,000.

Government administration—

11e. To deem former members of the Senate who are in receipt of an annuity pursuant to Part III of An Act to make provision for the retirement of members of the Senate and dependents of such members to be, for purposes of Finance Vote 20b of the Appropriation Act No. 10, 1964 and the regulations made thereunder, former members of the Senate who are in receipt of an annual allowance pursuant to the Members of Parliament Retiring Allowances Act or dependents of such members, as the case may be, $1.

15e. Contingencies—subject to the approval of the Treasury Board, (a) to supplement the paylist provisions of other votes; (b) for miscellaneous minor or unforeseen expenses; and (c) for awards under the Public Servants Inventions Act; including authority to re-use any sums repaid to this appropriation from other appropriations, $5,000,000.

16e. To authorize the Treasury Board to delete from the accounts certain debts due, and claims by Her Majesty, each of which is in excess of $1,000, amounting in the aggregate to $1,084,556.60, $1.

17e. Government's contribution as an employer under the Canada pension plan and the Quebec pension plan in respect of persons employed in the public service whose remuneration is payable out of the Consolidated Revenue Fund, $600,000.

23e. To provide that, for the purpose of the Public Service Superannuation Act, the period of employment in the public service of Joseph Charles Yvon Charlebois that commenced on September 9, 1954 and ended on March 16, 1955 shall notwithstanding section 4(1)(c) of the Act, be deemed to be a period during which he was required by subsection (1) of section 4 to contribute to the Superannuation account, $1.

24e. To provide that where a person who (a) was employed in the public service on July 1, 1954; and (b) has not, before the coming into force of this item, made any contributions under section 42 of the Public Service Superannuation Act; made an election under section 52(1) of the act in purported compliance therewith that was invalid by reason only that the person was not, on July 1, 1954, a participant within the meaning of the act, the said election shall be deemed to have been validly made under and in accordance with section 52(1) of the act, $1.

Municipal development and loan board—

50e. To extend the purposes of Finance vote 50b, Supplementary Estimates (B), 1965-66 to authorize the Municipal Development and Loan Board in the current and subsequent fiscal years, notwithstanding sections 7 and 11 of the Municipal Development and Loan Act, in cases where a municipal project, in respect of which a loan is approved by the board under the Municipal Development and Loan Act, (a) is completed to the satisfaction of the board during the period commencing on April 1, 1966 and ending on September 30, 1966, to forgive payment of 25 per cent of the principal amount of the loan; and (b) is not completed on or before the 30th day of September, 1966, to forgive payment of 25 per cent of that portion of the principal amount of the loan that is made with respect to the cost, as determined by the board, incurred on the project during the period commencing on April 1, 1966 and ending on September 30, 1966; and to authorize the board to enter into an agreement for the purpose of implementing this provision with the government of any province with which an agreement has been entered into under section 7(2) of the act, additional amount required, $12,000,000.

Loans, investments and advances—

L99e. To authorize the operation of a working capital advance account in the current and subsequent fiscal years in accordance with terms and conditions approved by Treasury Board for the purpose of providing data processing and related services to federal government departments and agencies, the cost of such services to be charged to the account and the amounts received in payment of such

services to be credited thereto; the amount outstanding under this authority, at any time, after deducting therefrom all amounts due by federal government departments and agencies, shall not exceed $1,000,000, $1,000,000.

L100e. Special accountable advances during the 1965-66 and 1966-67 fiscal years to or in respect of persons employed in the public service whose remuneration is payable out of the consolidated revenue fund and who are required to make contributions under (a) the Public Service Superannuation Act or the Diplomatic Service (Special) Superannuation Act, and (b) the Canada Pension Plan or the Quebec Pension Plan, in the amounts by which the combined contributions required from such persons in respect of remuneration to which an Act referred to in paragraph (a) and an Act referred to in paragraph (b) both apply exceed 6½ per cent of such remuneration in the case of males and 5 per cent of such remuneration in the case of females, $4,500,000.

L101e. Advances in respect of a toll bridge across the harbour of Saint John, N.B. in the current and subsequent fiscal years, in accordance with terms and conditions set out in an agreement relating to the financing, construction and operation of the toll bridge to be entered into between Canada, New Brunswick, the city of Saint John and the bridge authority, with the approval of the Governor in Council, (a) to the Saint John Harbour Bridge Authority established by c. 150 of the Statutes of New Brunswick, 1961-62; or (b) to a trustee for the holders of securities issued by the authority; the total amount of advances in each such fiscal year to be based on the difference for the year between the operating and financing costs of the toll bridge and the actual revenue of the bridge authority, as determined pursuant to the agreement, repayable when the actual revenue of the bridge authority for a fiscal year exceeds the amount of the operating and financing costs for such year, $10,000,000.

HOUSE OF COMMONS

Monday, March 28, 1966

The house met at 2.30 p.m.

FINANCE, TRADE AND ECONOMIC AFFAIRS

Mr. H. E. Gray (Essex West) presented the fourth report of the standing committee on finance, trade and economic affairs.

He said: Mr. Speaker, this report refers to Bill No. S-14. I presume it will go on the order paper in the usual way.

[Note: Text of the foregoing report appears in today's *Votes and Proceedings.*]

PUBLIC ACCOUNTS

REFERENCE TO COMMITTEE, WITH REPORTS OF AUDITOR GENERAL AND CANADA COUNCIL

Hon. G. J. McIlraith (Minister of Public Works) moved:

That the public accounts volumes I, II and III for the fiscal years ended March 31, 1964 and March 31, 1965, and the reports of the Auditor General thereon, tabled on February 16, 1965, and February 1, 1966, respectively, together with the reports and financial statements of the Canada Council for the fiscal years ended March 31, 1964, and March 31, 1965, and the reports of the Auditor General thereon tabled on July 14, 1964 and March 7, 1966, respectively be referred to the standing committee on public accounts.

Mr. Speaker: Is it the pleasure of the house to adopt the said motion?

Mr. Bell (Carleton): By leave, Mr. Speaker. This must be done by consent. I certainly wish to give my consent, but I think the house leader should ask for unanimous consent.

Motion agreed to.

• (2:40 p.m.)

SENATE AND HOUSE OF COMMONS ACT

AMENDMENT RESPECTING RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN MEMBER AND CITIZEN

Mr. H. W. Herridge (Kootenay West) moved for leave to introduce Bill No. C-158, to amend the Senate and House of Commons Act (St. Luke 11:46).

Some hon. Members: Explain.

Mr. Herridge: Mr. Speaker, this bill proposes to remedy the grievance that arises when the public relationship between a member of parliament and a citizen is subverted to the private relationship between a lawyer and client to the financial hurt of the citizen; as when, for example, the citizen asks his member to make inquiries of the ministry in an immigration matter and is often dismayed to find that his member, being a lawyer, has billed him for fees on a solicitor-client basis.

This grievance is an ancient one and the remedy proposed is to revive and modernize an order of the United Kingdom that is 300 years old. I present this bill as a further contribution to the development of a code of ethics for members of the Senate and House of Commons, and trust it will receive the support of all parties in this house.

Motion agreed to and bill read the first time.

Mr. Herridge: I rise on a point of privilege, Mr. Speaker. Some members are now asking me to explain what this St. Luke 11:46 means. May I have that privilege?

Mr. Speaker: Order. I believe we would need unanimous consent and I heard at least one "No". I suggest to the hon. member that this bill has already received first reading, and he will have ample opportunity to make his explanation when we get to second reading.

QUESTIONS

(Questions answered orally are indicated by an asterisk.)

ADDITIONAL FACILITIES, SPRINGHILL PENAL INSTITUTION

Question No. 210—**Mr. Coates:**

1. What additional facilities are to be constructed at the young offenders' penal institution at Springhill, N.S.?

2. What is the cost of the additional facilities and were public tenders called and, if so, who was the successful bidder?

3. How many tenders were received and what were the names and the amounts of the tenders submitted by each bidder?

4. When will the young offenders' penal institution be completed and on what date will inmates be transferred to the institution?

Questions

Hon. Judy V. LaMarsh (Secretary of State): I am informed by the Department of Public Works and the Solicitor General as follows:

1. A workshop and two small chapels.

2. Public tenders have not yet been called.

3. Not applicable.

4. In 1966. Some two months after completion of construction.

ECONOMIC SURVEY OF NORTHERN NEW BRUNSWICK

Question No. 456—**Mr. Keays:**

Has the government requested a survey or study of the economic conditions in northern New Brunswick (a) if so, who made the survey, when was it undertaken and when was it completed (b) what were the fees for this project?

Hon. Maurice Sauvé (Minister of Forestry): Yes. (a) Dyname Corporation. This survey was undertaken during the period July 22, 1965 and was completed February 1966. (b) $118,000.

HAMILTON HARBOUR COMMISSION

Question No. 499—**Mr. Harley:**

1. What is the salary of the members of the Hamilton Harbour Commission?

2. Is this salary paid directly by the federal government, or is such salary paid out of the revenue received from the undertakings of the Hamilton Harbour Commission?

3. Has the government given consideration to increasing the number of the Hamilton harbour commissioners in order that the town of Burlington be given representation on the commission?

Mr. J. A. Byrne (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Transport): 1. The Members of the Hamilton harbour commissioners do not receive any salary. Upon application to a judge of the Supreme Court of Ontario, they may be awarded compensation under the Trustee Act of Ontario. The court has established $9,200 to be divided among them as they see fit for 1965.

2. The compensation, when awarded, is paid out of revenue received from the undertakings of the Hamilton harbour commissioners.

3. This has been considered but no decision has been taken.

LANGUAGE REQUIREMENTS, COMPETITION No. 66-0-523

Question No. 578—**Mr. Allard:**

1. Why is the knowledge of the English language primarily required for the position of standards and methods officer, Civil Service Commission, competition number 66-0-523?

[Mr. Coates.]

2. Why is the knowledge of both the French language and the English language not required to the same degree?

3. Why in this notice of competition does the Civil Service Commission consider the French language as only an asset to the candidates?

4. Why does the Civil Service Commission not require bilingualism in all cases?

Hon. Judy V. LaMarsh (Secretary of State): 1, 2, 3. Competition 66-0-523 was the third competition advertised by the Civil Service Commission to recruit a methods and standards officer for the Department of Public Works, Ottawa. For each of the first two competitions, advertised in 1964 and 1965 respectively, a knowledge of both the English and French languages was required but neither competition attracted a qualified candidate willing to accept appointment. It was concluded that candidates with the desired technical and linguistic qualifications were not available. After carefully reviewing the needs of the department and the circumstances under which the duties would be performed, it was decided to require knowledge of English with knowledge of French considered an asset in the assessment of the candidates.

4. The role of the commission as far as bilingualism is concerned is determined by section 47 of the Civil Service Act which does not require bilingualism in all cases.

ARDA PROJECTS, EASTERN TOWNSHIPS

Question No. 601—**Mr. Neveu:**

1. Will the Minister of Forestry provide a list of what are the ARDA projects that have been considered or are being considered, for the eastern townships area, including Shefford county in particular?

2. Has the setting up of a pilot project in the rural part of the Shefford area been recommended and, if so, when will it be carried out?

3. What is, in brief, an outline of the main points of this project?

Hon. Maurice Sauvé (Minister of Forestry): 1. ARDA projects submitted by the province of Quebec to September 30, 1965 for the eastern townships area, including Shefford county, are recorded on the following list.

2. To date, the province of Quebec has not submitted a proposal for setting up a pilot project in the rural part of Shefford area.

3. Answered by 2.

Project Number	Description	Category	General Area of Activity	Shareable Cost	Federal Contribution
				$	$
5007	A drainage project to improve the Bergevin watercourse; approximately 2 miles; removal of 12,000 square yards of material.	SW	Châteauguay County	13,352	6,676
5013	Improving the Rivière-du-Sud watercourse; 5.8 miles; 50 farmers.	SW	Iberville & Missisquoi Counties	69,015	34,507
5017	Drainage project, Doyon watercourse, 2 miles; 8 farmers.	SW	Huntingdon County	13,507	6,753
5020	Improving the Des Trente watercourse and tributaries; 5.6 miles; 51 farmers.	SW	Laprairie County	31,135	15,567
5022	Drainage project—Lefebvre watercourse, 2.7 miles; 18 farmers.	SW	Châteauguay County	24,900	12,450
5026	Improving the watercourse of Pir-Vir and tributaries; 5.1 miles; 47 farmers.	SW	St. Jean County	28,294	14,147
5029	Milton watercourse improvement, 6.4 miles; 24 farmers.	SW	Shefford County	39,253	19,626
5031	St. Michel watercourse improvement to reclaim 845 acres; involving 23 farmers.	SW	Napierville County	17,925	8,963
5039	Brousseau watercourse improvement to reclaim 1267 acres; 55 farmers involved.	SW	Napierville County	50,724	25,362
5041	To develop a model sugar bush as an example for local farmers so that they might follow the proper practices and obtain maximum returns.	ALU	Sherbrooke County	2,475	1,238
5045	Classify and evaluate the main resources.	R	Brome region	96,000	48,000
5068	Chisholm watercourse improvement over 3 miles reclaiming 845 acres; 12 farmers.	SW	Châteauguay County	17,857	8,929
5069	Suzanne watercourse improvement, over 8.7 miles, reclaiming 760 acres; 50 farmers.	SW	Châteauguay and Laprairie Counties	45,506	22,753
5071	Rivière des Anglais watercourse improvement, 11 miles reclaiming 1690 acres, for 45 farmers.	SW	Châteauguay & Huntingdon Counties	64,837	32,418
5077	Des Terres Noires watercourse improvement; 1.4 miles, reclaiming 254 acres for 4 farmers.	SW	Napierville County	13,012	6,506
5078	Boston watercourse improvement over 2.4 miles, reclaiming 845 acres, for 10 farmers.	SW	Napierville County	21,241	10,621
5085	Lachapelle watercourse improvement, comprising 5.4 miles, reclaiming 870 acres, involving 30 farmers.	SW	Shefford County	42,459	21,229
5103	Bouchard watercourse improvement, 5.8 miles, reclaiming 515 acres and involving 10 farmers.	SW	Shefford County	21,641	10,821
5106	Improvement of the Des Quinze watercourse and branches, 5.6 miles, reclaiming 675 acres and involving 32 farmers.	SW	Laprairie County	24,235	12,117

Project Number	Description	Category	General Area of Activity	Shareable Cost	Federal Contribution
				$	$
5107	Corriveau watercourse improvement to reclaim 195 acres over 1.5 miles; involving 4 farmers.	SW	Missisquoi County	5,579	2,789
5111	Marcil-Stacey watercourse improvement; 2.1 miles, reclaiming 169 acres involving 12 farmers.	SW	Châteauguay County	15,588	7,794
5116	Guay Henry watercourse improvement; 3.4 miles; reclaiming 507 acres; involving 15 farmers.	SW	Châteauguay County	24,302	12,151
5180	Bank protection on Saumon River Majority of farms at the confluence of Massawipi and Saumon Rivers will benefit.	SW	Sherbrooke County	7,901	3,951
5187	River bank protection of the Saumon River in Ditton township.	SW	Compton County	13,159	6,580
24010	Acquisition and development of land for campsite—St. Armand Est. (159 acres).	Land Use and Farm Adjustment	Missisquoi County	19,000	3,975

PAY RATES, TRANSPORT DEPARTMENT SHIPS

Question No. 771—**Mr. Forrestall:**

What are the current rates of pay, by classification, for ships' crews, Department of Transport, on (a) west coast ships (b) Great Lakes ships (c) east coast ships?

Mr. J. A. Byrne (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Transport): The current salaries of ships' crews, Department of Transport, are listed on the chart hereunder. A few exceptions from the common rate occur; these have been noted under "comments". These exceptions occur because the conditions of employment vary in respect to function of vessel, size of vessel, and number of galley staff:

Rates—Ships' Crews (All rates in dollars per month)

Position in Department of Transport Vessels	East Coast and Great Lakes	West Coast	Comments
Boatman	275		
Boatswain	323	361	
Boatswain's Mate	297	345	
Cable Foreman	383		
Chief Cook	364	396	$363 (Estevan, Douglas, MacKenzie); $351 (Skidegate)
Assistant Cook (Second) (or cook)	286	363	$341 (Estevan, Douglas, MacKenzie)
Cook-Seaman	293		
Cook	286	363	
Third Cook	275	346	
Ship's Carpenter	323	355	
Ship's Clerk	372		
Coxswain	335		
Second Coxswain	306		
Dayman (E.R. Wiper)	281		
Deckhand 2	344		275 (Eastern Canals and Barges)
Diesel Operator	364		
Donkeyman	323	358	

Position in Department of Transport Vessels	East Coast and Great Lakes	West Coast	Comments
Electrical Assistant	321		
Engineer	306		
Engine Room Petty Officer	323		
Fireman	308	343	
Launchman	395		
Leading Seaman	287		
Oiler	315	346	
Operator	315		
Quartermaster	312	350	
Seaman	275	340	
Chief Steward	372	402	368 (Estevan, Douglas)
Assistant Chief Steward (Second Steward)	323	351	335 (Estevan)
Steward (Assistant Steward)	293	351	368 (MacKenzie, Douglas)
Steward's Cook	378		
Storekeeper	293		
Waiter	275	313	
Winchman	315	355	
Pilot Boats			
Deck Hand	344	357	
Senior Launchman		470	
Launchman	395	448	
Crash Boats			
Coxswain		453	
Second Coxswain		429	
Deckhand		392	
Patrol Cutters			
Oiler	367	401	
Seaman	319	392	275 (Spume, Spray, Spindrift)
Steward Cook	378		
Steward		399	
Cook-Seaman	293		
Lifesaving Stations			
Boatman		340	
Coxswain		392	
Engineer		371	
Relief Personnel			
Oiler		346	
Seaman		340	
Assistant Steward	275	335	275 (Barges-Seasonal)
Trainee Engineer	315	349	
Other			
Patrolman		340	

SASKATOON TERMINAL ELEVATOR

Question No. 818—**Mr. Watson (Assiniboia):**

1. What is the capacity of the Canadian government terminal elevator at Saskatoon, Saskatchewan?
2. How many bushels of (a) wheat (b) oats (c) barley (d) rapeseed, were stored at the end of each month at this elevator for the years 1961, 1962, 1963, 1964 and 1965?
3. What is the total amount of grain put through this terminal in each of the years 1961, 1962, 1963, 1964 and 1965?
4. What was the original cost of the terminal?
5. What is the depreciated value of this elevator to date?
6. What has been the cost of repairs and renovations at this terminal in each of the years 1961, 1962, 1963, 1964 and 1965?
7. How many permanent employees are there at this terminal (a) office (b) caretaker (c) labourers, and how many seasonal?
8. What was the total payroll in each of the years 1961, 1962, 1963, 1964 and 1965?

Hon. J. J. Greene (Minister of Agriculture):

1. 5,500,000 bushels.

2.

STOCKS IN STORE AT MONTH END

	Wheat	Oats	Barley	Rapeseed
	(Bushels)	(Bushels)	(Bushels)	(Bushels)
1961 January	2,246,876	Nil	423	862,090
February	2,442,012	"	423	702,726
March	2,447,572	"	423	551,348
April	2,466,286	30,434	423	416,065
May	2,451,364	30,434	Nil	333,382
June	2,512,383	30,434	"	249,257
July	3,165,327	22,750	"	203,228
August	3,320,226	196,876	"	334,972
September	2,505,453	217,046	"	793,284
October	2,305,528	279,760	424,284	821,776
November	3,128,874	279,760	555,701	853,590
December	3,463,482	279,760	615,622	797,881
1962 January	3,342,437	279,760	618,174	734,522
February	3,444,581	279,760	618,174	712,662
March	3,449,830	279,760	515,329	600,874
April	3,452,784	279,760	229,454	395,581
May	3,452,784	279,760	Nil	254,210
June	2,992,048	239,400	"	153,779
July	2,992,048	73,859	"	118,251
August	2,992,048	32,859	"	118,053
September	1,629,448	32,859	"	118,053
October	1,561,308	32,859	"	247,398
November	1,565,662	Nil	"	279,687
December	1,565,662	"	"	230,100
1963 January	1,565,662	Nil	Nil	173,816
February	1,565,662	"	"	148,604
March	1,560,539	7,872	"	78,307
April	1,560,539	7,872	"	77,314
May	1,560,539	7,872	"	5,482
June	1,560,539	7,872	"	1,193
July	1,560,539	7,872	"	1,193
August	1,846,986	7,872	"	1,193
September	2,153,658	7,872	"	136,086
October	2,293,849	7,872	"	249,923
November	2,293,849	7,872	"	244,708
December	2,293,849	7,872	"	249,932
1964 January	769,888	7,872	"	248,741
February	326,120	7,872	"	202,741
March	317,834	7,872	"	105,016
April	317,834	7,872	"	77,416
May	318,692	7,872	"	49,574
June	318,692	7,880	"	5,564
July	318,692	7,880	"	5,564
August	318,692	7,880	"	3,778
September	318,692	7,880	"	3,778
October	318,692	7,880	"	115,860
November	318,692	7,880	"	408,938
December	318,692	7,880	"	586,834
1965 January	318,692	7,880	"	329,626
February	571,123	7,880	"	279,773
March	1,015,320	7,880	"	203,244
April	1,250,550	7,880	"	199,844
May	1,298,366	7,880	"	199,601
June	1,324,615	7,880	"	199,601
July	1,093,982	7,880	"	179,451
August	642,465	7,880	"	171,605
September	213,384	7,880	"	151,805
October	9	7,880	"	154
November	386	7,880	"	1,670
December	377	6,770	"	2,752

3.

Crop Year	Receipts	Shipments
	(Bushels)	(Bushels)
1960-61	3,948,434	4,096,182
1961-62	3,211,077	3,419,987
1962-63	168,235	1,779,801
1963-64	986,373	2,222,705
1964-65	1,755,677	806,501
1965-66 (to Feb. 28, 1966)	295,505	1,561,288

4. Original cost—$1,283,988—total capital charges to date—$2,216,121.

5. The depreciated value of the elevator accepted for municipal tax purposes in 1964 is $1,101,745.

6. Cost of repairs and renovations

Fiscal Year	
1960-61	$45,571
1961-62	32,044
1962-63	51,475
1963-64	27,667
1964-65	12,538
1965-66 (to Feb. 28, 1966)	65,307

7. Continuing staff as at February 28, 1966—(a) Office—2, (b) Watchmen—3, (c) Operating Staff—20, and Casual or Seasonal—Nil.

8. Total payroll

Fiscal Year	
1960-61	$264,622
1961-62	158,381
1962-63	149,211
1963-64	141,055
1964-65	132,707
1965-66 (to Feb. 28, 1966)	142,922

MOOSE JAW TERMINAL ELEVATOR

Question No. 819—**Mr. Watson (Assiniboia):**

1. What is the capacity of the Canadian government terminal elevator at Moose Jaw, Saskatchewan?
2. How many bushels of (a) wheat (b) oats (c) barley (d) rapeseed, were stored at the end of each month at this elevator for the years 1961, 1962, 1963, 1964 and 1965?
3. What is the total amount of grain put through this terminal in each of the years 1961, 1962, 1963, 1964 and 1965?
4. What was the original cost of this terminal?
5. What is the depreciated value of this elevator. to date?
6. What has been the cost of repairs and renovations at this terminal in each of the years 1961, 1962, 1963, 1964 and 1965?
7. How many permanent employees are there at this terminal (a) office (b) caretaker (c) labourers, and how many seasonal?
8. What was the total payroll in each of the years 1961, 1962, 1963, 1964 and 1965?

Hon. J. J. Greene (Minister of Agriculture):

1. 5,500,000 bushels.

2.

STOCKS IN STORE AT MONTH END

	Wheat	Oats	Barley	Rapeseed
	(Bushels)	(Bushels)	(Bushels)	(Bushels)
1961 January	5,397,414	Nil	Nil	Nil
February	5,397,414	"	"	"
March	4,909,744	"	"	"
April	4,260,107	"	"	"
May	3,831,892	"	"	"
June	4,115,919	"	"	"
July	5,124,387	"	"	"
August	5,175,270	163,391	"	"
September	5,212,083	272,172	"	"
October	5,230,001	274,947	"	"
November	5,103,057	274,947	"	"
December	4,953,423	274,947	"	"
1962 January	4,717,873	274,947	"	"
February	4,582,530	274,947	"	"
March	4,214,826	274,947	"	"
April	3,770,236	323,928	"	"
May	3,214,826	371,118	"	"
June	3,214,826	267,573	30,034	"
July	3,214,826	162,729	35,986	"
August	3,214,826	162,729	35,986	"
September	3,214,826	162,729	39,321	"
October	3,214,826	162,729	39,321	"
November	3,214,826	162,729	35,121	"
December	3,214,826	162,729	30,921	"

STOCKS IN STORE AT MONTH END—Concluded

	Wheat	Oats	Barley	Rapeseed
	(Bushels)	(Bushels)	(Bushels)	(Bushels)
1963 January	3,214,826	162,729	20,221	Nil
February	3,085,826	162,729	13,771	"
March	3,085,826	122,478	9,671	"
April	3,085,826	122,478	Nil	"
May	3,085,826	Nil	"	"
June	3,085,826	"	"	"
July	3,085,826	68,358	"	"
August	3,085,826	Nil	"	"
September	3,085,826	"	"	"
October	3,085,826	"	"	"
November	3,026,896	"	"	"
December	2,913,281	"	"	"
1964 January	2,072,444	"	"	"
February	1,283,694	"	"	"
March	300,268	"	"	"
April	300,268	"	"	"
May	201,666	"	"	"
June	101,666	"	"	"
July	101,666	"	"	"
August	20,218	"	"	"
September	218	"	"	"
October	218	"	"	"
November	218	"	"	"
December	218	"	"	"
1965 January	218	"	"	286
February	218	"	"	Nil
March	218	"	"	"
April	218	"	"	"
May	218	"	"	"
June	218	"	"	"
July	218	"	"	"
August	230,587	"	"	"
September	207,443	"	"	"
October	218	"	"	"
November	201	"	"	"
December	201	"	"	"

3.

Crop Year	Receipts	Shipments
	(bushels)	(bushels)
1961–61	1,374,412	1,625,225
1961–62	584,205	2,295,050
1962–63	71,694	331,050
1963–64	1,397	3,053,917
1964–65	1,146	102,594
1965–66 (to Feb. 28, 1966)	238,116	239,336

4. Original cost—$1,283,988—total capital charges to date—$2,309,630.

5. The depreciated value of the elevator accepted for municipal tax purposes in 1964 is $771,120.

6. Cost of repairs and renovations

Fiscal Year	
1960–61	$120,417
1961–62	23,896
1962–63	23,748
1963–64	9,317
1964–65	5,591
1965–66 (to Feb. 28, 1966)	2,074

[Mr. Greene.]

7. Continuing staff as at February 28, 1966—(a) Office—3, (b) Watchmen—3, (c) Operating Staff—19, and Casual or Seasonal—Nil.

8. Total payroll

Fiscal Year	
1960–61	$126,726
1962–62	131,067
1962–63	132,865
1963–64	133,666
1964–65	122,210
1965–66 (to Feb. 28, 1966)	123,878

GOVERNMENT ELEVATOR, EDMONTON, ALTA.

Question No. 820—**Mr. Watson (Assiniboia):**

1. What is the capacity of the Canadian government terminal elevator at Edmonton, Alberta?

2. How many bushels of (a) wheat (b) oats (c) barley (d) rapeseed, were stored at the end of each month at this elevator for the years 1961, 1962, 1963, 1964 and 1965?

3. What is the total amount of grain put through this terminal in each of the years 1961, 1962, 1963, 1964 and 1965?

Questions

4. What was the original cost of this terminal?
5. What is the depreciated value of this elevator to date?
6. What has been the cost of repairs and renovations at this terminal in each of the years 1961, 1962, 1963, 1964 and 1965?
7. How many permanent employees are there at this terminal (a) office (b) caretaker (c) labourers, and how many seasonal?
8. What was the total payroll in each of the years 1961, 1962, 1963, 1964 and 1965?

Hon. J. J. Greene (Minister of Agriculture):

1. 2,350,000 bushels.

2.

STOCKS IN STORE AT MONTH END

		Wheat	Oats	Barley	Rapeseed
		(Bushels)	(Bushels)	(Bushels)	(Bushels)
1961	January	898,880	12,419	5,427	427,584
	February	699,309	10,295	3,613	301,229
	March	598,839	11,212	2,358	31,995
	April	604,039	2,162	967	4,489
	May	601,808	2,162	4,234	5,581
	June	573,171	5,262	3,903	8,060
	July	605,738	2,162	649	8,060
	August	612,609	5,646	649	Nil
	September	612,609	15,455	649	208,064
	October	523,668	18,162	649	808,493
	November	523,668	49,823	649	1,216,318
	December	375,430	76,565	53,635	1,314,332
1962	January	396,377	97,299	82,028	1,143,041
	February	401,102	108,375	35,016	884,971
	March	404,569	108,375	50,829	643,903
	April	398,694	108,375	54,649	566,452
	May	392,206	108,375	54,000	564,205
	June	388,406	74,015	53,765	564,205
	July	383,172	28,954	51,229	564,205
	August	421,449	16,000	35,739	564,205
	September	474,147	16,000	35,739	629,649
	October	474,147	16,000	15,765	891,999
	November	476,046	11,206	Nil	860,187
	December	474,147	16,000	9,355	375,057
1963	January	132,595	16,000	7,434	229,584
	February	132,595	16,000	5,529	64,763
	March	131,872	16,115	5,582	Nil
	April	131,872	16,115	5,582	"
	May	131,872	16,115	5,582	"
	June	168,851	16,115	5,582	"
	July	152,669	8,827	10,602	"
	August	118,722	8,827	10,602	"
	September	86,054	5,268	8,546	"
	October	129,212	7,849	13,335	140,853
	November	165,800	7,968	24,791	199,940
	December	176,454	9,246	24,634	199,940
1964	January	834,794	16,727	24,634	170,940
	February	1,664,521	16,959	25,039	106,940
	March	1,832,409	16,959	25,039	70,000
	April	1,750,900	16,727	22,816	68,317
	May	1,741,394	16,727	17,934	12,000
	June	1,735,118	16,727	24,282	1,000
	July	1,718,007	14,244	24,282	1,000
	August	1,280,768	14,244	5,987	317
	September	1,182,091	14,244	5,987	4,002
	October	1,178,108	14,244	7,448	293,775
	November	1,220,283	14,421	11,112	317,765
	December	1,219,152	14,421	10,805	332,871
1965	January	1,234,739	14,572	9,277	221,293
	February	976,933	14,395	10,070	311,041
	March	1,167,547	14,395	8,936	320,663
	April	1,139,230	10,511	8,683	259,462
	May	1,113,499	13,694	17,172	182,998
	June	803,871	13,694	14,648	6,500
	July	849,724	11,083	343,888	6,463
	August	1,055,117	483	706,466	6,463
	September	934,526	483	207,121	6,463
	October	633,526	483	457	2,225
	November	618,568	332	Nil	75,931
	December	604,727	332	"	139,750

Questions

3.

Crop Year	Receipts	Shipments
	(bushels)	(bushels)
1960-61	1,954,141	2,171,427
1961-62	1,913,624	1,492,552
1962-63	660,962	1,516,067
1963-64	2,248,440	664,574
1964-65	2,803,277	3,349,040
1965-66 (to Feb. 28, 1966)	1,129,063	1,704,073

4. Original cost—$1,525,217—total to date —$1,749,998.

5. The depreciated value of the elevator accepted for municipal tax purposes in 1964 is $842,550.

6. Cost of repairs and renovations

Fiscal Year	
1960-61	$ 24,213
1962-62	129,425
1962-63	48,089
1963-64	33,234
1964-65	15,750
1965-66 (to Feb. 28, 1966)	14,550

7. Continuing staff as at February 28, 1966 —(a) Office—2, (b) Watchmen—3, (c) Operating Staff—20, and Casuals or Seasonal—4.

8. Total payroll

Fiscal Year	
1960-61	$142,201
1961-62	133,844
1962-63	131,599
1963-64	146,935
1964-65	163,205
1965-66 (to Feb. 28, 1966)	149,364

CALGARY TERMINAL ELEVATOR

Question No. 821—**Mr. Watson (Assiniboia):**

1. What is the capacity of the Canadian government terminal elevator at Calgary, Alberta?

2. How many bushels of (a) wheat (b) oats (c) barley (d) rapeseed, were stored at the end of each month at this elevator for the years 1961, 1962, 1963, 1964 and 1965?

3. What is the total amount of grain put through this terminal in each of the years 1961, 1962, 1963, 1964 and 1965?

4. What was the original cost of this terminal?

5. What is the depreciated value of this elevator to date?

6. What has been the cost of repairs and renovations at this terminal in each of the years 1961, 1962, 1963, 1964 and 1965?

7. How many permanent employees are there at this terminal (a) office (b) caretaker (c) labourers, and how many seasonal?

8. What was the total payroll in each of the years 1961, 1962, 1963, 1964 and 1965?

Hon. J. J. Greene (Minister of Agriculture):

1. 2,500,000 bushels.

2.

STOCKS IN STORE AT MONTH END

	Wheat	Oats	Barley	Rapeseed
	(Bushels)	(Bushels)	(Bushels)	(Bushels)
1961 January	740,882	Nil	123,455	30,232
February	717,560	"	983,576	32,262
March	740,831	"	924,146	1,004
April	732,456	"	814,203	134
May	590,745	"	793,514	3,116
June	561,660	"	558,700	3,762
July	683,687	"	495,265	3,762
August	689,901	"	587,767	Nil
September	679,808	"	1,446,974	29,954
October	684,426	"	1,543,969	102,363
November	684,426	"	1,424,628	122,001
December	648,091	"	1,424,628	133,010
1962 January	665,927	"	1,311,824	137,928
February	660,357	"	1,201,381	142,847
March	658,393	"	1,156,873	45,271
April	663,407	"	1,026,190	Nil
May	663,407	"	762,093	"
June	650,995	"	553,663	"
July	626,452	"	393,322	"
August	638,737	"	358,927	"
September	656,136	"	475,048	29,683
October	656,136	"	871,688	87,046
November	656,136	"	1,179,080	87,046
December	658,122	"	1,339,167	Nil

STOCKS IN STORE AT MONTH END—Concluded

	Wheat	Oats	Barley	Rapeseed
	(Bushels)	(Bushels)	(Bushels)	(Bushels)
1963 January	97,928	Nil	1,376,381	Nil
February	99,423	"	1,330,704	"
March	99,268	"	1,114,511	"
April	99,268	"	857,767	"
May	99,268	"	676,920	"
June	99,268	"	561,072	"
July	99,268	"	270,750	"
August	99,268	"	75,573	"
September	99,268	"	208,825	"
October	90,973	"	370,940	"
November	94,697	"	376,209	"
December	94,697	"	400,930	"
1964 January	315,641	"	566,226	"
February	852,629	"	599,917	"
March	1,482,026	"	600,149	"
April	1,529,482	"	363,468	"
May	1,558,901	"	248,468	"
June	1,575,411	"	146,541	"
July	1,575,411	"	30,444	"
August	1,543,324	"	1,062	"
September	1,543,324	"	586,218	"
October	1,544,874	"	769,694	"
November	1,495,063	"	735,120	"
December	1,145,292	"	763,797	"
1965 January	1,154,528	"	785,497	"
February	1,339,908	"	755,206	16,592
March	1,366,567	"	756,960	12,646
April	1,377,567	"	753,768	10,976
May	1,381,670	"	552,465	10,976
June	1,379,064	"	247,945	169
July	1,506,416	"	117,004	169
August	1,780,050	"	56,534	169
September	882,654	"	145,084	169
October	789,759	"	539,819	Nil
November	304,980	"	583,463	33,283
December	104,628	"	548,999	29,597

3.

Crop Year	Receipts	Shipments
	(Bushels)	(Bushels)
1960–61	2,491,724	2,205,522
1961–62	1,966,118	2,129,057
1962–63	1,949,390	2,599,145
1963–64	2,710,207	1,465,066
1964–65	1,749,873	1,706,364
1965–66 (to Feb. 28, 1966)	1,422,646	2,420,560

4. Original cost—$869,600—total to date—$1,376,380.

5. The depreciated value of the elevator accepted for municipal tax purposes in 1964 is $473,380.

6. Cost of repairs and renovations

Fiscal Year	
1960–61	$81,236
1961–62	93,562
1962–63	53,901
1963–64	8,903
1964–65	7,090
1965–66 (to Feb. 28, 1966)	5,529

7. Continuing staff as at February 23, 1966—(a) Office—2 (b) Watchmen—3 (c) Operating Staff—21, and Casuals or Seasonal—3.

8. Total payroll

Fiscal Year	
1960–61	$150,771
1961–62	136,963
1962–63	134,362
1963–64	135,493
1964–65	133,380
1965–66 (to Feb. 28, 1966)	148,618

GOVERNMENT ELEVATOR, LETHBRIDGE, ALTA.

Question No. 822—**Mr. Watson (Assiniboia):**

1. What is the capacity of the Canadian government terminal elevator at Lethbridge, Alberta?

2. How many bushels of (a) wheat (b) oats (c) barley (d) rapeseed, were stored at the end of each month at this elevator for the years 1961, 1962, 1963, 1964 and 1965?

3. What is the total amount of grain put through this terminal in each of the years 1961, 1962, 1963, 1964 and 1965?

4. What was the original cost of this terminal?

Questions

5. What is the depreciated value of this elevator to date?

6. What has been the cost of repairs and renovations at this terminal in each of the years 1961, 1962, 1963, 1964 and 1965?

7. How many permanent employees are there at this terminal (a) office (b) caretaker (c) labourers, and how many seasonal?

8. What is the total payroll in each of the years 1961, 1962, 1963, 1964 and 1965?

Hon. J. J. Greene (Minister of Agriculture):

1. 1,250,000 bushels.

2.

STOCKS IN STORE AT MONTH END

	Wheat	Oats	Barley	Rapeseed
	(Bushels)	(Bushels)	(Bushels)	(Bushels)
1961 January	1,072,340	Nil	329	Nil
February	1,072,340	"	329	"
March	1,076,492	"	757	"
April	1,076,491	"	756	"
May	939,656	"	756	"
June	708,369	"	756	"
July	675,165	"	756	"
August	671,190	"	756	"
September	671,190	"	756	"
October	638,124	"	756	"
November	638,124	"	756	"
December	638,124	"	756	"
1962 January	638,124	"	756	"
February	638,124	"	756	"
March	638,124	"	756	"
April	638,124	"	756	"
May	390,744	"	Nil	"
June	390,744	"	"	"
July	390,744	"	"	"
August	390,744	"	"	"
September	390,744	"	"	"
October	390,744	"	"	"
November	390,744	"	"	"
December	390,744	"	"	"
1963 January	15,850	"	"	"
February	Nil	"	"	"
March	"	"	"	"
April	160	"	"	"
May	160	"	"	"
June	160	"	"	"
July	160	"	"	"
August	160	"	"	"
September	160	"	"	"
October	160	"	"	"
November	160	"	"	"
December	160	"	"	"
1964 January	238,975	"	"	"
February	684,409	"	"	"
March	940,906	"	"	"
April	964,152	"	"	"
May	964,152	"	"	"
June	964,152	"	"	"
July	964,152	"	"	"
August	964,152	"	"	"
September	870,436	"	"	"
October	791,118	"	"	"
November	791,118	"	"	"
December	591,118	"	"	"
1965 January	591,118	"	"	"
February	591,118	"	"	"
March	591,118	"	"	"
April	591,118	"	"	"
May	591,118	"	"	"
June	585,120	"	"	"
July	685,462	"	"	"
August	1,128,365	"	"	"
September	1,174,966	"	"	"
October	1,174,966	"	"	"
November	1,040,517	"	"	"
December	669,046	"	"	"

[Mr. Watson (Assiniboia).]

3.

Crop Year	Receipts	Shipments
	(bushels)	(bushels)
1960–61	209,181	580,296
1961–62	635	286,526
1962–63	1,668	392,253
1963–64	972,132	8,140
1964–65	122,201	400,890
1965–66 (to Feb. 28, 1966)	499,475	540,574

4. Original cost—$978,711—total to date $1,023,088.

5. The depreciated value of the elevator accepted for municipal tax purposes in 1964 is $737,930.

6. Cost of repairs and renovations

Fiscal Year	
1960–61	$ 2,708
1961–62	516
1962–63	1,565
1963–64	35,854
1964–65	3,056
1965–66 (to Feb. 28, 1966)	3,876

7. Continuing staff as at February 28, 1966—(a) Office—2 (b) Watchmen—3 (c) Operating Staff—13, and Casuals or Seasonal—Nil.

8. Total payroll

Fiscal Year	
1960–61	$78,678
1961–62	79,764
1962–63	77,505
1963–64	86,805
1964–65	87,187
1965–66 (to Feb. 28, 1966)	88,846

GOVERNMENT ELEVATOR, PRINCE RUPERT, B.C.

Question No. 823—**Mr. Watson (Assiniboia):**

1. What is the capacity of the Canadian government terminal elevator at Prince Rupert, B.C.?

2. How many bushels of (a) wheat (b) oats (c) barley (d) rapeseed, were stored at the end of each month at this elevator for the years 1961, 1962, 1963, 1964 and 1965?

3. What is the total amount of grain put through this terminal in each of the years 1961, 1962, 1963, 1964 and 1965?

4. What was the original cost of this terminal?

5. What is the depreciated value of this elevator to date?

6. What has been the cost of repairs and renovations at this terminal in each of the years 1961, 1962, 1963, 1964 and 1965?

7. How many permanent employees are there at this terminal (a) office (b) caretaker (c) labourers, and how many seasonal?

8. What was the total payroll in each of the years 1961, 1962, 1963, 1964 and 1965?

Hon. J. J. Greene (Minister of Agriculture):

1. 1,250,000 bushels.

2.

STOCKS IN STORE AT MONTH END

	Wheat	Oats	Barley	Rapeseed
	(Bushels)	(Bushels)	(Bushels)	(Bushels)
1961 January	Nil	Nil	992,801	Nil
February	"	"	683,626	"
March	"	"	248,130	"
April	"	"	969,280	"
May	"	"	422,878	"
June	"	"	711,611	"
July	"	"	400,618	"
August	"	"	238,643	"
September	"	"	891,330	"
October	"	"	866,442	"
November	"	"	311,910	"
December	"	"	225,529	"
1962 January	"	"	951,947	"
February	"	"	605,708	"
March	"	"	87,681	"
April	"	"	680,380	"
May	"	"	161,272	"
June	"	"	111,564	"
July	"	"	113,721	"
August	"	"	115,515	"
September	"	"	115,515	"
October	"	"	115,515	"
November	375,284	197	115,515	"
December	462,786	Nil	115,515	"

STOCKS IN STORE AT MONTH END—Concluded

	Wheat	Oats	Barley	Rapeseed
	(Bushels)	(Bushels)	(Bushels)	(Bushels)
1963 January	730,033	Nil	115,515	Nil
February	654,060	686	4,666	"
March	470,485	Nil	4,666	"
April	352,982	"	4,666	"
May	161,171	"	4,666	"
June	268,239	"	4,666	"
July	744,485	3,065	4,666	"
August	774,970	23,621	3,600	"
September	76,877	21,268	3,600	"
October	250,530	14,304	3,600	"
November	285,163	11,661	3,600	"
December	342,841	1,032	3,600	"
1964 January	101,455	1,496	3,600	"
February	744,131	1,603	3,600	"
March	712,881	1,749	3,600	"
April	473,229	1,259	3,600	"
May	377,224	1,113	3,600	"
June	590,956	1,113	3,600	"
July	471,930	1,113	3,600	"
August	611,072	1,438	3,600	"
September	532,510	1,247	3,600	"
October	319,746	1,284	3,600	"
November	565,971	1,612	3,600	"
December	133,939	1,213	3,600	"
1965 January	700,595	1,113	3,600	"
February	118,986	1,113	3,600	"
March	397,876	1,417	3,600	"
April	816,946	1,284	3,600	"
May	211,510	1,284	3,600	"
June	248,708	1,284	3,600	"
July	477,687	1,113	3,600	"
August	616,302	1,639	3,600	"
September	464,619	1,639	3,600	"
October	291,022	1,826	3,600	"
November	187,395	1,113	3,600	"
December	290,834	1,113	3,600	"

3.

Crop Year	Receipts	Shipments
	(Bushels)	(Bushels)
1960–61	9,878,210	10,398,173
1961–62	10,244,417	10,531,314
1962–63	4,301,122	3,665,384
1963–64	10,233,465	10,503,341
1964–65	10,138,037	10,132,281
1965–66 (to Feb. 28, 1966)	8,787,228	8,875,889

4. Original cost—$1,244,378—total to date —$1,680,603.

5. The depreciated value of the elevator accepted for municipal tax purposes in 1964 is $635,255.

[Mr. Greene.]

6. Cost of repairs and renovations

Fiscal Year	
1960–61	$61,504
1961–62	53,232
1962–63	72,230
1963–64	34,454
1964–65	28,420
1965–66 (to Feb. 28, 1966)	24,492

7. Continuing staff as at February 28, 1966—(a) Office, 2 (b) Watchmen, 2 (c) Operating staff, 23 and Casuals or seasonal, 28.

8. Total payroll

Fiscal Year	
1960–61	$175,476
1961–62	248,654
1962–63	159,904
1963–64	241,706
1964–65	271,862
1965–66 (to Feb. 28, 1966)	290,323

SUMMER EMPLOYEES, CITIZENSHIP AND IMMIGRATION DEPARTMENT

Question No. 859—**Mr. Caron:**

1. How many extra employees were hired for summer positions by the Department of Citizenship and Immigration (a) at the head office (b) in other Ottawa offices, during the summer of 1965?

2. Who recommended these employees?

3. Do they have relatives—father, mother, brothers, sisters, uncles and aunts—who work for the department?

[*Translation*]

Mr. J. C. Munro (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Citizenship and Immigration): 1. During the summer of 1965 the Department of Citizenship and Immigration employed: (a) sixteen summer employees at the head office, (b) two at the Immigration Port of Ottawa.

2. Sixteen were appointed by the Civil Service Commission under the Student Employment Program for University Graduates and Undergraduates. Later, when the Student Employment Program had been completed, the Department with the approval of the Civil Service Commission appointed two additional summer employees.

3. To our knowledge none of these summer employees had relatives who worked for the Department.

[*English*]

SUMMER EMPLOYEES, PUBLIC WORKS DEPARTMENT

Question No. 866—**Mr. Caron:**

1. How many extra employees were hired for summer positions by the Department of Public Works (a) at Confederation Heights (b) at 1010 Somerset Street West (c) for all other kinds of work, during the summer of 1965?

2. Who recommended these employees?

3. Do they have relatives—father, mother, brothers, sisters, uncles and aunts—who work for the department?

[*Translation*]

Hon. G. J. McIlraith (Minister of Public Works): 1. The total number of temporary employees hired in the Ottawa area was: (a) 162; (b) 86; (c) None. All in Ottawa area included in (a) and (b).

2. The Civil Service Commission, National Employment Services, Members of Parliament, Senators, etc.

3. Not known. Such information is not recorded.

[*English*]

NEGOTIATIONS WITH QUEBEC RESPECTING AMATEUR SPORT

Question No. 872—**Mr. Caouette:**

1. Are there negotiations in progress between the federal government and the government of Quebec, concerning the joint amateur sport program?

2. What has been the result of the last negotiations?

3. What have been the amounts laid down by the federal government for this joint program since it was initiated?

4. What has been the share received by each province since the program was initiated?

5. Does the province of Quebec recover by any means the share that it would get if it participated in this program and (a) if so, by what means (b) if not, for what reason?

[*Translation*]

Hon. A. J. MacEachen (Minister of National Health and Welfare): 1. No.

2. Quebec has not indicated its intention to participate in the Federal Provincial Amateur Sport Program. However, since the commencmeent of the program there has been the closest co-operation between the Federal Government and the Province of Quebec which has resulted in direct federal grants being made to national organizations operating for the most part in the province of Quebec and representing French Canada, such as the Canadian Catholic Girl Guides—French sector, which has received some $25,000 in federal aid under the program to date, and the Association Canadienne des Centres de Loisirs to which federal grants to date have totalled $103,900. In addition, the Federal Government has agreed to contribute up to $700,000 to meet the costs of organizing and staging the First Canadian Winter Games which will be held at Quebec city in February 1967.

3. Under the Federal Provincial part of the Fitness and Amateur Sport Program $500,000 was made available in 1962-63 and $1 million in each subsequent year.

4. The amounts claimed by and paid to the provinces since the commencement of the program are as indicated on the following statement.

5. No. (a) Not applicable. (b) See answer 2, above.

FEDERAL-PROVINCIAL FITNESS AND AMATEUR SPORT PROGRAM

(Amounts claimed by and paid to the Provinces since the commencement of the Program)

Province	1962-1963 Planning	1962-1963 Projects	1963-1964 Projects	1964-1965 Projects	1965-1966 to February 28, 1966 Projects
	$	$	$	$	$
Newfoundland	16,779	13,892	22,332	40,316	48,416
Prince Edward Island	15,400	15,185	9,100	38,311	23,869
Nova Scotia	17,810	13,717	29,998	40,743	53,961
New Brunswick	17,289	10,039	27,496	52,521	51,412
Quebec	—	—	—	—	—
Ontario	38,898	12,508	25,000	95,015	149,551
Manitoba	18,531	18,416	64,185	64,203	38,413
Saskatchewan	18,509	16,172	7,500	36,866	54,730
Alberta	20,174	14,438	41,544	45,349	33,648
British Columbia	21,247	13,439	11,066	50,423	84,230
Northwest Territories	15,091	7,290	3,366	26,478	33,714
Yukon	15,057	5,900	7,331	23,868	25,959
Totals	214,785	140,996	248,918	514,093	597,903

[*English*]

ROADS TO RESOURCES PROGRAM

Question No. 878—**Mr. Korchinski:**

1. When was the original program signed with each of the provinces under the "roads to "resources" program?

2. What is the date of expiration of the original program in each province?

3. What is the amount of money paid by the federal government in each year to each province under the program?

4. Have any provinces asked for extension of the program and, if so, which provinces and for what period of time?

5. If any provinces were granted an extension, were the terms of the original amount payable altered and, if so, by what amount?

6. Have there been any requests by provinces to redraft a new agreement and, if so, which provinces have asked for such an agreement?

Hon. Jean-Luc Pepin (Minister of Mines and Technical Surveys):

		Newfoundland	Prince Edward Island	Nova Scotia	New Brunswick	Quebec	Ontario	Manitoba	Saskatchewan	Alberta	British Columbia
1.		Dec. 15, 1959	Dec. 15, 1959	Dec. 14, 1959	Feb. 18, 1960	Oct. 18, 1960	Dec. 22, 1959	Dec. 21, 1959	Mar. 11, 1960	Dec. 23, 1959	Nov. 4, 1958
2.		Mar. 31, 1969	Mar. 31, 1966	Mar. 31, 1966	Mar. 31, 1969	Mar. 31, 1965	Mar. 31, 1967	Mar. 31, 1966	Mar. 31, 1966	Mar. 31, 1965	Mar. 31, 1963
3.	1958–59 $	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	750,000.00	—	1,000,732.79
	1959–60	332,712.93	1,127,191.38	1,970,638.00	884,846.09	—	118,956.14	955,957.57	961,224.08	1,878,640.00	769,829.51
	1960–61	797,598.38	1,465,609.74	1,064,184.68	784,142.46	321,419.59	1,504,264.35	1,602,011.38	1,940,259.79	1,536,336.88	984,172.75
	1961–62	799,595.28	954,285.64	1,765,177.32	1,210,174.49	426,087.74	1,649,159.94	1,677,849.72	806,326.92	1,559,597.47	1,151,745.48
	1962–63	723,670.34	903,847.94	900,000.00	870,836.35	2,280,626.06	1,391,383.58	667,316.14	581,565.81	868,994.56	1,142,294.47
	1963–64	750,000.00	1,000,000.00	900,000.00	750,000.00	1,397,175.65	498,944.20	750,000.00	311,863.04	750,000.00	1,024,508.65
	1964–65	750,000.00	515,140.51	460,920.46	750,000.00	1,011,345.63	750,000.00	750,000.00	410,945.57	369,405.55	294,269.38
	1965–66 Apr. 1/65 Jan. 31/66	750,000.00	496,875.60	232,207.68	750,000.00	1,274,690.25	709,737.38	830,672.13	373,791.42	213,925.06	437,097.84
4.	Yes—as indicated		X 1 year			X 1 year		X 1 year	X 1 year	X 1 year	X 5 years

Questions

5. Prince Edward Island, Quebec, Saskatchewan, Alberta and British Columbia have been granted extensions. Manitoba's request for an extension is still under review as this request was received just recently. The total of the original amount payable to each province has not been altered.

6. Yes. Quebec, Manitoba, British Columbia, New Brunswick, Saskatchewan, Prince Edward Island, Nova Scotia.

WILLIAM MACEACHERN

Question No. 891—**Mr. Coates:**

1. Has Mr. William MacEachern been taken on staff by the Minister of National Health and Welfare and, if so (a) on what date (b) to what position was he appointed (c) at what salary?

2. What were Mr. MacEachern's qualifications for the position in question, and who was his employer prior to his present appointment?

Hon. A. J. MacEachen (Minister of National Health and Welfare): 1. Yes. (a) February 21, 1966. (b) Special Assistant. (c) $12,000 per annum.

2. Mr. MacEachern's qualifications include a bachelor of arts degree from St. Francis Xavier University, a diploma in journalism from the University of Western Ontario and a wide experience in reporting and related activities. Before joining the staff of the minister's office Mr. MacEachern was employed in the field of journalism and public relations.

C.B.C. PUBLIC AFFAIRS COMMENTATORS, NOVA SCOTIA

Question No. 941—**Mr. McCleave:**

In the C.B.C. selection of commentators on public affairs for radio and television broadcasts originating from Nova Scotian stations during 1965, how many broadcasts were made by (a) employees of the Halifax *Chronicle-Herald* and *Mail-Star* (b) other newspapers (c) members of the faculty of Dalhousie University (d) members of faculties of other universities (e) other sources?

Hon. Judy V. LaMarsh (Secretary of State): I am informed by the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation that the following includes all individual, scripted commentaries, talks and reviews originating with the corporation's public affairs department and broadcast on a local, regional or national basis: (a) 136; (b) 52; (c) 25; (d) 41; (e) 134.

WINTER NAVIGATION, ST. LAWRENCE RIVER

Question No. 949—**Mr. Flemming:**

1. What was the estimated cost of keeping the St. Lawrence river open during the winter season of the years 1960, 1961, 1962, 1963, 1964?

2. What was the estimated value of products exported as a result of keeping the St. Lawrence river open during the same years?

[Mr. Pepin.]

Mr. J. A. Byrne (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Transport): 1. The river St. Lawrence between Quebec and Montreal was not in fact kept open at all times throughout the winter for the years 1960-1964, but was blocked by ice jams for varying periods between the start of ice formation in December and the final disappearance of ice in April. The total time that the river was blocked varied from a minimum of 41 days in the winter 1963-64 to a maximum of 77 days in the winter 1960-61.

The cost of operating the Canadian Coast Guard icebreakers to clear ice jams and to try to prevent their formation in order to prevent flooding of the adjoining low lying countryside was as follows: 1960-61, $238,270; 1961-62, $271,700; 1962-63, $272,400; 1963-64, $389,300; 1964-65, $356,700.

These costs apply only to the icebreakers operating between Quebec and Montreal and not to the provision of icebreaker services at other points to assist navigation in the lower river, gulf of St. Lawrence and Atlantic provinces.

2. Not available.

ATLANTIC PROVINCES FISH EXPORTS

Question No. 950—**Mr. Flemming:**

What are the figures, in dollars, of the value of processed fish and fish products produced and exported from the Atlantic provinces in the years 1960, 1961, 1962, 1963, 1964?

Hon. Robert Winters (Minister of Trade and Commerce): (a) Value of fish and fish products from all manufacturing and trade industries, Atlantic provinces.[1]

1960	Sea fish	$124,767,000
	Inland fish	689,000
	Total	$125,456,000
1961	Sea fish	$124,810,000
	Inland fish	588,000
	Total	$125,398,000
1962	Sea fish	$140,638,000
	Inland fish	725,000
	Total	$141,363,000

1963	Sea fish	$164,757,000
	Inland fish	670,000
	Total	$165,427,000
1964	Information not yet available.	

[1]Includes Newfoundland, Prince Edward Island, Nova Scotia, New Brunswick and Quebec.

(b) Domestic exports of processed fish and processed fish products cleared through customs ports in the Atlantic provinces during the years 1960-1964 were as follows:

Calendar Year	Processed Fish and Processed Fish Products
1960	$47,004,000
1961	48,824,000
1962	50,705,000
1963	57,551,000
1964	67,428,000

PURCHASE OF BELL TELEPHONE STOCK BY EMPLOYEES OF SUBSIDIARIES

Question No. 962—**Mr. Nesbitt:**

What are the reasons for the Board Of Transport Commissioners' rejection of the Bell Telephone Company's proposal to allow employees of wholly owned subsidiaries to buy Bell Telephone stock under the same plan provided to Bell Telephone stock under the same plan provided to Bell Telephone employees?

Mr. J. A. Byrne (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Transport): The Board of Transport Commissioners for Canada advise as follows: this information is contained in the board's judgment of February 18, 1966, and the board's order No. 120008 of the same date, which can be obtained upon application to the secretary of the board.

CENTENNIAL PROJECTS

Question No. 978—**Mr. Dinsdale:**

1. Since 1963, what progress has been made on the program to develop a major historic site in each province and territory to be available for the edification of visitors to Canada during our centennial year?

2. Has the government made arrangements for historic trail tours to be available in time for Canada's centennial?

Hon. Arthur Laing (Minister of Northern Affairs and National Resources): 1. All the provinces except Alberta have an established major historic site under active development. While the Yukon Territory has also such a site under development, the Northwest Territories has not yet arrived at the final decision in this matter.

2. Consultation between the Canadian historic sites division and the Canadian Travel Bureau has taken place leading to the availability of such information in time for Canada's centennial.

*COST OF B AND B COMMISSION

Question No. 995—**Mr. Coates:**

1. What was the estimated cost of the royal commission on bilingualism and biculturalism to March 31, 1966, as set out by the Minister of Finance?

2. What is the estimated cost of the commission for the fiscal year 1966-67?

3. On what date was the commission established and on what date does it plan to conclude its inquiry?

4. What was the length of the following royal commissions and the cost of each (a) MacPherson royal commission (b) Glassco royal commission (c) Porter royal commission (d) Gordon royal commission (e) Rand royal commission (f) O'Leary royal commission?

5. Has any royal commission appointed since 1945 carried on an investigation for a longer period of time than is indicated by the royal commission on bilingualism and biculturalism?

6. Has any royal commission appointed since 1945 expended in excess of $3,000,000 in bringing its investigation to a conclusion?

Mr. John R. Matheson (Parliamentary Secretary to Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, with respect to parts 1, 2 and 3 of this question, I am informed by the royal commission as follows:

1. The estimated cost of the royal commission to March 31, 1966 was $4,502,635.33.

2. The estimated cost of the royal commission for the fiscal year 1966-67 was $1,200,000.

3. The commission was established by order in council on July 19, 1963. No final date has been established for publishing the commission's report.

The answers to parts 4, 5 and 6 are as follows:

4. (a) 38 months, $574,090; (b) 30 months, $2,791,915; (c) 30 months, $732,901; (d) 28 months, $1,303,819; (e) 11 months, $99,166; (f) 8 months, $136,121.

5. See answer to part 3.

6. No.

EXPENDITURES ON WHARF, LITTLE SANDS, P.E.I.

Question No. 999—**Mr. McQuaid:**

1. What was the total expenditure during the fiscal year 1965-66 on the wharf at Little Sands, King's County, P.E.I.?

2. Was a contract let for this work and, if so (a) to whom was it let (b) what was the contract price (c) were there other bidders and, if so, who were they and what were the amounts of their bids?

Questions

3. What were the names of all persons, firms, or corporations to whom money was paid for this job and the amounts paid to each?

Hon. G. J. McIlraith (Minister of Public Works): 1. $74,463.15

2. Yes, (a) and (b) Colin R. MacDonald Limited, Antigonish, N.S.—$68,690.

(c) Yes, the other bidders and the amount of their bids were: Scott Wheaton Limited, Moncton, N.B., $74,260.00; Leo Leblanc, Richibucto, N.B., $77,140.00 Norman N. MacLean, Murray River, P.E.I., $77,306.00; Modern Construction Limited, Moncton, N.B., $84,643.00; Stanley Reid, Port Hilford, N.S., $86,880.46.

3. Contractor, Colin R. MacDonald Limited, Antigonish, N.S., $72,749.38; Material Inspection—Atlantic Testing & Inspection Co., Charlottetown, P.E.I., $185.47; Inspectors—Angus Stewart, $1,489.90; Thomas Hayter, $38.40.

AUTOMOTIVE PRODUCTS AGREEMENT

Question No. 1,011—**Mr. Howe (Wellington-Huron):**

1. What motor car companies have taken advantages of the agreement concerning automotive products between the government of Canada and the government of the United States of America, signed on January 16, 1965?

2. What models of each of these companies and in what number for each model, up to January 16, 1966, have been (a) exported from Canada to the United States (b) imported from the United States into Canada?

3. What was the total value of (a) these car exports from Canada to the United States (b) these cars imported from the United States to Canada?

4. What was the retail price of each of these models with automatic transmission, windshield washers and wipers, sun visors and wheel discs, and including all government taxes at (a) Windsor, Ontario (b) Detroit, Michigan?

5. Under the previous arrangements, what would have been the revenue for Canada on the cars imported from the United States during this period?

Hon. C. M. Drury (Minister of Industry): 1. The following manufacturers of motor cars, i.e., passenger automobiles, are operating under the Canada-United States automotive agreement. American Motors (Canada) Limited, Chrysler Canada Ltd., Ford Motor Company of Canada Limited, General Motors of Canada Limited, General Motors Products of Canada Limited, Studebaker of Canada Limited, Volvo (Canada) Ltd.

2. Information concerning models of vehicles imported from and exported to the United States, or the numbers of vehicles imported and exported by individual companies, is not available.

[Mr. McQuaid.]

3. (a) Total value of cars exported from Canada to the United States—January 1965 to November 1965 (latest import figures available) was $68.8 million. (b) Total value of cars imported from the United States to Canada—January 1965 to September 1965 (latest import figures available was $96.0 million.

4. Details of retail sales of motor cars are not reported to the federal government and dealer prices differ appreciably depending on the circumstances of a particular sale. It is possible, however, to compare factory wholesale prices in Canada and the United States. For comparable models of popular volume selling cars, the Canadian price was on average 8 per cent higher for 1965 models, whereas for 1966 models the differential ranged from 3 to 5 per cent.

5. Under previous import duty remission arrangements which were replaced by the present automotive program, it would have been expected that full remission of duty on vehicles imported from the United States would have been earned by the companies and that the revenue, therefore would have been nil.

ROADS TO RESOURCES, SASKATCHEWAN

Question No. 1,020—**Mr. Korchinski:**

1. What is the amount paid to date to the province of Saskatchewan under the roads to resources program?

2. What roads were undertaken in Saskatchewan under the program?

3. What are the terminals of each road?

4. What was the approved total mileage of each road?

5. What is the mileage completed to date of each road?

6. What is the total cost of the mileage completed on each road?

7. What is the estimated cost of completion of each road?

8. What is the estimated date of completion of each road?

9. What payments were made each year to the province of Saskatchewan since commencement of the program?

Hon. Jean-Luc Pepin (Minister of Mines and Technical Surveys): 1. $6,181,804.48.

2 and 3. Uranium City road, commencing at Lac La Ronge and proceeding north along the western side of Reindeer Lake, thence westerly to Stony Rapids and Uranium City. Hanson Lake road, commencing from a point on highway number 55 at or near the village

of Smeaton, thence northerly and easterly through Nipawin provincial park, thence easterly by way of Big Sandy Lake and Ballantyne Bay, thence north of Hanson Lake and terminating at highway number 35 at or near the town of Creighton. The Otosquen road, commencing from the town of Hudson Bay, thence northerly to Carrot River, thence easterly to the Manitoba-Saskatchewan boundary. The Island Falls road, from the Hanson Lake road to Island Falls. The Cumberland road, from Squaw Rapids to Cumberland House. Prince Albert bridge—Construction of a bridge over the North Saskatchewan river at Prince Albert.

4, 5, 6, 7 and 8.

	Approved Mileage	Mileage Completed	Cost of Mileage Completed	Estimated Cost of Completion	Estimated Date of Completion
Uranium City road	505.0	65.5	$2,600,105	$16,000,000	Not available provincial schedule
Hanson Lake road	225.3	225.3	5,757,303	3,500,000	Complete
The Otosquen road	79.1	79.1	1,646,531	1,800,000	Complete
The Island Falls road	75.0	14.4	564,663	3,500,000	Not available provincial schedule
The Cumberland road	57.0	35.0	267,991	927,543	Not available provincial schedule
Prince Albert bridge	—	—	1,527,016	1,650,000	Complete

9.

1958-59	$ 750,000.00
1959-60	961,224.08
1960-61	1,940,259.79
1961-62	806,326.92
1962-63	581,565.81
1963-64	311,863.04
1964-65	410,945.57
1965-66 to date	419,619.27

FOREST ACCESS ROADS, SASKATCHEWAN

Question No. 1,021—**Mr. Korchinski:**

1. What amount has been paid to the province of Saskatchewan in each year since commencement under the forest access roads program?

2. Where are these roads located?

3. Have any requests been made by the province of Saskatchewan for additional funds under the program and, if so, on what dates?

Hon. Maurice Sauvé (Minister of Forestry):

1. The following amounts have been paid to the province of Saskatchewan in the fiscal years as shown:

Fiscal Year	Federal Payment to the Province
	$
1957-58	95,056
1958-59	179,438
1959-60	161,353
1960-61	nil
1961-62	263,954
1962-63	172,962
1963-64	185,189
1964-65	60,758
1965-66 (To Nov. 30/65)	38,603
	$1,157,313

2. The following is a list of roads and trails constructed, the names indicating the location: Dore Lake road, Montreal River road and bridge, Emmeline-Montreal river road, Armit road, Fir river road, Bittern lake road, Muskeg lake road, Bigstone road,

Kazan lake trail, Primeau lake trail, Dipner lake trail, Lac La Plonge trail, Cumberland, trail, Pinehouse trail, Emmeline trail, Fire Guard trail, Portage La Loche road, Neweiben road and bridge, Fox Point road, Sipanok channel bridge, Turnburry road, Helldiver lake road, McBride lake road, Chitek lake road, Keely lake road, Ile a La Crosse road, Miscellaneous bridges, Big Sandy road, Stewart lake trail, Porcupine hills trail, Miska lake trail, Little Bear south trail, Little Bear north trail, Fishing lake road, Clearwater valley trail, McLean lake trail, Descharme lake trail, Dillon-Sandy Point trail, Clear lake trail, Michel-Dillon road, Waterhen-Lac des Isles road, La Loche road, Sturgeon Weir, Tulabi lake, Puskwakaw lake, Kistopiskaw, Johnson lake, Hamill lake, East Trout, Torch trail, Shirley lake road, Turnor lake road, Potato lake trail, Jan lake road, Amyot lake trail, Michel point road, Kemball lake road, Apps lake trail, Candle lake East road, Candle lake South road, Candle lake road, Green lake road, Waterhen road, Whelan bay road, Canoe lake road, White Swan road, Emma-Christopher road, Division road, Parr Hill road, Meadow lake road, Ballantyne bay road, Cowan river bridge, Lac des Isles road, Shoal lake road, Strong Pine road, Woody river road, Canoe lake-Beauvil track, La Loche-Clearwater river track, Limestone lake, Winteringham lake, McBride lake road, Granite lake, Tyrell lake, McDougall creek road, Mistatim Tower road, Nesslin lake road, Rabbit lake tower.

3. No.

AVON RIVER PROJECT, NOVA SCOTIA

Question No. 1,036—**Mr. Reid:**

1. Has the government made a commitment to participate in a project on the Avon river in Nova Scotia?

2. If so, what is the nature of the project?

3. What is the extent of the participation by the government of Canada?

4. When will tenders be invited from contractors?

5. Will tenders be invited by the government of Canada or by the province?

6. Will the tendering and construction processes be supervised by any agency of the government of Canada, and if so, by what agency?

Hon. Maurice Sauvé (Minister of Forestry): 1. Yes.

2. Construction of a combined causeway and dam with aboiteau to provide permanent flood protection for 3,400 acres of marshland; a crossing for both the highway and the railway; and diversions of both routes around the town of Windsor, N.S.

[Mr. Sauvé.]

3. Fifty per cent of the costs of the basic structure required to accommodate the highway and railway, including the costs of extending Windsor's sewage system through the dam, and the costs of the engineering and contingencies for that part of the project, not exceeding $1,335,000.

4. Information not available.

5. By the province.

6. Jointly by the province and the maritime marshland rehabilitation administration of the Department of Forestry.

TAX REFUNDS RESPECTING HOMES FOR AGED

Question No. 1,040—**Mr. Johnston:**

Under the terms of the Excise Tax Act, section 47, (a) how much money was refunded to organizations constructing homes for the aged in 1964 and in 1965 (b) what were the sums refunded for each province in 1964 and in 1965 (c) how many institutions in each province received such refunds?

Hon. E. J. Benson (Minister of National Revenue): The information is not available in departmental records.

SENIOR OFFICERS, PRINTING BUREAU

Question No. 1,046—**Mr. Ricard:**

1. What are the names of the ten senior administrative officers of the Canadian government printing bureau?

2. What position is held by each of them, and what duties are assigned to each such officer?

[*Translation*]

Hon. C. M. Drury (Minister of Industry): 1. There are eight (8) Senior Management Officers at the Canadian Government Printing Bureau and their names and titles appear in answer to question No. 60, parts 2-3-4 and 5, House of Commons Debates of February 2, 1966, page 574.

2.

Name and Position	Duties
C. B. Watt, General Manager. Manager,	Responsible for the management, operation and control of the Canadian Government Printing Bureau.
F. E. Everett, Production (Main Plant).	Conducts the operations of the Main Plant of the Printing Bureau.
J. A. Kiefl, Production Manager, (Outside Plants).	Conducts the operations of the Outside Plants of the Printing Bureau.

Name and Position	Duties
F. Rogers, Plant Engineer.	Develops and applies programs on plant engineering and maintenance.
M. Zaleski, Manager, Research and Industrial Engineering Services.	Develops measured time standards for all production operations; conducts special technical studies including research on materials for specifications and quality control.
R. D. Mather, Comptroller.	Provides financial services and controls, including data processing and systems analysis.
G. Neyron, Personnel Manager, (Acting).	Provides industrial relations and personnel services, including staff training and welfare.
J. B. Archambault, Special Assistant.	Assists and advises the General Manager in his executive and administrative duties and responsibilities; provides administrative services.

[*English*]

*VISIT TO CANADA BY CARDINAL WYSZYNSKI

Question No. 1,048—**Mr. Laprise:**

Does the government intend to make representations to the Polish government toward allowing Cardinal Stefan Wyszynski to visit Canada next May?

[*Translation*]

Mr. D. S. Macdonald (Parliamentary Secretary to Secretary of State for External Affairs): I would not wish in any way to intervene in a matter that is within the domestic jurisdiction of the Polish Government; however, I think I can say that I fully understand the feelings of Canadians of Polish origin towards Cardinal Wyszynski, whom they have invited to visit Canada to attend their ceremonies marking the Polish Millennium. I would share their regret if the Primate of Poland were not in a position to accept their invitation and if their hope of welcoming this religious leader should be disappointed.

[*English*]

COST OF APPRENTICE TRAINING, H.M.C. "DOCKYARD"

Question No. 1,055—**Mr. Forrestall:**

What is the average total cost of training one apprentice, by shop, at H.M.C. *Dockyard*, Halifax?

Hon. Paul Hellyer (Minister of National Defence): Approximately $18,000. There is no significant difference in the costs of training apprentices between the various shops in H.M.C. *Dockyard* Halifax as all apprentices are compensated on a common wage schedule.

TABLING OF DOCUMENTS RESPECTING DISABLED PERSONS ACT

Question No. 1,086—**Mr. Douglas:**

1. Has the government of Saskatchewan asked permission from the government of Canada to table in the Saskatchewan legislature all correspondence between the government of Saskatchewan and the government of Canada asking that the Disabled Persons Allowance Act be amended to (a) increase the benefits, and (b) alter the federal regulations with a view to increasing eligibility?

2. If so, on what date was the request made?

3. Has approval for the tabling of this correspondence been granted by the federal government?

4. If so, on what date was approval granted?

Hon. A. J. MacEachen (Minister of National Health and Welfare): 1. The Department of National Health and Welfare has not received a request from the government of Saskatchewan for permission to table correspondence dealing with the Disabled Persons Allowance Act in the Saskatchewan legislature.

2, 3 and 4. See answer 1 above.

DELAY IN FISHING VESSEL ASSISTANCE PAYMENTS

Question No. 1,094—**Mr. McQuaid:**

1. Is there a delay in the payment to some fishermen in Districts 7B and 8 in Prince Edward Island of the subsidies payable under the Fishing Vessel Assistance Regulations, 1964, and, if so, what is the reason?

2. How soon will cheques be issued to those to whom payments have not as yet been made?

Hon. H. J. Robichaud (Minister of Fisheries): 1. Yes. For a considerable number of boats in the 35′ to 45′ size there is question as to eligibility.

2. A survey team is examining the boats in question. For those which may prove eligible, payment will be made without delay.

IMPORTS OF CHAROLAIS BULLS

Question No. 1,096—**Mr. Schreyer:**

1. How many Charolais bulls have been imported from France in the past four-year period?

2. What was the average import valuation for these animals?

Questions

3. Has the federal Department of Agriculture purchased any of these animals (a) directly from French exporters (b) from Canadian livestock breeders?

4. If so, what average price was paid by the federal government for these animals?

5. How many such animals were purchased?

Hon. Judy V. LaMarsh (Secretary of State): I am informed by the Departments of Agriculture and National Revenue as follows:

1. Thirty one bulls and 82 females are now in quarantine at the Grosse Ile, Quebec, quarantine station, from where they will be released in late April or early May if they pass the necessary health tests. These are the only importations from France within the past four years.

2. $4,944.62 Canadian funds.

3. (a) No. (b) No.

4. N/A.

5. N/A.

COPIES OF BILL OF RIGHTS

Question No. 1,099—**Mr. Bell (Saint John-Albert):**

1. How many copies of the bill of rights are still in stock in the department of the Queen's Printer?

2. Is the Queen's Printer still continuing to produce copies of the said bill of rights to meet the demand and, if not, for what reason?

Hon. Judy V. LaMarsh (Secretary of State): 1. None of the English version, 458 copies of the French version.

2. No, because the demand has not warranted the cost of a reprint so far.

SECRETARIAT FOR FEDERAL-PROVINCIAL AFFAIRS

Question No. 1,101—**Mr. Mongrain:**

1. Is there a secretariat for federal-provincial affairs?

2. If so, when was it established?

3. What minister has jurisdiction over this secretariat?

4. Are there any full time employees?

5. If so, what are each employee's specific functions?

Mr. John R. Matheson (Parliamentary Secretary to Prime Minister): 1. Yes. There is a special unit within the Privy Council office, known as the provincial relations secretariat, with general responsibility for the co-ordination of federal-provincial activities.

2. The establishment and terms of reference of the secretariat were announced in the House of Commons on May 12, 1964, by the then parliamentary secretary to the Prime Minister.

3. The Prime Minister.

4. There are three officials specifically attached to the secretariat devoting from two thirds to three quarters of their time working directly for the secretariat. There are in addition a number of other officials in the Privy Council office who are concerned from time to time with the federal-provincial relation aspects of questions within their particular fields of responsibility. The time spent by these officials on such matters varies depending on circumstances.

5. Not applicable in light of reply to item 4.

COMPLETION OF FORMS BY METEOROLOGICAL BRANCH EMPLOYEES

Question No. 1,112—**Mr. Douglas:**

1. Are employees in the meteorological branch of the district air services of the Department of Transport being fingerprinted on form CSC 283-20M-1-57-1027?

2. If so, what is the reason for this action?

3. Are employees in the meterological branch of the district air services of the Department of Transport being asked to complete a "personal history form"?

4. If so, what is the reason for this action?

Mr. J. A. Byrne (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Transport): 1. Yes.

2. When security is a requirement consistent with the announced government policy on personnel security; see volume 108, number 76, *House of Commons Debates* for Friday, October 25, 1963, at page 4047.

3. Yes.

4. See answer to 2 above.

QUESTION PASSED AS ORDER FOR RETURN

CIVIL SERVICE COMMISSION CLASSIFICATION OF RADIO OPERATORS

Question No. 679—**Mr. Barnett:**

1. Did the Civil Service Association of Canada make submissions to the Department of Transport and to the Civil Service Commission, in 1962 and/or subsequently, concerning the need to modify the classification and promotion opportunities for radio operators in the public service of Canada?

2. If so, when were such submissions made?

3. Did the Department of Transport make recommendations to the Civil Service Commission in respect of any such submissions?

4. If so, what proposals did the Department of Transport advance?

5. What action did the Civil Service Commission take on any such proposals?

6. Is the Civil Service Commission considering at the present time any proposals for a reclassification of positions in which radio operators are employed?

7. If so, when is it expected that the Civil Service Commission will announce its decision in respect of any such reclassification?

Return tabled.

PARLIAMENT HILL

INTERFERENCE WITH MEMBERS BY OTTAWA POLICE

On the orders of the day:

Hon. J. A. MacLean (Queens): Mr. Speaker, I should like to address a question to the Prime Minister and ask him whether he would state under what authority the city of Ottawa police on Saturday prevented members of parliament from approaching Parliament Hill, thereby interfering with the privileges of members of parliament.

Right Hon. L. B. Pearson (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, I will have to look into this matter. I had not heard of this difficulty before, but I will look into it at once.

DOMINION-PROVINCIAL RELATIONS

REPORTED STATEMENT BY PRIME MINISTER RESPECTING OPTING OUT

On the orders of the day:

Mr. T. C. Douglas (Burnaby-Coquitlam): Mr. Speaker, in view of the Prime Minister's statement at the Quebec Liberal conference over the week end to the effect that there will be no need for Quebec or any other province to opt out of any plans because in future the federal government will not opt into matters within provincial jurisdiction, I want to ask the Prime Minister if this will apply to the introduction of a medicare program for Canada.

Right Hon. L. B. Pearson (Prime Minister): No, Mr. Speaker, that is not the kind of program I was referring to when I said that I hoped that in future the federal government would not be required to opt into these joint programs.

[*Translation*]

HEALTH AND WELFARE

QUEBEC DEATHS—ATTRIBUTED TO BEER DRINKING

On the orders of the day:

Mr. Réal Caouette (Villeneuve): Mr. Speaker, the Minister of National Health and Welfare being absent, I shall put my question either to his Parliamentary Secretary or to the right hon. Prime Minister.

Inasmuch as the newspapers report that at least 40 people died suddenly in the Quebec city area after drinking some beer, are federal authorities looking into the matter? Will we soon know what brewery is poisoning the public, so that we may put a stop to that scourge?

[*English*]

Right Hon. L. B. Pearson (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, I have read this report and I shall discuss it with the Minister of National Health and Welfare to see what inquiry can be made.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Gilles Grégoire (Lapointe): Mr. Speaker, further to the question of the member for Villeneuve (Mr. Caouette), I wish to put a question to the Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of National Health and Welfare.

Could she tell us whether inspectors of the Food and Drugs Directorate in Ottawa are now in Quebec City to warn the population as soon as possible against the danger of food poisoning from a certain kind of beer now being sold?

[*English*]

Mrs. Margaret Rideout (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of National Health and Welfare): Mr. Speaker, may I take this question as notice and bring it to the attention of the minister?

[*Translation*]

Mr. Grégoire: Mr. Speaker, I have a supplementary question.

In view of the importance of the matter and in view of the large number of sudden deaths, can the parliamentary secretary tell the house whether the Minister of National Health and Welfare is now in Quebec, so as to assist in solving this problem?

[*English*]

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

Inquiries of the Ministry

Mr. Pearson: I have just had some information sent to me to the effect that the federal authorities have, of course, been made aware of the problem and are co-operating with the provincial authority in investigating this matter. Two members of the food and drug administration are in Quebec city today.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Grégoire: Mr. Speaker, I should like to put a supplementary question. Since several hundred persons have been poisoned in Quebec city, could the Prime Minister see to it that the name of the company responsible be made public as soon as possible?

[*English*]

Mr. Duquet: Mr. Speaker—

Mr. Grégoire: May I have an answer to my question?

Mr. Speaker: Order. The Chair has some doubt whether the line which is being followed by the hon. member for Lapointe and the hon. member for Quebec East—

[*Translation*]

who, apparently, wants to put the same type of question. I do not think this question is in order at the present time.

Mr. Grégoire: Mr. Speaker—

Mr. Speaker: The member for Lapointe put a question which was answered by the Prime Minister, and it seems to me this should bring the discussion to an end.

Mr. Grégoire: I rise on a point of order, Mr. Speaker. A tragic event has occurred in the city of Quebec. In fact, over a hundred persons were poisoned after drinking beer bearing a certain label, which was allegedly manufactured without due regard for the regulations. Two hundred other persons are in danger of being affected by the beer bearing this label.

Furthermore, it is urgent and even vitally important that the name of that company be known as soon as possible. It is in the interest of hundreds of Quebec citizens. Following the death of nearly a hundred persons, will the name of that company be made public?

Mr. Gérard Duquet (Quebec East): Mr. Speaker, I think this question is premature, since the Quebec Health Department stated this morning that it was in no way established that beer was the cause of these deaths.

[Mr. Speaker.]

Mr. Speaker: Order. We are starting a discussion and I suggest that hon. members should confine themselves to the questions asked and the answers given.

Mr. Grégoire: Who is he protecting?

Mr. Caouette: The backers.

[*English*]

EXTERNAL AFFAIRS

RHODESIA—RETURN TO OTTAWA OF CANADIAN HIGH COMMISSIONER TO U.K.

On the orders of the day:

Mr. R. N. Thompson (Red Deer): Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the Secretary of State for External Affairs. I would ask him whether it is true that Hon. Lionel Chevrier, our high commissioner to the United Kingdom, is being recalled and, if so, what is the purpose of his recall?

Hon. Paul Martin (Secretary of State for External Affairs): Mr. Speaker, from time to time heads of missions return to Ottawa for consultations with the government. This is a routine visit.

Mr. Churchill: May I ask a supplementary question?

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Red Deer.

Mr. Thompson: Mr. Speaker, as a supplementary question can I ask if the government has contemplated a new policy in relation to Rhodesia?

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. I wonder whether this is a supplementary question. If not I believe the hon. member for Winnipeg South Centre has a supplementary question.

Mr. Churchill: You would have ruled me out on the same grounds. I will wait.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Red Deer.

Mr. Thompson: Mr. Speaker, I merely asked if the visit of our high commissioner to London had to do with a new policy being formulated for Rhodesia.

Mr. Martin (Essex East): Mr. Speaker, no new Canadian policy is being envisaged.

FINANCE

U.S. GUIDE LINES—REPORTED STATEMENT AS TO EFFECTIVENESS

On the orders of the day:

Hon. George Hees (Northumberland): Mr. Speaker, I should like to direct a question to the Minister of Finance. In view of the report by the United States national industrial conference board that United States business believes the guide line policy will stifle economic growth and will not contribute substantially to solving the United States balance of payment problem, has the minister received any indications that this policy may be discontinued in the near future?

Hon. Mitchell Sharp (Minister of Finance): Mr. Speaker, as the hon. gentleman knows and as the house knows, I have been expressing similar views about the effect of United States guide lines upon Canadian and United States developments. However, in answer to the specific question asked by the hon. member, I have not received any indication of any change in United States policy.

NORTHERN AFFAIRS

CONSTRUCTION OF REPLICA OF "GRANDE HERMINE" FOR EXPO '67

On the orders of the day:

Mr. J. R. Keays (Gaspé): My question, Mr. Speaker, is directed to the Minister of Northern Affairs and National Resources. With respect to a press release of March 18, noting the intention of the government to build a replica of the *Grande Hermine* which will be moored at Expo '67, then put on permanent display as a tourist attraction at the Cartier Breboeuf park at Quebec city, may I ask the minister whether he will review this policy as a matter of urgency, due to the fact that Gaspé is the birthplace of Canada and the request for such a project originated in Gaspé? It is urgent that a review of this be made before the policy is made final and irrevocable.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. The hon. member has made his point. If he wants to pursue it he should place the question on the order paper, or discuss it in the adjournment debate.

Mr. Keays: I am worried about this, because I believe this will cause a distortion of history unless it is put right. May I be allowed to debate it at ten o'clock?

Inquiries of the Ministry

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE

REQUEST FOR REPLY TO QUESTION ON ORDER PAPER

On the orders of the day:

Mr. Erik Nielsen (Yukon): Mr. Speaker, I would ask the Minister of Justice when we might expect an answer to question No. 577 on the order paper, which has been there for 46 days.

Hon. Lucien Cardin (Minister of Justice): I apologize to the hon. member for the delay. The question could have been answered about ten days ago. I signed the release, and the hon. member should get the answer to the question some time today or tomorrow.

THE CANADIAN ECONOMY

EFFECT ON PENSIONERS OF INCREASING COST OF LIVING

On the orders of the day:

Mr. Stanley Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Mr. Speaker, I have a very brief question for the Prime Minister. In view of the statement in the budget papers tabled on Friday last by the Minister of Finance, to the effect that the cost of living will continue to go up this year, what are pensioners to do?

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. I have some doubts as to whether this is a type of question which can be asked. I do not accept the question the way it is put.

Mr. Knowles: Mr. Speaker, if the question needs to be more specific may I ask the Prime Minister what will people, who cannot now get by on their pensions, do when the cost of living goes up? Does the government have any answer for this?

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. The hon. member for Lapointe.

Mr. Knowles: Ten o'clock, Mr. Speaker.

[*Later:*]

Mr. Eric Winkler (Grey-Bruce): I have a question for the Prime Minister somewhat related to the one asked by the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre, but I will put it in a more direct way because I agree with Your Honour that the discussion then was out of order.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh.

Mr. Winkler: I realize this question has been put to him many times, but I should like to ask the Prime Minister whether he could today inform the house if anything is to

be done by way of an increase in the old age pension before, shall we say, Easter?

Right Hon. L. B. Pearson (Prime Minister): Not today, Mr. Speaker.

[*Later:*]

Mr. R. A. Webb (Hastings-Frontenac): Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct a question to the Prime Minister and ask whether he would consider an increase from the present $1,260 maximum to $1,900 as income for a single person in need of assistance?

Mr. Speaker: Order. This is a question of policy which I suggest to the hon. member cannot be asked at this time in this way.

[*Translation*]

PUBLIC SERVICE

REPRESENTATIONS FROM STAFF ASSOCIATIONS ON BILINGUALISM

On the orders of the day:

Hon. Théogène Ricard (Saint-Hyacinthe-Bagot): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the right hon. Prime Minister.

Would the Prime Minister tell the house whether he has received a letter from the Canadian postal employees union complaining that their officials were not invited when the Prime Minister discussed the matter of bilingualism in the public service with the officials of the civil service association?

Mr. Speaker: Order. May I point out to the hon. member that this question was put last week and that the Prime Minister answered it.

ROYAL CANADIAN MOUNTED POLICE

MONTREAL—INABILITY TO OBTAIN FRENCH REPORT FORMS

On the orders of the day:

Mr. Maurice Allard (Sherbrooke): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Solicitor General.

Is he aware of the fact that French speaking R.C.M.P. officers, particularly in Montreal, are complaining that they are still being refused French forms to make their reports, and would he kindly give instructions in this regard?

[*English*]

Hon. L. T. Pennell (Solicitor General): This is a matter which has been under study in the department for some time, and I can advise the hon. member that it is being given active attention.

[Mr. Winkler.]

INCOME TAX

ALLOWANCE OF MUNICIPAL TAXATION ON FARM HOMES

On the orders of the day:

Mr. Lee Grills (Hastings South): Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct a question to the Minister of National Revenue. Is it the intention of the government, and in particular of his department, not to allow municipal taxes on farm homes to be considered as a farm expense against farmers' income tax?

Mr. Speaker: This is the same type of question, which I do not think should be asked at this time.

Mr. Grills: Right. Ten o'clock, Mr. Speaker.

HOUSING

CONSIDERATION OF ROYAL COMMISSION ON URBANIZATION

On the orders of the day:

Mr. Reid Scott (Danforth): Mr. Speaker, I want to direct a question to the Minister of Labour in his capacity as the minister who answers for C.M.H.C. About a year ago, in answer to a suggestion by myself, the minister said he would give consideration to recommending the appointment of a royal commission on urbanization in Canada. In view of the continually mounting problems created by urbanization, has the minister reached a decision on this suggestion and, if so, could he tell us what is his decision?

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. I suggest this question should be placed on the order paper.

AIRPORTS

VANCOUVER—REPORTED LAY-OFFS AT AIR TRAFFIC CONTROL CENTRE

On the orders of the day:

Mr. Barry Mather (New Westminster): Mr. Speaker, I wanted to direct a question to the Minister of Transport, but I see he is not in the house at the present time so perhaps some other minister could give me the information I seek. On Friday the Minister of Transport undertook, at my request, to check into the reported lay-off situation at Vancouver airport. I wonder if he has done so and, if he has, what the information is on this point; because I am still receiving wires about the alleged lay-offs.

Hon. John N. Turner (Minister without Portfolio): Mr. Speaker, I shall look into that matter and be in touch with the hon. member.

Mr. R. W. Prittie (Burnaby-Richmond): As a supplementary question, Mr. Speaker, would the Minister without Portfolio also check into the report that a strike is being threatened by the air traffic controllers at Vancouver within the next 24 hours?

Mr. Turner: I will.

ADMINISTRATION OF JUSTICE

REQUEST FOR REPORT OF COMMITTEE ON CORRECTIONS

On the orders of the day:

Mr. Ron Basford (Vancouver-Burrard): Mr. Speaker, I wish to direct a question to the Solicitor General. In view of the fact that the recent book on the trial of Steven Truscott once again raises serious questions about the effectiveness of our criminal procedures in adequately protecting the rights of citizens, will he assure us that the committee on corrections, which is now working, will speed up its work so that we can have before the house in the near future measures for a thoroughgoing reform of the Criminal Code?

Hon. L. T. Pennell (Solicitor General): Mr. Speaker, I have an appointment this Thursday with the chairman of the committee, and I will discuss with him the question raised by the hon. member.

LABOUR RELATIONS

ONTARIO—PROGRESS OF NEGOTIATIONS IN TRUCKING STRIKE

On the orders of the day:

Mr. David Lewis (York South): Mr. Speaker, I should like to address a question to the Minister of Labour and ask if he can inform the house whether any negotiations were carried on over the week end between the striking unions and the trucking firms in Ontario, and what plans, if any, there are for further negotiations this week.

Hon. J. R. Nicholson (Minister of Labour): Mr. Speaker, I understand that some negotiations have taken place during the last few days and that further negotiations are contemplated, beginning on Wednesday of this week, with the suggestion that they be sustained until some solution is found.

Mr. Lewis: As a supplementary question, can the minister inform us whether someone representing his department is present throughout these negotiations?

Mr. Nicholson: In most instances but not in all cases. I might say that I myself spent an hour and a half in Toronto discussing this matter with the provincial minister and his senior departmental officials during the latter part of last week.

NATIONAL EMPLOYMENT SERVICE

PROPOSED MOVE OF OFFICE FROM MONCTON TO HALIFAX

On the orders of the day:

Mrs. Margaret Rideout (Westmorland): Mr. Speaker, my question is addressed to the Minister of Citizenship and Immigration in his capacity as minister of manpower. Is the minister considering the representations that are being made against a proposed move of the national employment service office from Moncton to Halifax?

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. It is difficult for the Chair in a case such as this to determine whether there is any urgency. I am not sure whether this move is going to be made this week or next week, but in view of the special circumstances I might allow the question.

Hon. Jean Marchand (Minister of Citizenship and Immigration): The answer is yes, Mr. Speaker. The new regional offices for manpower are to be responsible for coordinating all the manpower services, including training, rehabilitation, placement of immigrants and so forth. The new office will not be of the same nature as the one in existence right now in Moncton. But in any event no final decision has been reached and Moncton is not going to suffer in any way from the decision we are going to take about that office.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Réal Caouette (Villeneuve): Mr. Speaker, I should like to direct a supplementary question to the future minister of Manpower.

When he says: "Steps will be taken to help persons who will eventually be displaced in the Maritime provinces to find jobs", is the minister aware of the situation prevailing in Val d'Or, Malartic, Rouyn-Noranda, where mines have or will eventually close down?

Is the department offering guidance to those workers or helping to create new industries to keep them in their own areas?

Mr. Marchand: Mr. Speaker, the department is generally informed about displaced workers and closing down of mines. The unemployment service is looking after all those problems and does solve them in many instances; in other cases it takes more time, but the situation does not escape us.

Inquiries of the Ministry

TRADE

COPPER—REQUEST FOR EXPORT RESTRICTIONS

On the orders of the day:

Mr. J.-A. Mongrain (Trois-Rivières): Mr. Speaker, as I do not know to which minister my question should be directed, I shall put it to the right hon. Prime Minister.

Has he been informed that there is a serious shortage of copper in the country? Has the government been approached on the subject of reducing exports of copper to the United States in order to keep it for Canada?

Mr. Speaker: This is a general question which should be put on the order paper.

[*English*]

GRAIN

PRINCE RUPERT, B.C.—INCREASE IN ELEVATOR CAPACITY

On the orders of the day:

Mr. Frank Howard (Skeena): Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct a question to the Minister of Northern Affairs and preface it by saying I posed the question to his colleague the Minister of Agriculture on Friday, but he preferred to leave the answer to the minister of northern affairs. I now ask the same question that I asked on Friday. Has the government as yet made a favourable decision about an extension of the grain elevator in Prince Rupert?

Hon. J. J. Greene (Minister of Agriculture): Mr. Speaker, there is no final decision. The tenders that came in with respect to that particular contract were extremely high and, in view of the fact that they were so high, it has been determined not to go ahead at those prices but to postpone the work until prices receded somewhat, or until we can get better prices with respect to the construction.

Mr. Ron Basford (Vancouver-Burrard): As a supplementary question, will the minister consider having the planned facility re-engineered so as to provide the same capacity at less costs?

Mr. Greene: Mr. Speaker, we would be very pleased to consider any plans which will give the same capacity at less cost.

Mr. E. Nasserden (Rosthern): Mr. Speaker, supplementary to the answer we have just had from the Minister of Agriculture regarding building costs, I want to ask the Prime Minister if it is now the position of the government that it recognizes building costs are too high in Canada?

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

[Mr. Marchand.]

[*Translation*]

THE BUDGET

INQUIRY AS TO ADVICE FROM ECONOMIC COUNCIL

On the orders of the day:

Mr. Henri Latulippe (Compton-Frontenac): Mr. Speaker, may I put a question to the Minister of Finance?

Did the economic council of Canada send him a special brief in connection with the budget he will put before the house tomorrow and is he ready to table it?

[*English*]

Hon. Mitchell Sharp (Minister of Finance): Mr. Speaker, the only advice we have received from the economic council, bearing on this point, has been published.

INDIAN AFFAIRS

RECRUITING OF GUIDES AND HOSTESSES FOR EXPO '67

On the orders of the day:

Mr. T. S. Barnett (Comox-Alberni): Mr. Speaker, I wish to direct a question to the Minister of Northern Affairs and National Resources which arises out of a press release issued by his department under date of March 23, indicating that a recruiting campaign is under way, through the cultural affairs section of the Indian Affairs branch, to recruit Indian girls to act as guides and hostesses at the Indian Affairs Pavilion at Expo '67.

I wonder whether the minister can tell the house through what channels across the country this recruitment campaign is being organized.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. This question should be placed on the order paper.

[*Translation*]

CROWN CORPORATIONS

POLYMER—LACK OF FRENCH CANADIAN DIRECTORS

On the orders of the day:

Hon. Jean Marchand (Minister of Citizenship and Immigration): Mr. Speaker, last Friday the hon. member for Lapointe (Mr. Grégoire) stated in the house that the Polymer Corporation has no French Canadian director. Having looked into the matter, I should like to say that there is one, that is Mr. Eugene Laflamme, of Quebec city, whose address is 410—

Mr. Gilles Grégoire (Lapointe): I rise on a question of privilege, Mr. Speaker. I referred to the "bureau de direction", not the "conseil d'administration". The "bureau des directeurs" of the Polymer Corporation if made up of businessmen, including the president of Aluminum Company, while Mr. Eugène Laflamme is an "administrator". I said the "bureau des directeurs", on which there is not one French Canadian.

Mr. Speaker: Order. I wonder whether the minister was speaking on a question of privilege, on a point of order, or whether he had put a question. In any case, I doubt that he can make a statement at this time, and I point out to the hon. member for Lapointe that he has nevertheless succeeded in correcting the situation as he wanted.

Mr. Grégoire: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a question of privilege, following the minister's statement—

Mr. Speaker: Order. It seems to me that the hon. member, even if he had a question of privilege, which I doubt very much, has explained the situation and I suggest to him that we could readily conclude the discussion at this time.

Mr. Grégoire: On a question of privilege, Mr. Speaker. The Minister of Citizenship and Immigration stated that I had misled the house. That is my question of privilege. Let the minister read what I said last Friday and he will find that I stated that there were no French Canadians on the "bureau de direction". This is still true, and I invite the minister to come to picket the headquarters, as he promised he would.

Mr. Speaker: Order. The hon. member for Calgary North.

[*Later:*]

Mr. Grégoire: Mr. Speaker, may I put a question to the Minister of Citizenship and Immigration?

So as not to mislead the people as the minister just did, could the minister undertake to look into the whole situation concerning the Polymer corporation?

Mr. Speaker: Order.

Mr. Grégoire: Mr. Speaker, may I put a question to the Minister of Industry and Minister of Defence Production, who is responsible for the Polymer corporation?

Since there are no French Canadians on the "bureau de direction" of this corporation, which scandalizes the Minister of Citizenship and Immigration (Mr. Marchand), could the minister tell us whether he will appoint one?

Mr. Réal Caouette (Villeneuve): Mr. Speaker, I should like to put a question to the Minister of Citizenship and Immigration.

Does the minister admit that he blundered a moment ago when he referred to—

Mr. Speaker: Order.

[*English*]

THE CANADIAN ECONOMY

REPORTED STATEMENT BY IMMIGRATION MINISTER ON INFLATION CONTROL

On the orders of the day:

Hon. D. S. Harkness (Calgary North): Mr. Speaker, I should like to direct my question to the Minister of Citizenship and Immigration. Will the minister tell the house about the unpopular measures the government is about to take to control inflation, to which he made reference at a meeting in Quebec over the week end?

[*Translation*]

Hon. Jean Marchand (Minister of Citizenship and Immigration): Mr. Speaker, if the hon. member would be kind enough to point out to me to which unpopular measures he is referring, I could answer him. But I cannot think of any just now. Which is the unpopular measure?

[*English*]

[*Later:*]

Mr. Harkness: Mr. Speaker, now that the Minister of Citizenship and Immigration has seen the headline in Saturday's Toronto *Star* regarding the measures that he hinted should be taken, I wonder whether he can make a statement?

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. I do not think it is incumbent upon the minister to make that kind of a statement in answer to the hon. member's question.

[*Translation*]

AGRICULTURE

REQUEST FOR STATEMENT ON REMAINDER OF DAIRY POLICY

On the orders of the day:

Mr. Clément Vincent (Nicolet-Yamaska): Mr. Speaker, may I put a question to the Minister of Agriculture?

Can the minister tell us when he intends to complete the dairy program he announced last week and inform us about the government's intentions with regard to the price of cheese, powdered milk and casein?

Inquiries of the Ministry

[*English*]

Hon. J. J. Greene (Minister of Agriculture): Those are decisions of the stabilization board, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Vincent: Mr. Speaker, may I ask a supplementary question?

In view of the fact that the new dairy program will come into force this week, is it the intention of the minister to make known the decisions of the Agricultural Stabilization Board before April 1?

[*English*]

Mr. Greene: Mr. Speaker, if the hon. member will read the statements that were put out last week I think he will find that they contain the information.

EXTERNAL AFFAIRS

RHODESIA—POSSIBLE CONFERENCE RESPECTING SANCTIONS

On the orders of the day:

Hon. Gordon Churchill (Winnipeg South Centre): Mr. Speaker, I should like to ask the Secretary of State for External Affairs whether he is considering the possibility of holding conferences with regard to Rhodesia, with the view of altering some of the punitive measures that Canada has taken against that country which now appear not to have been successful?

Hon. Paul Martin (Secretary of State for External Affairs): No, sir.

Mr. Churchill: I should like to ask another question of the Secretary of State for External Affairs, who is not as loquacious as he normally is. Is Canada participating in any way in radio broadcasts to Rhodesia which are antagonistic to the Smith regime?

Mr. Martin (Essex East): I know of no such broadcasts, Mr. Speaker.

FINANCE

REQUEST FOR TABLING OF AIDE-MEMOIRE ON UNITED STATES GUIDE LINES

On the orders of the day:

Mr. T. C. Douglas (Burnaby-Coquitlam): Mr. Speaker, on three occasions the Secretary of State for External Affairs has promised to table the aide-memoire to the United States regarding changes in S.E.C. regulations. I should like to ask him whether he will be ready to table it soon.

[Mr. Vincent.]

Hon. Paul Martin (Secretary of State for External Affairs): Mr. Speaker, I thank the hon. member for jogging my memory. I will table it tomorrow.

PUBLIC SERVICE

APPOINTMENT OF PERSONS WHO HAVE CONTRAVENED ELECTIONS ACT

On the orders of the day:

Mr. Stanley Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Prime Minister. Is the Prime Minister aware of the fact that sessional paper No. 1-B, tabled on Friday, lists the names of a number of people who are in violation of the Canada Elections Act, and that three or four of them are persons the government has appointed to government positions? Does he not think something should be done to rectify this situation?

Right Hon. L. B. Pearson (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, I shall be glad to look into that matter right away.

HIGHWAY SAFETY

MEETING OF MINISTER WITH PRESIDENT OF CHRYSLER CORPORATION

On the orders of the day:

Mr. Heward Grafftey (Brome-Missisquoi): Mr. Speaker, I should like to direct a question to the Minister of Industry. During his meeting this morning with Mr. Todgham, president of the Chrysler Corporation and the Canadian Motor Vehicles Manufacturing Association, was the subject of automobile safety discussed relating to the inclusion of proven safety features at the production level, and can the minister report any progress in this regard?

Hon. C. M. Drury (Minister of Industry): Mr. Speaker, that was not the purpose of our meeting this morning.

CRIMINAL CODE

PROPOSED AMENDMENT REGARDING CAPITAL PUNISHMENT

The house resumed, from Thursday, March 24, consideration of the motion of Messrs. Byrne, Nugent, Scott (Danforth) and Stanbury:

Resolved, that it is expedient to introduce a measure to amend the Criminal Code for the purpose of

(a) abolishing the death penalty in respect of all offences under that act;

(b) substituting a mandatory sentence of life imprisonment in those cases where the death penalty is now mandatory; and

(c) providing that no person upon whom a mandatory sentence of life imprisonment is imposed shall be released from imprisonment without the prior approval of the governor in council.

Mr. R. N. Thompson (Red Deer): Mr. Speaker, at the outset, as we resume consideration of the motion concerning the abolition of capital punishment, I want to say that it is an honour and privilege to take part in this debate. The question of capital punishment has been brought to the attention of the nation as never before, and as a result the eyes of Canadians across the nation are focussed on this debate.

It is no light matter for any one of us to be part of a decision which involves the lives of other human beings. Life moves forward constantly, and with it progress. The famous Danish critic, Kierkegaard said "Life can only be understood backwards; but it must be lived forwards."

• (3:20 p.m.)

Therefore we must seek to learn from the past in order that we may live safely and justly in the future. The spirit of the times is for change. Change is imperative if we would survive. The pattern of living things is for change. However, acknowledging that, I do not believe it means that we should reject those basic moral principles which have been the warp and woof of our heritage. I believe it is our duty to be progressive enough to understand the inevitability of change but conservative enough to accept the need for the continuity of basic principles particularly as they relate to fixed values and standards.

The question of capital punishment is one which arouses emotion in each of us. I am grateful for this non-partisan debate on the basis of personal conviction. I believe it has been of a very high standard and a credit to the house. Abolitionists and retentionists both claim evidence to support their arguments. Conflicting evidence confuses the picture. In my opinion the reason there is no convincing evidence on the subject is that it is difficult to measure man's mind. Therefore what we say is basically for the record as we explain the reason for our personal votes.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. I am sorry to interrupt the hon. member but conversations are taking place in the chamber which make it very difficult to follow the hon. member.

Mr. Thompson: Before proceeding further with the reasons for my own stand I must state that I cannot support the motion before us because I am convinced that it would be wrong to abolish the death penalty completely. It is interesting to note that while this motion would provide, if passed, for the abolition of the death penalty under the Criminal Code, it does not have this effect with regard to the death penalty as provided in other statutes. I am thinking specifically of the National Defence Act, sections 66,67,68,69, 70 and 71. It is a fact that section 66 of the National Defence Act makes the death penalty mandatory for certain offences against the state.

I cannot accept the statement repeated by several in this debate that to retain the death penalty is to cling to a hangover from the barbaric past. In my Christian faith I believe that human life is most sacred. Man was created in the image of God. In the commandments of Moses I am told by God not to kill. When others in my society accept this command with me, then I have personal safety of life as do my family and neighbours.

The sanctity of human life cannot be questioned. Christ has told us to love our neighbours. Murder, the taking of life, is not to be condoned. It is therefore the continuing responsibility of the Christian to interpret to those about us that every human being must have as his basic right not only justice before the law but also our personal understanding, respect and concern because he, like me, is a human being and our brother under one God, Creator of us all.

However, in determining my own stand on the question of abolition versus retention I cannot rely entirely on my own judgment. There are still those old-fashioned enough, and I am one of them, who believe that God has provided in His Word guidance to meet every problem which may confront us. In James 1:5 we read:

> If any of you lack wisdom, let him ask of God, that giveth to all men liberally, and upbraideth not; and it shall be given him.

To me, at the root of every question the Scriptures must be our final authority, not my opinion or someone else's. It is not the reasoning of one who differs with me which must be my final guide. It is not the norm of what is considered the lowest common denominator of custom or current practice. It is not even what the church itself teaches, for again it is the Bible, not the church, which is the final authority. In my understanding of Scripture I find that capital punishment was

intended by God as a penalty for those who take law and justice into their own hands or who for personal gain wilfully take the life of another person.

Prior to the days of Noah there was no death penalty. When Cain killed his brother Abel there was no such law and no such sentence was passed. He was banished from the Garden for life. Following this the descendants of Cain became part of a society which was grossly corrupt, rotten with sin and violence, and God sent death universally upon all but one family. Following the flood God says in Genesis 9:6:

> Who so sheddeth man's blood, by man shall his blood be shed; for in the image of God made he man.

Exodus 21:12 says the same thing:

> He that smiteth a man, so that he die, shall be surely put to death.

Significantly this passage in many Bibles falls on the same page as the Ten Commandments which are the basis of our Canadian law and fundamental to the moral conduct of the individual. Some argue that the New Testament has changed this Old Testament teaching. They say the New Testament has replaced the "eye for an eye" philosophy with an ethic of love. However, the ethic of love theme of the New Testament applies only on a person to person basis, as do the Ten Commandments. The command to turn the other cheek cannot apply to law enforcement by the state; otherwise lawlessness would be encouraged. The right of the state to punish with death is more expressly established in chapter 13 of Romans, verses 1 to 5. Here the apostle Paul describes the law enforcement officials as "ministers of God" who "bear not the sword in vain".

Many Bible commentators, much more wise in their understanding of the Scriptures than myself, interpret this passage as supporting capital punishment. Among them are such men as Luther, Calvin, Hodge, Clarke, Moule, Meyer and Studd. Capital punishment is the traditional Christian position. It was also held by the Roman Catholic theologian, Thomas Aquinas. According to the Romans' passage, God gave the state the power of death for two reasons, first, to satisfy the demands of God's justice and, second, to serve as a protection to society by deterring crime in the future.

When the state takes the life of a capital offender it does so as God's agent, having received express authority from God. In the performance of law enforcement law officials

[Mr. Thompson.]

are likewise responsible. Therefore it is as much a dereliction of duty for law officials to execute men who do not deserve death as it is to fail to execute criminals who deserve it. That does not mean that every capital offender must be executed. Far from it. The Bible permits and encourages justice to be tempered by mercy at times but not all the time.

Capital punishment is necessary for the good of society. I agree with Father W. J. Ring who said recently:

> The whole function of government is to protect and to advance the common good, the welfare, of the civil community as a complete entity. This it does by legislation through the exercise of civil authority both in the making of laws for the common good and in seeing to it that the laws are kept by means of adequate and appropriate sanctions. Moreover, since man is by nature, and not simply by choice a civil animal, and his nature as such is from God, then God also is the source, in this sense, of the civil authority without which the common good and, consequently, the individual good of the citizen, cannot be achieved. Civil authority, then, is the exercise of divine authority in the civil sphere. It was for this reason, for example, that St. Paul could tell his people to be subject to their rulers.
>
> Now since the government is charged with the duty of protecting and defending the common good it has, then, the right to use whatever legitimate means are required to preserve the common good which, after all, can only be the physical, emotional, moral and intellectual welfare of the civil community as a complete entity.

• (3:30 p.m.)

> Consequently, it is obvious that the government has the right and the duty to defend the civil community from aggression from without, as in time of war, or from aggression from within, as from treason and the like. This is so, even though such a defence of the community may involve the taking of the life of the aggressor. Surely, if by way of the just defence of his own life a given citizen may take the life of one who is unjustly attacking him, *a fortiori*, the civil community, through the agency of government, may do the same thing when the life of the community is so endangered. A murderer is precisely that, an unjust aggressor with regard to the community, for in taking into his own hands the unlawful execution of another human being in this fashion he has thereby made an attack on the life of the community itself.

Dr. James M. Gray, the noted Bible scholar and Christian statesman of our parents' day, stated it well when he said:

> The death penalty has been abused in almost all the countries of the world, but this does not justify its abolition in cases of premeditated homicide; and unwillingness to apply to the criminal the pain of death ordained by God himself, the author of life, always tends to the increase of crime and gives loose rein to personal vengeance. The inviolability of human life means that the life of a human being is a thing so sacred that he who takes it without just cause must pay for it with his own in amends to outraged justice, both human and divine. When, therefore, law makers abolish the death penalty for capital crimes, they

strike a blow at the very source and centre of real God-ordained government, and transgress an unrepealed law of God for the good of the race.

God placed upon man the great responsibility of self-government. This responsibility has never been taken away. The authority of the state is subject to the sovereignty of God and it is man's duty to obey in all the instructions He has given and for this reason man has no authority to make his own choice against that of God. Clearly the commandment is that the state has the right to administer capital punishment for premeditated, wilful murder, and I agree with the present Criminal Code's differentiation between capital and non-capital murder, even as it is agreed that the state has the authority that it has to administer lesser punishment for lesser crimes.

It is not correct to grant this responsibility as retribution or revenge. Retribution and state authority must be differentiated. The issue is between the administration of justice by the state and the individual. Punishment for a crime is the responsibility of the state; it is clearly the state's prerogative. There are those who have said in this debate that reformation and rehabilitation are the primary objectives of punishment. This therapeutic aspect is an important part but not all of it. Punishment also must have as its objective the cleansing and protection of society and the vindication of justice.

"Thou shalt not kill" is probably more correctly stated as "Thou shalt not murder." Murder is always killing, but killing is not always murder. Capital punishment is killing but it is not murder. It is, rather, the penalty for murder. Scripture defines murder: If a man hate his neighbour, and lie in wait for him, and rise up against him, and smite him mortally that he die—that is capital murder. In other words, murder is the direct result of unlawfully planning the death of another person, or where one person dies as a result of another person seeking to fulfil his own passions of greed or sex. It is worthy of note that the majority of today's murders fall into either of these two groupings. Perhaps the most common of the two is the gangster murder by the professional criminal.

The recent murder of lawyer Payette of Montreal is a good example, or the lime pit murders of the underworld in Quebec. Here the murderers make killing their business. They are men who weigh the benefits and the risks. They may even have their legal advisers. They, by specific intent, make a decision to eliminate certain people. Society, the common good, must be protected from such and capital punishment is the only effective penalty. Surely such criminals are not worthy of some therapeutic reform. I cannot but agree with former Royal Canadian Mounted Police Commissioner L. H. Nicholson, who said:

The criminal fraternity generally would welcome the abolition of capital punishment. I think the time has not yet come to abolish capital punishment.

The inquiry into the security of the nation promised by the Prime Minister (Mr. Pearson) may well be more important than any of the recent inquiries. Has international crime, the underworld of gangsterism, successfully penetrated the fibres of our society? Perhaps even the Munsinger inquiry has its importance in determining whether or not the real threat of the underworld posed itself in the person of a party call girl.

It is imperative that the channels of justice do everything in their power to make sure that men who are not guilty of murder do not die. As one regards the current book about the trial of Steven Truscott one wonders if in this case justice did do all it should have. The Bible warns about such cases.

The murderer shall be put to death by the mouth of witnesses: but one witness shall not testify against any person to cause him to die.

The moral law of God is perfect. Human beings are not perfect and do make mistakes. You and I do, we all do. However, I do not believe we should condemn what is sound law simply because of the imperfections and mistakes of human beings. Our society will be strengthened if we seek to uphold and honour the moral laws of God rather than repudiate and abolish them.

I respect the appeal the abolitionists have made in this debate. However, I believe their suggested solution is one which will have far greater and more serious consequences than those which the specific problem presents to us now. There are a few comments I should like to make regarding some of the arguments presented by those who support abolition.

First, it is said that capital punishment is not a deterrent. If capital punishment appears to be not much of a deterrent the reason is that a lot of the sting has been taken out of it. Although crime has steadily increased the use of the death penalty has steadily decreased. Practice in Canada during recent years is equivalent to the abolition of

capital punishment. It is for this reason that I believe the resolution before us must be permitted to come to a vote. I had intended at first to move an amendment but as the debate has progressed I have become convinced that the question has been well put. This debate, therefore, should be terminated without undue extension by a specific vote.

It is argued also that society should be concerned about the redemption of the criminal, a redemption that might be prevented by an execution. However, by the same argument society should be concerned for the safety and welfare of potential murder and rape victims. One of Caryl Chessman's targets, a 17 year old girl, was subjected to brutal depravity for four hours. Twelve years later she was still in a trance with little hope of recovery. Jack Graham blew up an airliner containing his mother and 43 innocent victims. How much opportunity did these victims have to prepare for eternity, for eternal redemption?

On the other hand, there needs to be more concern for crime prevention. Is it reasonable to campaign strongly for the possibility of the redemption of murderers, most of whom have a long record of violent crime, while millions of pliable minds watch men and women being stabbed, shot, strangled, drowned, poisoned, and maltreated in almost every possible way as often as 20 times a day on television? If those who lead the movements for abolition are really concerned for the sacredness of life they should do something about the disrespect shown for life on television programs and in movies, which do so much to influence pliable minds.

It appears that with a decrease in the severity of punishment for criminals comes a corresponding increase in crime and the suffering of the innocent. In recent years, for example, the number of policemen murdered by felons has been larger than the number of felons executed by the state. It is argued that the administration of capital punishment is attended by many abuses. This may be so. The same can be said of the administration of Christian churches. Do we, therefore, eliminate the Christian churches? No, we try to eliminate the abuse. The same appproach applies to the abuses of capital punishment.

Abolitionists make much of the loss of innocent lives through the death penalty. They overlook the fact, however, that more innocent lives have been lost through non-executed criminals who remained alive to commit more crimes than through executed non-criminals.

[Mr. Thompson.]

It has been said that the science of penology as well as the improvements in standards of social work and law enforcement have advanced to the point where society is protected to a greater extent than by the imposition of capital punishment. It is true that we have more effective police forces and more thorough rehabilitation of criminals. However, of the 14 states in the United States which abolished capital punishment prior to 1962, 8 have reinstituted it. Penology does give more protection now than formerly against criminals committing crimes in the future, but it cannot protect against persons committing crime in the first instance.

• (3:40 p.m.)

Every one of us, Mr. Speaker, still reflects the image of God. To murder a man is still an outrage, an outrage against God, the Creator, against man, the victim, against the victim's loved ones, against society and against the institution of government. Because life is sacred, Mr. Speaker, life must be protected against maltreatment and murder. Policemen charged with the enforcing of the laws of the state must have the right to kill in self-defence or in the interest of law enforcement. The state must punish severely, at times with death, those who wilfully disregard the sacredness of the lives of others. I believe this is necessary for the general good of society.

Mr. G. W. Baldwin (Peace River): Mr. Speaker, let me say at once that I would join only to a very limited extent with what has been said by the hon. member for Red Deer (Mr. Thompson), but I do agree with him with regard to the quality of this debate. In answer to those who have made accusations in respect of standard of debate in this house I say that the strength of argument, exercised with restraint, and the eloquence which has gone hand in hand with common sense have been a great tribute to the members who have participated during the two days through which this debate has progressed. The subject is a tremendously difficult one. I hasten at once to say that I completely disagree with the hon. member for Red Deer as to his conclusion, the way in which he has arrived at his conclusion and as to the way he is going to vote.

One can not dismiss from one's mind, Mr. Speaker, all of the wisdom which lies within the four corners of the Scriptures, but in respect of the religious considerations in regard to this matter God has endowed me with some intelligence and set me upon a path

along which I have derived some experience. In coming to a decision in an issue of this kind I would be derelict in my duty if I failed to take into consideration the knowledge and experience I have derived during the course of my life and my career. Having done this, I can come to no other conclusion, Mr. Speaker, than that I must support this resolution.

I have taken a little time to look through the debates of Wednesday and Thursday of last week and I think a rather remarkable phenomenon appears from a reading of what has been said. I am particularly interested in what has been said by those who have taken the opposite view to mine and who, generally, seem to favour retention. The phenomenon is this, Mr. Speaker. If you examine carefully what most of these members have said—this applies particularly to those who appear at first blush to have been very strong proponents of a measure of retention—you will find somewhere in their speeches indications of doubt, of qualification, of conditional acceptance. In my opinion, if there is to be an onus in an issue of this kind the onus should be upon those who urge that capital punishment be retained. I think the act of taking life is so unnatural, so abnormal and so repugnant that those who argue even for the right of the state to take life must be prepared to discharge that onus.

Here, Mr. Speaker, we find in this chamber those who argue for the retention of capital punishment qualifying their statements. I have a few of the comments before me but I am not going to relate them to the hon. members who made them. One hon. member said: "The supreme penalty should be enacted only after guilt is established beyond a shadow of a doubt and only for wanton, wilful and premeditated murder".

As you know, Mr. Speaker, and as other hon. members know, today guilt must be established in any criminal offence beyond a reasonable doubt. If capital punishment were to be inflicted only upon those who were convicted within the four corners of this qualification, I think capital punishment would never be carried out. The hon. member said that guilt must be established "beyond a shadow of a doubt". This shadow of a doubt must be applied to each specific area of the charge. It must be established beyond a shadow of a doubt that it was wanton murder, that it was wilful murder and that it was premeditated murder. The hon. member who made that statement may not know it but I suggest he has a strong doubt in his own mind as to the necessity of preserving capital punishment.

Another hon. member said: "So long as human sciences are what they are I think it might be wise to wait". Then there is the qualification: "Let us not do it now; let us wait a little while. Let us have another parliament abolish capital punishment." Another hon. member said: "I have reached the conclusion that now is not the time to abolish capital punishment". Another hon. member said: "I think it must be retained because we are not ready for abolition". And so it goes.

I would direct my remarks, Mr. Speaker, to those hon. members who are still wrestling with their consciences, those hon. members who are gripped in the agony of irresolution in an attempt to come to a proper decision in this matter. I suggest that if those who are urging that capital punishment must be retained can do so only in qualified terms of this kind, then they have failed to establish a case by that standard which we in this chamber should expect in an issue of this sort.

Let it be remembered, Mr. Speaker, that in this debate we are holding in our hands the highest of all human responsibilities, that of life and death. It is for us to lay down the rules which can spin out the golden thread of life or snap it off each time a trapdoor opens to hurl a living, breathing human being into the darkness of eternity. I know there are those who say and are quite entitled to say that we will do this only to those who in turn have taken life.

But this distinction must be made. Ours will not be the tortured, twisted and unnatural action, sometimes only an emotional muscular reflex, which comes from the gloomy recesses of the mind of man who has killed. Ours is, or should be, the calm, reasoned, cold and calculated volition, the collective act of those who are the repository of the wisdom of all the people in the state. For us there can be no refinements, no subtleties, no distinctions, no recommendation for mercy, no excuse. Let this be understood.

I suggest that there can be no clearer way of bringing this home to the attention of the house than to put it this way. If we fail to pass this measure substantially in its present form, then whether we like it or not we are directly and intimately concerned with all the consequences. It is of no avail to say that the law is there and that it ought to be a matter

of applying it, of letting the law taking its course. We are the law. We make the law; we change the law or we leave the law relating to capital punishment as it is. I suggest that if we retain capital punishment we must be prepared in our minds to spend the last hours with those who are condemned and awaiting execution, to walk with them to the scaffold, to watch the hangman securing the noose, and to wait for the end. We are a part of this and we cannot rationalize or raise specious arguments to avoid this consequence.

I say this, Mr. Speaker, as solemnly as I can. The decision in an issue of this kind, made by the yeas and the nays which will be cast when we vote on this resolution, cannot be supported on anything but our own consciences. We should listen to our constituents, read the writings of others and review the debate not only on this particular resolution but on others which have gone before. This is right and this we can and must do. But the ultimate decision must be made by each one of us in the loneliness of his own conscience.

• (3:50 p.m.)

Mention has been made of the fact that there has been a possibility of error creeping into criminal trials and this has been linked to the Truscott case. Generally speaking, I have confidence in our courts, in our judges and in our system of justice, and my view in this regard is derived from almost 40 years of practising law mainly in the criminal courts of this land. But, Mr. Speaker, this is only relative praise. Our system is not perfect. In my opinion it is only the least imperfect system of any systems of justice that I know. There is room for error. There have been miscarriages of justice. Innocent men have been sent to jail. Men have been hanged when the sentence imposed on them should have been reduced. Also, I believe innocent men have been executed.

However, I would rather discuss the extension of this principle to something distinct from though related to the simple black or white of guilty or not guilty. Let there be a certain set of facts which could be, and I emphasize the words "could be", proved. Does this mean that under any possible conditions the same result, the same verdict, the same sentence would always be brought about? By no means. There are wide possibilities for variation.

The choice of the charge to be laid is a choice which lies within the range of an individual or within the range of several individuals. For example, in my own province of Alberta it is the Attorney General who decides on the basis of a certain set of facts which have been brought out in a preliminary hearing whether the charge will be manslaughter, non-capital murder or capital murder. Also of importance are the character of the judge, the make-up of the jury, the character, ability, experience and background of counsel for the defence and to a lesser extent of crown counsel.

I say on my full responsibility and with all the solemnity I can command, basing my opinion in large measure on my own personal knowledge, that out of the same set of facts it is likely and in fact possible that different combinations of these external collateral conditions can bring about a verdict of not guilty, a verdict of guilty of manslaughter, a verdict of guilty of non-capital murder, a verdict of guilty of capital murder with a recommendation for mercy or a verdict of guilty of capital murder with execution to follow. I have always had an uneasy feeling, despite the strides we have made in our system of jurisdprudence and in spite of the progress we have made in the administration of justice, that in our trials and in our administration of justice there still remains much of the quality of a gamble. There still remains something of the nature of a game of roulette. We can never be certain that the ball is going to drop into the proper slot.

One is tempted to draw on one's personal experience to support this view. At the same time, Mr. Speaker, I can do no better than to refer to an incident in a most fascinating book called "For the Defence", which is a biography of the great English advocate, Sir Edward Marshall Hall, superbly put together by another lawyer, Edward Marjoribanks. In the book it is set out how in one of his earlier cases Marshall Hall defended a young working girl who had been seduced by a married man. She bore an illegitimate child. Soon after the birth of the child she told the nurse not to mind the baby but to attend to her, the mother. Ten days later the young mother was sitting with the nurse and her baby and said, "How can anyone get rid of a baby like that?" Shortly afterward the mother took the baby up to bed and the child was never again seen alive.

The police traced the mother and an inspector took a statement from her in which she said, "I will tell you the truth. I killed it. I did not know what to do with it. I put it in a box. You will find it up there." The mother

was charged with wilful murder and admitted the charge. The law being what it was, she was indicted for murder. Her counsel called no evidence and his entire defence was elicited through cross-examination.

The mother's remark at the confinement was accounted for by the fact that she had not seen the child and her maternal instincts had not been aroused. Her remark about getting rid of the baby was shown in a completely new light when the two nurses called by the prosecution admitted that the emphasis fell upon the word "Can" and that the actual words were "How can anyone get rid of a little baby like this?" This, together with the admission that the mother was kissing and feeding her child, completely contradicted the interpretation suggested by the prosecution.

As to the other statement attributed to the mother, the whole meaning of it is changed by making the middle sentence refer to the last part and not to the first. In other words, having killed the child accidentally by overlaying it in bed she admitted this and then said she did not know what to do with it and had put it in a box. As to the admission of wilful murder, the inspector admitted that he had made a mistake and had never charged her with wilful murder, but merely with causing the death of the child.

In that case a brilliant defence counsel with a sense of timing and drama who had recently suffered a similar tragedy in his own life, conducted the defence. Presiding at the trial was an outstanding and sympathetic judge and a sympathetic jury. The verdict was the right one. However, I do suggest it is quite possible, and in another case it might have happened, that had counsel for the defence attempted to exclude the statements he would have been unsuccessful and the result would have been, as happens in eight cases out of ten, a verdict of murder.

This, of course, is a case where justice was done. However, I can recall a case in which I participated some years ago, Mr. Speaker, where a young boy of 19 was tried, convicted and ultimately executed. This happened well over 30 years ago. In that particular case the evidence was strongly consistent, in my opinion, with insanity and certainly with a verdict of manslaughter. The jury brought in a verdict of guilty of murder with a strong recommendation for mercy. The boy was ultimately executed.

Many years later I had the opportunity to discuss this case with one of the jurors who had come to see me. He told me that the trial jury had been dominated by one strong-minded individual who had an almost pathological aversion to any crime which included robbery and violence. It happened that in this case robbery with violence was not the motive. At least, it was not the primary motive. It happened that after the crime the boy had put on a pair of pants and a shirt belonging to the deceased. In the pants was 50 cents. It was in this sense that this man on the jury took it that there had been robbery with violence and he dominated the proceedings to such an extent that the verdict of guilty of murder was brought in. The rest of jurors salved their consciences by bringing in a recommendation for mercy which was not acted on. The boy was hanged.

This sort of thing does happen in our murder trials. In our system of penology and parole there is always some hope for righting a wrong and for making the punishment fit the crime, if necessary after the event. But we cannot awake the dead to say that we are sorry, that we must have made a mistake and that we really did not mean to hang you. I suggest that on vagaries such as this, on such slender reeds as this, rests the issue of life and death. Can we safely entrust to these arrangements the lives of any members of our society? True, they are imperfect members but imperfect members of an imperfect society for which we must at least accept our share of collective responsibility.

All of us have, with concern and with anxiety, studied the history of this grizzly subject of capital punishment and I conclude on this note, Mr. Speaker. We must conclude that there has been a slow but inexorable move toward the lessening of the use of this barbaric and outmoded instrument of execution which, despite arguments to the contrary, is still in the minds of too many people the weapon of retribution and vengeance. Can anyone really doubt that the end result of these proceedings will be, as in other civilized states, the abolition of the death penalty? Why then should Canada be among the last to act in its abolition? Mr. Speaker, let us do it now.

• (4:00 p.m.)

Hon. Judy V. LaMarsh (Secretary of State): Mr. Speaker, I am happy to have this opportunity to take part in the debate, not, as must be obvious to all hon. members, as a member of the cabinet but as a member of the House of Commons speaking on a private member's

resolution and speaking as a matter of conscience. Throughout my remarks, which I anticipate will be brief, I will try not to reflect in any way upon matters which I have learned as a Privy Councillor and member of the government though it will be appreciated that it is difficult to set aside such experience.

If one must characterize one's position in this debate, my views are somewhere between those of the last two speakers. If you look at the subject from the point of view of the hon. member for Peace River (Mr. Baldwin) I am a retentionist; if you look at it from the point of view of the hon. member for Red Deer (Mr. Thompson) I am an abolitionist.

Murder is foul whenever it occurs. In the scale of our crimes it is and has always been the highest, the most hideous and the most hated by our people. Throughout the history of Canada and even before, by reason of the form of law we have followed many punishments have been exacted upon those who have taken the lives of others, some of them so horrible that nowadays we can hardly believe that sentient men and women would resort to drawing and quartering, rending limb from limb and similar penalties. We have a scale of punishment for every offence under the law. Our laws are framed for the preservation of the balance of our society and, of course, to protect our social structure. We attach different penalties to different offences, ranging from a kind of supervision, something we call a suspension of a sentence, through monetary fines and periods of incarceration to the death penalty which we now retain as the final punishment for the taking of a life.

The temptation is easy to take a Biblical approach and to characterize any retentionist as a person who requires only that "vengeance be mine". Yet I think the word "vengeance" probably does not apply to anyone in our society with the possible exception of a person who feels himself or herself individually aggrieved, a person who is likely to be a close relative of a murder victim. We feel gradations of revulsion with regard to crimes. We feel gradations of revulsion even about civil matters involving offences against society. It seems to me—and I say this for the peace of my conscience—that there are some crimes, some kinds of murder which cry out for the ultimate penalty. Again, this is not a matter of wreaking vengeance but an expression of a punishment which is the top of the scale, the only way in which in our society we can move to keep our social structure as we would have it. This means there are cases of willful killing for which I would not require the death penalty to be meted out. When I spoke in this chamber in 1961 while the hon. member for Kamloops (Mr. Fulton) was minister of justice it may be recalled that when killings were being divided into capital and non-capital murder it was a suggestion of mine that the murder of a prison official should be regarded as a type of capital murder.

It seems to me that if we are to retain our social structure positive measures must be taken to protect men such as police officers who risk their lives for our protection. Measures must be taken to protect our prison guards, those ill-paid individuals who need to be constantly on the qui vive to protect society from the occupants of prison cells. Then there must be some means of protecting society against those who commit murder for the second time. I believe this latter category is rare. I believe experience has shown that only in very few instances do people acquire a taste for killing and then kill again. But records show that such cases exist.

In these three categories it seems to me society needs the death penalty, bearing always in mind that I speak of those who are sane, of those who have not successfully raised the defence of insanity. Speaking from my own conscience, I believe the death penalty should be imposed for these classes of murder.

What I say in this regard is nothing new. Many hon. members have singled out the same classes of people. But, since I believe there must be a gradation of penalty to correspond with a gradation of crime, my conscience compels me to speak about a special kind of murder, revulsion to which may arise, I will readily admit, as much from the fact of my own sex as from my experience of 16 years at the bar. It is a crime so foul and it causes such revulsion that I do not in any circumstances hold out against the retention of the death penalty for those who rape and murder small children. The outrage felt by a family is to be expected. The outrage of society follows, not because one wants to forms a lynch party and destroy the person responsible. Most Canadians are, I believe, not so uncivilized; our veneer is deeper than that. But we have, so far as I know, no records of women attacking infant males and causing their deaths. Perhaps nature militates against it.

[Miss LaMarsh.]

Attacks on young female children by men who are sane within the definition of our law have, I believe, been increasing rather than diminishing, and by far the greater number of children so attacked are destroyed, not by the attack itself but by the deliberate decision of the attacker so as to protect himself against apprehension. The fact that there are many such rape-murders of small children may be cited by abolitionists as proof of the fact that the death penalty which is now imposed is no deterrent. In my years at the bar I have heard this question of deterrence argued back and forth. I have read the figures which were produced for all hon. members and for the public by the Department of Justice last summer. I have read and studied the murder statistics published recently by the Dominion Bureau of Statistics covering the last few years in Canada. I have done this, and I confess that so far as I am concerned I remain convinced that for this most heinous crime this most heinous penalty must remain.

Perhaps we could protect many who are charged—it may be falsely—with this and other capital crimes by making a psychiatric report mandatory. At the present time it is not mandatory for someone who is charged with capital murder to undergo a psychiatric examination. If a defence counsel is instructed to do so and if the defendant can afford it, he can always retain an alienist and ask him to consider an accused who lies in a cell. His cursory examination may take no more than half an hour.

• (4:10 p.m.)

If there is some reason, so far as the Crown is concerned, to believe that there is something wrong with the accused the Crown, of course, may always obtain a psychiatric report. But I think we should be careful, no matter how archaic our definition of insanity may be, that at least within the limits of the law as framed no one, by reason of lack of opportunity, should be denied the defence of insanity when appropriate.

Perhaps also, if we are to retain capital punishment in any form, we must consider something which so far as I am aware has not been attacked by legislatures, and that is the prerogative right of mercy of the sovereign. It has passed now and resides in the executive body of the cabinet. So far as I am aware from what I have been able to find to read about it, it is unfettered in this jurisdiction and elsewhere and depends upon the minds, the consciences, the hearts, even sometimes the number of those present who are exercising the prerogative right of mercy. Perhaps this parliament would feel that now is the time to curb that right, now is the time to detail when and in what circumstances the law should be interfered with rather than be carried out.

We have error in our courts. There is no question of that. No lawyer who sits in this chamber or practices in any court of the land will say that there have not been errors in the cases he lost, and some tragic ones. But, as the last speaker said, none of us can be sure that so long as man is imperfect the institutions he puts together will be more perfect. I have great respect for our courts, for the men who operate within them as officers and who sit in judgment on us.

In addressing myself to this resolution I feel I would have to vote against it and of course against any amendment save an amendment that would retain within the law those classes of cases which I have had an opportunity to cite. I cannot myself move an amendment. Because this is the first opportunity I have had to speak from the front benches without speaking for my own department, I would like to thank hon. members for the attention with which they have received my remarks.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Maurice Allard (Sherbrooke): Mr. Speaker, since last Wednesday several hon. members have expressed their views on the death penalty and the following resolution:

> Resolved, that it is expedient to introduce a measure to amend the Criminal Code for the purposes of (a) abolishing the death penalty in respect of all offences under that act;
>
> (b) substituting a mandatory sentence of life imprisonment in those cases where the death penalty is now mandatory; and
>
> (c) providing that no person upon whom a mandatory sentence of life imprisonment is imposed shall be released from imprisonment without the prior approval of the governor in council.

The present resolution contains three propositions. I am against paragraphs (a) and (b) because, in my humble opinion, the death penalty must be maintained a while longer.

I would be in favour of paragraph (c) because it would be appropriate for the governor in council, rather than the parole board, to decide about changing a sentence of life imprisonment or perpetual imprisonment in cases where such action has been considered until now.

But, since the movers of the resolution did not present it in such a way as to allow

separate votes and you, Mr. Speaker, following a point of order I raised last Wednesday, supported by the hon. member for Lapointe (Mr. Grégoire), decided not to separate the resolution as far as the votes were concerned, I will vote against the said resolution.

We are given the occasion to ask for the retention of the death penalty or its abolition. I will be brief for two main reasons: first of all, my position on that subject has been well known in the house since 1958 and there is no conclusive reason for me to change it today. Moreover, we must not prolong the debate in order to allow the government to introduce as soon as possible very urgent measures to fight poverty, namely by increasing old age pensions, family allowances and reducing taxes in favour of Canadians with a low income as well as fighting inflation and increases in the cost of living. I hope that in his budget speech tomorrow night the Minister of Finance (Mr. Sharp) will meet the wishes of millions of citizens.

Mr. Speaker, on May 30, 1958, I made a speech in the House of Commons in favour of the retention of capital punishment. At that time, I stressed the provisions of our Criminal Code which seem marked with secular wisdom, with many judicial precautions and consecutive legal appeals. I showed also that capital punishment was an effective deterrent against murder, an appropriate retribution, a protection for the administration staff of our prisons and a means to avoid the proliferation of professional criminals. In conclusion, I said then that capital punishment must not be abolished as long as our customs and institutions would not make it necessary, and as long as the great majority of our Canadian people did not require such a change.

In 1961, our parliament gave a clear definition of capital murders, that is murders with premeditation, and non-capital murders. Today, I can see no definite argument which would convince me to change my stand.

However, I want to make it clear that, in my mind, capital punishment is not so much a necessary punishment than a means to set an example and to effectively prevent capital murder, treason and piracy.

• (4:20 p.m.)

Some members used statistics from foreign countries to support their argument, to illustrate the decrease or increase in the number of murders as a result of abolition or retention of capital punishment.

[Mr. Allard.]

We must not judge solely by such data, for figures do not give the same results throughout the world, and it must be recognized that various countries reflect historical, political, social and psychological differences.

Let us, however, recall that England abolished capital punishment in 1964 and that, since then, murders have increased by one third, to such an extent, in fact, that on January 29 last, hundreds of thousands of Englishmen launched an active campaign in favour of reinstating it.

Here, in Canada, and more specifically in Quebec, according to the provincial Minister of Justice, Claude Wagner, who said so at Verdun, at a banquet held on January 30 last, there are twice as many murders since Ottawa has multiplied commutations of death penalty. The same is probably true for the other provinces.

It is advisable, under the circumstances, to retain capital punishment and to demand that the governor general in council, that is the federal cabinet, assume its responsibilities and apply the present law in its entirety. If the members of the federal cabinet commute death penalties because, in their innermost heart they want abolition, then let them speak out now and vote according to their conscience. But I would ask them to quit playing hide-and-seek and systematically making the present laws inoperative.

Capital punishment remains the best answer to capital and sordid murders, as the Secretary of State (Miss LaMarsh) so ably pointed out a while ago, the first deterrent for thousands of citizens against such crimes. This is so true that people who deal with law courts, in whom armed bandits confide, know full well that a large number of bandits do not load their revolvers before committing a robbery, for fear that, in the excitement of the criminal operation, they might kill someone and hang for it later on.

It remains that some hardened murderers who have not been rehabilitated due to lack of advanced psychiatric knowledge, are known to be a permanent menace to society. It should be remembered that prison guards and other inmates are also members of society. If a life sentence is the only punishment for such murderers, in many cases they will try to escape. To achieve this, they will not hesitate at all to kill a guard or an over talkative partner. If justice nabs them again for naught save life, all they have to say is: "Put it on the bill. What's a murder more or less. Let society keep on feeding me in spite

of my crimes and escapes and the permanent menace that I am."

I have no objections to certain judicial reforms to enable every citizen, accused or sentenced for life under the provisions now in force, if they lack sufficient money for an adequate defence, to benefit from the same legal advantages now enjoyed by the Crown. In every case where mandatory death sentence is involved, the state should cover all legal costs of a full defence and, in addition, give the accused or the condemned without means the choice of counsel.

Furthermore, I would look with favour on the suggestion that the criminal now standing condemned for life come under the governor in council as far as his liberation is concerned. In such serious and far reaching cases, the responsibility of a decision should rest with those directly responsible to the people as the Minister of Justice (Mr. Cardin), the Solicitor General (Mr. Pennell) and the members of the Federal Cabinet and not with the untouchable commissioners of the Parole Board.

Certain acts could also be improved and adapted to the developments of modern science. I am referring specifically to the evidence required on mental cases. Finally, rehabilitation methods could be improved.

But whatever reforms are suggested, capital punishment must be maintained in the statutes and fully implemented. I beg to differ from the hon. member for Hochelaga (Mr. Pelletier) who maintained, on Thursday last, that we have now achieved a sufficient degree of civilization and progress to solve capital murders and murders for gain by means other than capital punishment.

I am deeply convinced that man, by his nature, will always be a human being and not a god, a being torn within himself between good and evil, and that his degree of civilization or moral refinement will always be in doubt.

As representatives of the people, we must take public opinion into account. That is why at the end of last January, through the newspapers of my county, I sounded the electorate of the county of Sherbrooke, with the following result:

Of 541 answers received, 475 or 88 per cent were in favour of retaining capital punishment; 66 answers or 12 per cent wanted capital punishment abolished.

Those who favoured the retention of capital punishment were asked questions concerning method of execution. The answers were as follows:

50 per cent favoured hanging; 18 per cent, the electric chair; 11 per cent, the gas chamber; 13 per cent, the injection; .4 per cent, the guillotine; 2.6 per cent, shooting; 1 per cent, other methods and 1 per cent left it to the choice of the condemned man.

The Junior Chamber of Commerce of Sherbrooke also questioned its 210 members on this subject at the beginning of last February and 73 per cent of the answers were in favour of retaining capital punishment.

Therefore, for the reasons given in my speech in this house on May 30, 1958 and in view of the additional explanations which I gave today, I shall vote against the present resolution I want capital punishment to be retained as long as psychiatry and psychology do not succeed in making sane and well-adapted individuals out of those who commit premeditated and horrible murders.

[*English*]

Hon. E. D. Fulton (Kamloops): Mr. Speaker, the House of Commons, for the three days during which this debate has been taking place, has been discussing a matter of very great and urgent concern not only to those here but to the country as a whole. In a debate of this kind, as indeed in any debate, it is only to be expected that members will take different positions for different reasons. We will, therefore, be in disagreement. I am in disagreement with many of those who have spoken or with the position they have taken or have indicated they will take. But we all proceed on the assumption that in this debate at any rate our disagreements and differences of opinion do not involve any questioning of motives and that we respect the motives and positions taken by others. The sincerity of the motives of everyone who has participated in the debate is demonstrated by the quality of the speeches which have been made.

Notwithstanding that feature of this debate and notwithstanding the importance of the subject we are dealing with and the decision that has to be made, I have a growing feeling that the House of Commons should not be asked to vote on this matter after only three days of debate which, as now has been indicated, is all the time that will be made available. I feel that we are not qualified to

make a proper decision and I therefore intend to make a suggestion as to how we might deal with it by an alternative method before I conclude my remarks.

Speaking for myself, I have to say with respect to the motion that if it comes to a vote I have not yet heard sufficient evidence to convince me that the law should be changed as the motion would change it.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Fulton: If I have to vote on the motion I will therefore vote against it. I shall, as I know every other member will, vote with a clear conscience. I think I can fairly say that I am not in the habit of avoiding issues or ducking or evading responsibilities. If I have to vote I shall, and I will do so with a clear conscience but with a very great feeling of concern because I do not think we should be voting on the motion at this time. I know that the concern I feel, which makes me take this position and which leads to make my suggestion, is not a unique concern. I know it is felt by all members, although perhaps in the greatest measure by those who, like me, will feel compelled to vote against the motion if it comes to a vote.

• (4:30 p.m.)

Great concern would be felt by me if we had to vote because I do not think the evidence has been sufficient to cause me to approve of the motion. I do not think the arguments that have been advanced enable us to make up our minds. Particularly I think it is not a sound argument and yet it has been advanced—this is what bothers me—to say that the retention of capital punishment would be evidence of a continuation in Canada of some sort of barbaric society. I think this is not the kind of argument that should be used in this kind of debate, at least not in an attempt to convince others to change their minds, because if we vote to retain the death penalty it is not because we like to have it. Who is to suggest that anyone who votes that way takes any pleasure in the contemplation of the execution even of the most brutal murderer? We would vote that way because we believe that the retention of capital punishment, at this stage at any rate, is necessary for the protection of society and that no other means sufficiently adequate have yet been established.

In this connection, in support of my position I do not rest my case on the argument of the deterrent effect of capital punishment. I rest it rather on the ground of protection from those who have shown a readiness to commit or procure the commission of a deliberate and planned killing. It is in this respect that I speak of the protection of society. I should like, therefore, to discuss the matter for a few minutes in the context of that approach and in the context of the law as it now stands as a result of the changes made in 1961.

In the course of the debate on the amendment to the Criminal Code which I had the honour of introducing when I was minister of justice in 1961, I attempted to elaborate and state as a philosophy, if you like, the concept upon which in my mind that amendment was based. I refer to the amendment which divided killings into two types, non-capital murder and capital murder.

I am not going to rehearse all those arguments at this time, although I have re-read them, but I have seen no compelling evidence to lead me to believe that the argument is not sound and does not form a sound basis for the retention of capital punishment. I am not suggesting that the law as it was amended in 1961 and as it now stands is perfect. By no means do I suggest that. Law is always susceptible to change and improvement. But surely we are entitled to be convinced by argument that the change suggested is an improvement before we simply adopt it for the purpose of change in itself.

It is therefore, I think, only right that we should remind ourselves what the law of 1961 did and how it now stands. One thing it did was to eliminate from liability to the death penalty many of the types of murders which some hon. members seem to have used as the basis of their arguments for the abolition of capital punishment. The change in the law in 1961 eliminated from suffering the death penalty a person who had committed murder and might be described as psychotic. It provided that capital murder was the only type of murder to which the death penalty was applicable.

In other words, by that change it is provided that unless the crime which results in a killing or the killing itself is planned and deliberate, the murder is non-capital. If the killing is carried out by an insane person there is, of course, still the absolute defence of insanity. If it is carried out by a person in a sudden fit of passion there is, quite apart from the defence of provocation, the necessity for the Crown now to prove that it was done in a planned and deliberate fashion, and if it

can be established that it was done in a fit of sudden passion that element is not proven. In other words, Mr. Speaker, if the crime is totally unpremeditated, then it is not capital murder. That important change was made, and it seems to me to have been overlooked by many of those who have spoken in support of this motion.

Further, even if the murder is capital and the jury finds that the accused was guilty of a planned and deliberate killing, there is the important change made as a result of the law of 1961 that the jury must be asked whether they have any recommendation to make as to leniency or mercy. The jury must be asked that question. The purpose of inserting this provision was precisely to take care of the case in regard to which the jury had any doubt so that even if they felt it was capital murder within the definition, if there was something about it, some surrounding factor which would cause them to recommend leniency, they could do so. Even although they had found the accused was not insane within the legal definition of insanity, yet they might not be sure that his mental state was such that he should in fact suffer capital punishment as a consequence of his crime.

At this point, Mr. Speaker, I should like to observe that I am not happy about the definition of insanity as still carried forward in our Criminal Code. I refer to the old M'Naghten rule. I think this is one area which should be studied and possibly changed. This is another reason why I think this motion is inadequate and does not enable us really to get at the roots of the problem with which we should be dealing if we are to deal conclusively with the matter of capital punishment. I observed recently reports in American periodicals of a recommendation made as a result of an extensive study of the definition of insanity by the American Bar. I am very much influenced by that recommendation, which seems to me to be a great forward step in the legal treatment of insanity.

Coming back to the question of our law as it now stands, another important change made in 1961, which seems to me to go a good distance to meeting many of the arguments that have been advanced by those who have spoken in favour of the resolution, was that we provided for an automatic appeal court review. It does not matter whether the accused is rich or poor. If convicted of capital murder he not only has the right but the appeal court has the duty to review the case and the transcript of the evidence not only with respect to matters of law but the adequacy of the procedure and the facts as well. This is so whether or not the accused makes application for appeal. In addition to the reveiw by the court of appeal which is carried out automatically the accused has the right as a right—he does not need leave—to go to the Supreme Court of Canada, the highest court in the land. His case can be heard there whether he is rich or poor. He does not have to apply for leave.

Another very important change that was made and which I think should be borne in mind when we consider our position with respect to the motion was that in 1961 we inserted a provision in the law that no one under the age of 18 years could suffer pain of death by hanging. Even though convicted of capital murder such a person cannot be sentenced to be hanged. So, Mr. Speaker, while I make no further observation on the Truscott case at this point I simply say that Steven Truscott could not have been sentenced to hang after the 1961 change in the law.

• (4:40 p.m.)

These, sir, are some of the factors I think should be borne in mind when we ask ourselves whether we are yet convinced that the law with respect to capital punishment as it now stands should be changed. I have said that in my view the philosophical arguments in support of the retention of capital punishment rest on the basis of the protection of society from those who would deliberately challenge society's supreme ordinance, the only basis on which a well ordered society can rest, namely, that no individual has the right to take a life. I say that society must be protected against those who would deliberately challenge that law. I am satisfied that this is quite a different argument from the argument which says that capital punishment should be retained because it deters would-be murderers from killing. Obviously it does not because people still kill. You cannot say it is a completely effective deterrent. Nor in my view, however, can you say it has not deterrent effect. Unfortunately you cannot prove the case one way or the other statistically, as it were. It is for this reason I say that it never seemed to me to be a sound basis upon which to rest a firm position. I think the basis of the protection of society against those who have defied society's supreme law is a sound philosophical basis.

Other arguments were advanced which in my view leave room for the kind of uncertainties about which I have spoken and the kind of uncertainties which I would feel if I were compelled to vote now. These arguments are based on the statistics relating to the number of murders and the disposition of capital cases after there has been a conviction. I think it is important in the light of what we are discussing to examine some of these statistics. I shall only look at those since 1961 when the change was made to distinguish between capital and non-capital murder.

I should like, first, to look at the statistics with regard to the commutation or disposition of these cases because I think the statistics here indicate there is another area or another kind of uncertainty about whether some change should be made in the present law. I am alluding to the same facts as were referred to by the Secretary of State (Miss LaMarsh), namely, that perhaps there should be greater certainty introduced into the circumstances under which the prerogative of mercy may be exercised.

I have referred to the change that had the result that a person convicted of capital murder is now convicted only of deliberate killing and we still have the additional safeguard of asking the jury whether or not they have any recommendation to make. It was certainly my thought, and I speak here only as an individual and do not say the law carries this interpretation, that when there came before any government of which I might be a member or others might be members a case where there was a conviction for capital murder and no recommendation of mercy, the disposition of the case should not be in doubt.

We find, if we look at the record of cases since 1961, the first year of the change, to ascertain whether or not any recommendations were made, that from the statistics reported on pages 100 to 103 of the White Paper on Capital Punishment, as brought up to date by some statistics that have been very kindly furnished to me by the Solicitor General (Mr. Pennell), show there have been 30 capital cases since September, 1961. There have been 30 cases in which an individual has been convicted of capital murder.

In so far as recommendations are concerned, we find that in 12 of these cases the jury made no recommendation and in the other 18 cases the jury recommended mercy.

It is interesting to find too, Mr. Speaker, that out of those 30 cases the judge, who of course always has the right to make a recommendation, made no recommendation in 19 cases. The judge made a recommendation in 11. Further, it is interesting to note that the judge recommended mercy in two cases in which the jury did not recommend mercy. This, then, is the record with regard to recommendations. As I have said, out of 30 cases the jury recommended mercy in 18 and made no recommendation in 12.

I refer now to commutations. We find that since 1961, when the former government of which I was a member was in office, there were ten cases of persons convicted of capital murder which came before us. In eight of those cases the sentence was commuted to life imprisonment and in two cases the sentence was carried out. If we examine the question of recommendations we find that of the eight commutations, five were in cases where the jury recommended mercy. Of the three where there was no jury recommendation, two had been recommended to mercy by the judge.

There was a commutation, between September, 1961 and April, 1963, in only one case in which there was no recommendation whatever. If you examine the record since April, 1963, you will find there have been 20 convictions for capital murder which came before the cabinet and all 20 have been commuted. Of those, 13 had been recommended to mercy by the jury and 7 had no recommendation by either the judge or the jury. It is not my purpose, Mr. Speaker, to make any political condemnation here. However, speaking statistically, I would say that since April, 1963, there have been seven, what I would call doubtful cases where the government did not act in accordance with what I had believed would be accepted as the intent of the new law, namely, that where there was no recommendation in a conviction of capital murder there would be a certain execution. I mention this because I do believe this feature is a major reason for the unrest and concern which is felt about this whole matter in the country at the present time.

The other statistics which may or may not prove anything but certainly are a cause for concern, the kind of concern which I said would be felt if we have to vote on this motion, are statistics which have come before me from my own constituency. I feel they are typical of a mixed urban and rural constituency. The daily paper in Kamloops ran what

might be called a poll for three days. They inserted a small coupon in which the readers were asked to indicate broadly whether they favoured retention or abolition.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Rinfret): Order. I regret to interrupt the hon. member but the time allotted to him has expired.

Some hon. Members: Continue.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Rinfret): There seems to be unanimous consent to allow the hon. member to continue his speech.

Mr. Fulton: May I thank the house for this courtesy. Of the coupons so completed and sent to me, 226 were in favour of retention of capital punishment and 36 in favour of abolition, a proportion of nearly 7 to 1 in favour of retention.

Another statistic which concerns me but which, as I say, may or may not be capable of immediate proof or statistical application in this case, is the number of murders reported to the Dominion Bureau of Statistics since 1961. I use that year because it is the year in which there was the division between capital and non-capital murder. In 1961 there were 185 murders reported; in 1962, 217; in 1963, 215; in 1964, 218. It could be said, therefore, that whereas in 1961, the last year before the change, there were 185 murders, since that time the number reported to the Dominion Bureau of Statistics has gone up by an average of 30.

• (4:50 p.m.)

Mr. Cashin: Would the hon. gentleman permit a question?

An hon. Member: Wait your turn.

Mr. Fulton: These statistics, like so many other statistics in this matter, are perhaps not a valid guide so I want to take them further in order to complete this reference because of what it shows. I find that in 1960, the year prior to the one with which I started, 190 murders were reported; in 1959, 141; in 1958, 153. And so it goes back, Mr. Speaker, with a steady dinimution in the number of murders or a steady increase, if you like, up until 1961. However, it is still indisputable that although there has been a steady increase in the number of murders, nevertheless there was a jump of 30 and a substantially sustained increase between 1961 and the subsequent years. I do not know whether or not this is related to the change which was made in the law but it is the kind of statistic which causes grave, real and justifiable concern to those who, like me, require convincing proof before we will be ready to say that capital punishment should be abolished.

One other factor which is most important to me, Mr. Speaker, in the consideration of this matter is this. It is true that the law now provides that there is no death penalty except in the case of a murder which is planned and deliberate. Therefore we have the case that where a person kills deliberately, for instance, for individual gain, then he is subject to capital punishment. But if there is an question of doubt a recommendation may be made.

I am not so much concerned with the case of one individual, one isolated transaction. I am concerned about the fact that syndicated crime does exist in Canada, and let us not blink our eyes at that fact. Syndicated crime does exist and it concerns all of us, not just the government. I am not here to apportion blame. But it is there and is a matter about which we are all concerned and which we are determined to fight. I am wondering whether we can fight it effectively without capital punishment.

We are dealing here with the case of people who are sitting in comfortable offices and ordering the elimination of others. They say: "Rub him out, he is getting in the way". These people are enemies of society. They are deliberate and dangerous enemies of society. Society needs and is entitled to the maximum protection against them which we can afford.

I am not certain, Mr. Speaker, that life imprisonment is sufficient protection in the sense in which I am using the words "protection of society". These people, if they are detected, prosecuted and convicted, must not be left around. Therefore there are but two alternatives: one is execution, the other life imprisonment, but life imprisonment real and literal.

I do not know whether those who favour this motion would reproach me by telling me that the most inhuman punishment of all is to lock a man up literally for the rest of his life. But society needs the protection of the permanent removal from its midst of this kind of enemy once caught, prosecuted and convicted. I think that even in the case of a vicious criminal who might have been put away for life imprisonment pressures would mount for his release before he had served that penalty to its fullest and to its literal extent.

So, Mr. Speaker, I conclude by saying that it seems to me that these uncertainties, some

of which I have mentioned, are not removed by this motion and therefore it cannot be supported at the present time. As I say, society needs protection, and it seems to me this is removed at least in part, or would be, if the motion carries. Police officers and prison guards need protection. Yet I do not think it is logical to retain capital punishment for them only, that is to say, in cases where police officers or prison guards alone have been killed. It seems to me that it is the nature of the crime, not the person or the victim, to which we should look. I also stated, Mr. Speaker, that the motion does not deal with the important question of insanity, the case of the person who may have a psychotic personality as against one who is legally insane. Therefore I cannot vote for it.

There is another reason I should like to mention—I hope the house will permit me to do so because I think it is terribly important—why I do not think we should be asked to vote on this matter now. I do not think that any member should be asked to vote at this stage at all. I say this because in addition to the uncertainties I have mentioned I believe there are some 10 or 12 men who have been convicted of murder and sentenced but whose cases have not yet come before the cabinet. Therefore I do not think it is right to ask the House of Commons to vote under those circumstances.

Certainly I think we are entitled before the debate is concluded to an assurance from the Prime Minister (Mr. Pearson)—I regret he is not here; however, I have mentioned this matter to one of his colleagues and I hope that the message will be passed to him as urgent—that whatever the outcome of this debate, whether we vote on the motion or not, whether we carry it or whatever the outcome, those cases now waiting to be dealt with by the cabinet will be dealt with on their merits and in accordance with the law as it now stands so that no one can say we have influenced the disposition of those cases one way or the other by any vote taken in the House of Commons. I am sure the Prime Minister, if he will reflect on that for a moment, will see why we have the right to ask for that assurance.

I should like, Mr. Speaker, to make a suggestion at this point. My suggestion is that instead of voting on this question at this time the matter should be referred to a special committee of the Senate and this house. I would move such a motion but I think it would require unanimous consent; otherwise it would not be in order at this stage.

I do not want to involve the house at this time in a procedural discussion of this nature and in this context, but I think there are very real and important advantages which would follow from the reference of this subject matter for study by such a committee. It is ten years since we had a committee of parliament study the question. A very good committee was set up between 1954 and 1956. However, it dealt with capital punishment, corporal punishment and lotteries, though it did deal very helpfully with capital punishment in the light of opinion prevailing at that time and in the light of the evidence available. Thought does progress in these matters. Expert opinion becomes more easily available and more authoritative, and I think this parliament is entitled to the benefit of expert opinion and expert analysis of what these statistics tell us, if they tell us anything.

So, Mr. Speaker, for these and other reasons I could mention, but I do not want to abuse the courtesy and tolerance of the house, if it had been in order I would have moved this motion:

> That Special Order No. 66 be not further dealt with at this time, but that the subject matter thereof, together with the relevant provisions of the Criminal Code relating to the defence of insanity, be referred to a special committee to consist of such number of members of this house as shall be determined after consultation between the house leaders, and that the Honourable the Senate be invited to join in the deliberations of such committee and to name thereto such number of members as shall be determined after consultation between the two houses;—

Then I would have gone on to provide the usual powers to send for persons and papers, to ask for leave to sit while the house is sitting, and the other usual powers of such a committee.

• (5:00 p.m.)

I am not going to make that motion now, Mr. Speaker, for the reasons I have indicated, but I trust that those who have brought the present motion before us and others who are concerned with arranging the business of the house will give it their earnest consideration because I think it has great merit. I think that only as a result of some such procedure will this parliament be in a position where it can and should vote on the motion and the subject matter now before us. If my idea is not accepted, Mr. Speaker, then I repeat that with a clear conscience I shall vote against the motion, although with great reluctance

and with a great deal of uncertainty of the sort that I have outlined.

[*Translation*]

Hon. Jean Marchand (Minister of Citizenship and Immigration): Mr. Speaker, I have followed, here in the house or in *Hansard,* our discussion on the death penalty. I have analysed the arguments and statistics brought before the house and tried to come to a conclusion on the basis of arguments of a statistical or strictly legal nature. I must confess that I did not succeed. We may be shown that, during a certain period, more murders were committed than in another, that capital punishment actually does prevent some people from killing, but I confess that the records I looked at did not convince me one way or the other. So, to form an opinion that could satisfy me, I have to rely on certain basic principles in which I believe and to which I must refer when considering such a serious matter.

Now Mr. Speaker, if we were dealing with perfect human societies, that is to say human societies with no structural flaws and led by men who always stood at the highest level of perfection, who could understand the body and the heart and the soul of men, perhaps I might be inclined to think favourably of retention.

On the other hand, when we consider the kind of society we form, not only here in Canada but all over the world, when we discover our imperfections, those of men themselves and those of their constitutions and institutions, I ask myself how we could, without misgivings, lay down rules for judging men to their innermost depths. I realize that, in order to function, a society must apply certain rules and set down certain limits, so that it may not be abused. Society may even provide penalties which, although they cannot be often strictly justified, may be warranted failing any better alternative.

When society is depriving an individual of his liberty for a period of time, it is not doing him irreparable harm. Even if there is a mistake, after all necessary precautions had been taken, this risk may be taken to protect society. But in the case of the death penalty, we are dealing with the most important and fundamental element in man, that is life.

If society must forgive deficiencies inherent to man, I do not see why its attitude would change radically when life itself is at stake. When looking at societies which engender war, societies which for years literally let people die in filthy conditions by permitting men to exploit other men to death, not a brutal but a slow, asphyxiating death, while we sat looking on then as now; when we let hit-and-run drivers endanger people's lives on the highways and professional killers run loose; when we let drug peddling go on legally, finding out later on that drugs are a menace to health and life; when we consider all the flaws in the means we have to control men and their intentions, I wonder why, suddenly, we transform ourselves into some sort of tribunal with divine qualities which can only be attributes of the Creator, and I am concerned.

It is that imperfection in life which strikes me in the circumstances and it is ridiculous to try to ignore it artificially.

Civilization has always strived to lead man out of the paths of violence. Since the beginning of the world, mankind has tried to avoid using violence, the law of retaliation, the rules of revenge.

I think that, as mentioned by the hon. member for Hochelaga (Mr. Pelletier), as long as we do not turn away from that state of violence which was the primitive state of man, we are moving away from justice. To sentence someone to death, Mr. Speaker, is to sentence someone to a punishment one knows nothing about.

I will be told: He killed, he deserves to be killed; but has society, which must strive toward perfection, a perfect organization to judge people? How can society accept to use the same methods used by bandits and sick people? No, we must not use the same methods. If we are reduced to using the same methods, I say that we are going back to barbarism, because whoever stole will have to be stolen from, whoever injured the physical integrity of a man will have to suffer the same thing, that is to say that it will become necessary to apply a punishment equal to the crime.

I think that society has progressed much farther. We are told about modern psychiatric methods. If I were sure that psychiatry is perfect, that it cannot make mistakes, that it can truly judge man in depth and determine exactly the responsibilties, I would feel quite comfortable and I would be in favour of the death penalty because we would have found in psychiatry some kind of substitute for divine attributes. But psychiatry is only just beginning. I read recently that, after forty years of imprisonment, a man judged to be insane had been found of sound mind and

had been granted a compensation of $105,000 or $125,000. There has been some progress. At that time, psychiatry was far from perfect.

I am convinced that psychiatry was very imperfect and that it found people guilty who, today, would not be found guilty. Faced with the weakness of our methods, I say that in all good faith we cannot judge another man.

• (5:10 p.m.)

I had the opportunity once to study the file of a young criminal. Everything seemed to point to a murder committed in cold blood. That might have been the case.

But reviewing the life of this young man—he had been brought up in an orphanage—I wondered about a few things. He had been frustrated in his family life, had had a hard time earning a living and, at one point, he had fallen into ways of murder, theft and, in short, of moral depravity.

When society produces such a child, that is, when society deprives a child of a proper education and of a normal life, no wonder he no longer complies with the rules of the community, and when we pass judgment on him, it is on society itself that we pass judgment.

Which reminds me of what Charles Péguy said—I do not know how one would say it in English, but in French it is beautiful—he said:

> The father against whom the son raises his hand is responsible (the father is responsible) for having sired a son who raises his hand against him.

Therein lies our problem, Mr. Speaker, where lies the responsibility? Could we but find a human institution capable of making an objective appreciation, I would agree to the death penalty. But if that guarantee cannot be given, then I cannot agree.

This entails great responsibility, very much as we encounter in other fields.

I am thinking of those workers who were exploited throughout a lifetime of meager salaries, who could not afford to send their children to school, who could not get an education nor afford one for their children, and then were told suddenly: You cannot have higher salaries, for you are ignorant, for your children did not go to school.

This means that we take the product of our society and hold it responsible for our own incompetence.

It is possible, it is even certain, that some criminals are responsible. I am not saying that some killers should not be hanged. I merely say that we do not have the means to judge them, especially if the penalty concerns life itself. The only sanctions we can enforce are those which protect society by depriving of their freedom, for a greater or a shorter length of time, those who are guilty of crimes.

I know of no man who could say: I have just passed judgment and I am sure that judgment is a fair one. The risk of committing an injustice is intolerable when life itself is at stake.

Well, when one finds oneself in such a situation, Mr. Speaker, one's own conscience is deeply involved. I am not suggesting that those who favour the death penalty are wicked or have no conscience. I am saying that, as far as my own conscience is concerned, unless the law were to impose upon me a certain conduct in line with duties I had accepted to discharge, I do not see how I could pass judgment on an actual fact that is beyond my grasp. I will never do it according to my own judgment and conscience, once more for the simple reason that I could not be sure, and I do not know many men who could be.

At this stage, I should like to quote words which probably do not go to well with the rules and purposes of this house. But sometimes poetry comes closer to the truth than other means of expression. Here then is what a great French poet, Charles Baudelaire, said:

> Oh, Creator! can monsters exist in the eyes of the one and only one who knows why they do exist, how they came to be, and what could have prevented them from being—

He is the only one to know and so, obviously, those who pretend to replace Him are running a very great risk, that of being unjust.

Now, is there some way of protecting society, because it certainly must be protected? I think there is. The hon. member for Kamloops referred a while ago to life sentences. As long as they are really life sentences, I entirely agree. But if we sentence murderers to prison and let them out after five or six years, especially when we do not know whether or not they are rehabilitated and particularly for the same reasons I have already indicated, because we do not really know what is in them, then I feel that society is responsible and should not place the population as a whole under such a risk. It must really be life imprisonment.

Some would like exceptions to be made. Reference was made to policemen and jail guards. All my sympathy goes to policemen

and jail guards. But let us not forget, Mr. Speaker, that all those who work on this earth, all members of our society run a number of risks.

Workers who are engaged in digging tunnels where many lose their lives run risks. Employees who tend sick, particularly persons affected by contagious diseases, run risks. Here, in this chamber, we take risks; if the political situation should ever turn to violence we could be threatened in our lives and we have to accept that condition.

I do not know that jail guards and policement themselves run risks of such an exceptional nature that they should constitute a special category all by themselves. I do not think so, Mr. Speaker.

Workers who work on steel structures on our construction sites run risks which are surely as serious as those run in prisons or in the performance of the duties of a policeman. Besides, British bobbies have even been unarmed; they no longer carry revolvers. I do not think their lives are more imperiled than that of several other categories of citizens.

Obviously, there are risks which, in my opinion, are not of an exceptional character.

Now, Mr. Speaker, if techniques were found to keep in cages lions, rattlesnakes and other kinds of dangerous animals, then surely techniques can be found to keep murderers in jail without society as a whole, guards and policemen being subjected to very serious risks.

Let us say, then, at any rate, Mr. Speaker, that for me the death penalty is first of all a moral question. And I think that hon. members had the right, and it might have been the proper thing to do, to consult their constituents. I am not at all convinced that what I am saying this afternoon reflects the views of all my constituents. I am rather inclined to think that it is the opposite. But, in spite of all that, I think we are here also to try to give leadership. We are here also a little to try to open horizons to people and not only to call on their instinct of self-preservation or their vengefulness which they often express in these words: He killed, he will be killed. That may be simple and effective but it does not bring out the best in them. The same instinct would wake up in me if I learned that a member of my family had been stupidly murdered in the street, but I would have to overcome it not to betray the ideas I have just voiced.

• (5:20 p.m.)

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, we are faced here with not one but two risks. We have to choose between two risks this afternoon. It is possible that if we abolish the death penalty, the number of murders will increase. But it is possible that if we retain it, we will continue to commit serious injustices and go on living with a troubled conscience.

If we were willing to make an experiment together for five years to see what it would give, we would assume the noblest of the two risks. We would lean, in our uncertainty, take the side of charity and generosity. I would rather make a mistake on that side than on the other. Should we make a mistake, it could not be so serious. The death penalty was abolished in some countries and nothing catostrophic happened. The risk in abolishing it is not so great that we should refuse to run it; we could change our stand should events prove that we erred.

We cannot say that if we abolish it, we run a greater risk than if we retain it. There are risks in both cases. Mr. Speaker, there are risks. Reducing the deterrent power may be a risk. But there is also the other risk of murdering innocent people in cold blood because our knowledge of man is not deep enough and our institutions are too imperfect.

I will not give a list of judicial errors. But I think that we are protected well enough to afford to make that great human experiment.

Mr. David Lewis (York South): Mr. Speaker, I am happy to say that I am wholly in agreement with the minister who has just spoken.

[*English*]

I only hope that in the future I shall have many opportunities of agreeing with him.

There have been many suggestions, Mr. Speaker, that we should not use emotion or sentiment in this debate but I have been glad to note, listening to hon. members, that they have used their emotions and their sentiments. What we are concerned with is a matter of moral behaviour by society as a whole, and it would be impossible for any one who has any deep feeling on the matter to speak without deep emotion. What we really mean is that we should not be so blinded by our emotions and sentiments as to ignore facts which are ascertainable and reason which can be applied.

I start with the proposition that there are several matters about which all of us are agreed, and I think it is wrong for speakers on either side to suggest that the other side is unaware of any of these matters. First of all, I believe we are all agreed, abolitionists and retentionists alike, that the greatest thing in our society is the protection of human life and the sanctity of every human being. We are all agreed that that is the case and we are all earnestly concerned about taking the life of the accused, as I will call him, or seeing the accused take the life of his victim.

Let us make that assumption and let not those who are for retention say, as some of them have said, that we who are for abolition of the death penalty are soft on murderers, that we are concerned with protecting them and not their victims. That is really unfair to those of us who are presenting the abolitionist side. We are fully concerned with the welfare of the victims and of those who are related to the victims of murder.

Second, I take it that we are all concerned to protect society. The hon. member for Kamloops (Mr. Fulton) is concerned about it. The Minister of Citizenship and Immigration (Mr. Marchand) is concerned about it just as deeply, just as much, just as earnestly and just as anxiously as the hon. member for Kamloops. We are all concerned about making the police protection of our society as efficient as possible. I repeat that we are all equally concerned about that, those of us who believe the abolition of the death penalty will assist rather than hinder as well as those of us who believe the opposite.

Finally we are concerned—some of us who support abolition and I imagine many of those who are retentionists—to see that at some appropriate point parliament and the legislatures will pass legislation to protect the victims of murder and of murderers. Let us assume all of those things and let us discuss the issues before us on the basis of some of the moral precepts by which we live, and on victims of murder and of murderers. Let us also, as we discuss these things, be as objective about the facts as we can.

The Secretary of State (Miss LaMarsh) said in her very moving and carefully enunciated speech that she believes the most heinous crime is that of rape followed by murder, and she says for this most heinous crime the most heinous punishment should be administered. I do not really follow that. If what the hon. lady means is that regardless of whether or not the protection of society follows from it

and regardless of whether or not anybody else is deterred from committing that kind of detestable crime—and I agree with her it is perhaps the most detestable of all—if she means that and that regardless of the effect of the execution of the person responsible for such a murder she would nonetheless want to see him killed for some reason of retribution or something like that, then I respectfully disagree with her.

I do not think our system of justice in 1966 has any right to have within it any element of vengeance, any element of retribution, any element of punishment for its own sake.

I believe that in our society, in all our actions in Canada and in those of every other modern society, these elements connected with punishment have disappeared. The only acceptable reason for punishment is protection of society by deterring other similar crimes, which the punishment may do, or removal of the criminal so that he will not again be able to commit such a crime. Those and those alone are the reasons which morally justify punishment of any sort. Therefore people who suggest they are not concerned with vengeance or retribution and at the same time indicate the kind of crime for which under any circumstances they would provide capital punishment seem to me to be indulging in a contradiction that is very serious from the point of view of a sensible consideration of this subject.

I suggest to the house that there is a basic illogicality in the division made in our present law. I was very much impressed some time ago to read in the British *Hansard* for December 21, 1964, beginning at column 905, a speech made by a Conservative member, Mr. Henry Brooke, member of parliament for Hampstead, who had been Home Secretary in that country. He informed the British parliament that he had started out by being a retentionist but his experience as Home Secretary had persuaded him that capital punishment should be abolished entirely.

I commend to all hon. members, and particularly to the hon. member for Kamloops who was minister of justice when the division of murder was made in our Criminal Code, several of Mr. Brooke's statements. At column 907 Mr. Brooke is reported as saying:

> I was aware of it—
>
> The anomaly.
>
> —from my experience in considering death-sentence cases that came to me. I gave all of them a very long thought, yet every now and again it used to come over me that while I was having to determine whether persons sentenced to death

for capital murder should be hanged or not, other murderers, whose crimes were indeed worse than the one which I had under consideration at that moment were not liable to the death penalty.

I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that if you are dealing with the question either of the protection of society or of retribution or with any other angle—and do not anybody misunderstand me or think I am advocating it—that the person who is mentally ill, the psychotic guilty of desiring to commit murder not for any gain, for any purpose but as a part of his psychotic personality, is a greater danger to society than even the murderous criminal who murders for gain.

And it is an obvious illogicality to provide that the person who kills for kicks, to put it in simple terms, can escape the gallows because he is mentally ill whereas the person who kills presumably only if it pays him to do so will receive the gallows. I am not suggesting that the mentally ill be taken to the gallows. What I am suggesting, what I am earnestly asking hon. members to contemplate, is that when we decided that the mentally ill person should not suffer execution we made an important step forward in our consideration of the administration of justice and of punishment.

• (5:30 p.m.)

I submit we should now take another step forward in recognizing that if we are not doing any good to society, and I submit we are not, by taking the life of the other kind of murderer we ought to take the next step and abolish execution altogether. This would be a forward and progressive step based on a sensible and intelligent scientific analysis of punishment and the way in which we treat those who contravene our laws.

The hon. member for Kamloops and many other people have said that statistics prove neither one nor the other; they do not prove either deterrence or the lack of deterrence. May I stop there for a moment and say that the hon. member for Kamloops did a little violence to the statistics he cited this afternoon. He cited from page 104 of the White Paper on Capital Punishment and he indicated there was an increase in the number of murders reported by the police from 1961 onwards. What he should have told the house, and I am sure he would have had he noticed it, is that the footnote to the table indicates that from 1954 to 1960 adjustments were made in the previous years' figures as the result of revised R.C.M.P. and O.P.P. figures on murder offences known to the police.

From 1954 to 1960 inclusive the Quebec Provincial Police did not report but from 1961 to 1963 inclusive they did report to the Dominion Bureau of Statistics. Obviously that accounts for some of the increase over the previous years.

Another point the hon. member for Kamloops failed to draw to the attention of this house, which is obviously relevant, is that while there was an increase in the absolute number of murders reported there was hardly any appreciable increase in the rate per 100,000 population. One does not have to be a statistical genius to know that if you have a smaller population you will have a smaller number of murders and that if you have a larger population the likelihood is that you will have a larger number of crimes of all sorts.

When you look at page 104, table E, you find that in 1954 the ratio was 1.0; in 1955 it was .9; in 1956 it was 1.0; in 1957 it was .9; in 1958 it was 1.1; in 1959 it was 1.0; in 1960 it was 1.3; in 1961 it was 1.2; and in 1962 and 1963 it was 1.4. Those figures all are related to 100,000 of population. If anything can be clear it is clear on the whole—this is something that has been proved by statistics for many other jurisdictions—that there appears to be a level of this kind of crime over a large number of years.

Finally, in order for the statistics which the hon. member quoted to have any meaning at all to our present discussion, I respectfully suggest to him that the murders ought to be divided between capital and non-capital ones. They are not so divided. His point would be well taken only if these statistics showed that non-capital murders increased in number while capital murders decreased. The likelihood is that nothing of this sort occurred but that both increased in the same way.

Mr. Brooke of the British parliament, to whom I referred earlier, said that one of the things which convinced him in regard to abolition, one of the points which convinced him that continuing the death sentence was worthless to society, was the fact that he found that the statistics covering the five years before the change made in Britain in 1957 and the five years after the change indicated that the proportion of murders which were capital and the proportion which were not were about the same for both periods. The proportion that were capital murders before 1957 was 14.4 and the proportion that were capital after 1957 was 13.5. You can make your own calculations as to

the balance which were non-capital. So again there was no evidence before him, and I am certain that the figures in Canada, if the information were available, would show precisely the same result that would indicate that the removal of the death penalty for non-capital murder affected the number of non-capital nurders which were committed during the years since 1961. So why do we continue the death penalty?

There have been a great many Scriptural references made in this house and I am not going to add to them. I will merely content myself by telling hon. members who have quoted the Scriptures that all the leaders of the religion which is based on the Old Testament are in favour of abolishing the death penalty or at least those with whom I have consulted. I also ask those who have quoted the Scriptures to realize that there are men of all denominations who hold views for abolition as well as for retention. I am sure that they would be the first to want to admit that the Christians, Jews and Buddhists, whatever their religion may be, who are in favour of abolition accept and follow their religion just as strongly as the people who are in favour of retention.

I want to draw something to the attention of the house that has not been drawn to its attention before. I refer to a most significant thing which occurred during the period of this debate. There was one member of this house, the hon. member for Prince (Mr. MacDonald), who spoke magnificently; he was a prison chaplain and he spoke on the basis of his experience. *Le Devoir* of last Thursday and Friday printed an article on the subject in two parts written by Father Jean Paul Régimbald who is "un ancien aumônier des prisons". If my French is good, he also is an ex-prison chaplain. He is a Catholic and the hon. member for Prince is a Protestant. They both are experienced as prison chaplains and they both argued for abolition of capital punishment on the basis of their experience. Both of them appealed to this house, and I echo their appeal, that society has no right collectively, by design and by deliberation, after a carefully contrived procedure, after months of delay and frequently after years of delay in the lower courts and appeal courts, and after consideration by a cabinet, to take a human life unless there is overwhelming proof that the taking of that human life will serve some kind of social purpose.

It is an error in my respectful submission to place on those of us who want to abolish capital punishment the onus of proving our case, as in fact has been done, although I may add that I am prepared to accept that onus as I am sure are my colleagues who support abolition. Surely it is wrong to place that onus upon us. If I may refer again to my Conservative friend, whom I have not had the pleasure of meeting, Mr. Brooke of the British parliament, I should like to ask hon. members whether his statement was not absolutely correct when he said, as recorded in column 907 of the British *Hansard* as I have mentioned:

> I hope that I shall carry the House with me in saying that the taking of life is so grave a matter that the onus of proof must be on those who very sincerely believe that the death penalty should be retained.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Lewis: I say to the hon. member for Kamloops and to others who have spoken as he has spoken that if, as he has said, he has some doubt, we all have a duty to resolve that doubt in favour of abolition of the death penalty.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

• (5:40 p.m.)

Mr. Lewis: Like all hon. members, I have tried to read a great deal of the history of my country and of others, particularly the history of thought and philosophy and more particularly the history of thought in ethics. I have yet to come across any proposition involving morality and the question of ethics, involving weighing the possible consequences of one act or another, about which anyone with any mind at all can be absolutely dogmatic and certain that he is right. No moral proposition worth making is capable of that kind of certainty, that kind of absoluteness. I am sure that many of us who are on the side of abolition are aware of the fact that there may be somewhere, as the Minister for Citizenship and Immigration said, a little doubt as to what the exact consequences may be, just as the sincere retentionist has doubt on his side. I repeat, Mr. Speaker, that if any of us has any doubt at all, then because we are concerned with the collective taking of life, which is prima facie questionable unless justified, the doubt should be resolved in favour of not taking human life.

A great deal has been said about jail guards.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. The hon. member's time has expired.

Some hon. Members: Carry on.

Mr. Speaker: Has the hon. member the consent of the house to continue?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Mr. Lewis: I express my gratitude to the house for its kindness. A great deal has been said about jail guards. The people in our jails are undoubtedly very concerned about the consequences to them and I have great sympathy with them. I do not know how you settle these things. Perhaps the factual evidence does not prove anything conclusively, but I noticed when I read the White Paper that on page 108 Table H gives the details of four killings in prison. After studying the table I was struck by the fact that in the cases where the killer was found not one killing was committed by a lifer.

The first one deals with someone who was killed in Kingston penitentiary in 1948 by an inmate who was serving ten years imprisonment for armed robbery. He was not a lifer. With regard to the second one, the murderer was not discovered. The third case deals with a guard who was shot and killed at St. Vincent de Paul penitentiary in the province of Quebec. He had been forced into a cell by two inmates who were threatening and stabbing him. When the guards fired into the cell, Tellier, the guard who was forced into it, was apparently hit accidentally. Who were the inmates who were detaining Tellier? Neither of them was a lifer. One of the men concerned had been sentenced to ten years imprisonment for armed robbery and the other was serving four years for robbery. Edwin James Masterton the fourth case, was stabbed to death at Dorchester penitentiary, New Brunswick, on Sepembter 23, 1964, by an inmate 18 years of age who was serving concurrent sentences of 10 and 12 years respectively for robbery with violence.

I am not for one moment suggesting that there is any conclusive proof in this; I am merely saying that certainly it is not proof that if you gave the murderer life imprisonment instead of executing him he would necessarily be the one to kill the guard. It could just as easily be someone serving four years imprisonment for robbery rather than any more serious crime, although robbery is a serious enough crime.

The same argument applies to the police. I have had the pleasure of working with police associations in my professional, legal capacity. I have met these people and no one here can possibly have greater regard than I have for the men, and women now, who are given the job of protecting us against crime.

However, Mr. Speaker, I say with respect to them that their opposition to the abolition of capital punishment, as I have read their briefs, consists of a series of assertions and quite understandable fear but without any basis in fact for that fear at all. I believe that the Minister of Citizenship and Immigration is absolutely right and it can be statistically proved that there are many other occupations in our society with regard to which the death rate is greater per number of workers than it is among the police. I refer particularly to those employed in the construction industry, to those who ply the occupation of rigger, for example.

May I summarize my thoughts on this question. I shall do so briefly and will not take too much advantage of the kindness of members of the house. I believe that we ought to abolish capital punishment because we ought not to retain the practice of the collective destruction of a human being unless it can be shown that there is overwhelming proof that such destruction will serve a useful social purpose. The fact is that there is no such proof, that whatever proof there is is to the contrary, that capital punishment is not a uniquely effective deterrent but on the contrary imprisonment can be just as effective a deterrent.

Second, I urge members of the house not to overlook the possibility of judicial error, the possibility of innocent people being executed. It is impossible to rectify that situation once the person is dead. Third, I ask hon. members to consider the possibility of rehabilitating some of even the most difficult murderers. The history of this matter shows that in many cases, in cases where often you would least expect it, people who are given an opportunity come to themselves and later become useful citizens of society. I submit that we do not have any right to take from even the murderer the possibility of becoming a useful and honourable citizen. By taking his life we make it completely impossible to give him any assistance at all.

I believe there is value in setting an example to our citizens and indeed to the world, because I have always believed that our country holds a unique place among the

nations of the world and that what we do in the direction of progress is bound to have some effect and influence elsewhere among nations. I ask hon. members, even if they have some little doubt, to support this resolution and see to it that we give the best possible example in this connection.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, I must say a few words about the suggestion that this question be sent to a committee. In my opinion there is no need for this to be done. Personally I have no difficulty in arriving at a decision and I imagine this applies to most hon. members. However, if hon. members really believe that they need more information, then the suggestion that this question be sent to a committee for study is one that should be followed. I hope they will not think this necessary and will pass the resolution as it is.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Henri Latulippe (Compton-Frontenac): Mr. Speaker, would the hon. member permit a question?

Mr. Lewis: Yes.

Mr. Latulippe: I should like to put a question to the hon. member which is also directed to other hon. members, like the hon. gentleman from Quebec West for instance.

Does the hon. member recognize that all authority comes from God? Should we not imitate God, punish evil and do justice?

Is it not the right and the duty of society to punish evil and protect itself, even though this requires that criminals must pay with their lives their debts to society, which is duty bound to see that Divine justice is respected?

Mr. Sauvé: There is only one God.

• (5:50 p.m.)

[*English*]

Mr. Lewis: Mr. Speaker, may I say very simply to the hon. member as seriously as he asked the question that in all the teaching I received about God and about the duties of all men to God the central point was that mercy and charity in the human breast and human mind are the most obvious and most essential characteristics of a religious and godly life. This is as true for society collectively as it is for every individual in society. Second, all the teaching I received on the subject has taught me that it is not right for me to state certain ideas and seek refuge in the assertion that they come from God but that it is much more important for me, as it is for all members in this house, to use the intelligence and the conscience which God gave us to arrive at the conclusion at which we are intended to arrive as human beings exercising our own wills.

[*Translation*]

Mr. L.-P. Neveu (Shefford): Mr. Speaker, in this important debate, I am happy to have the privilege of expressing my views before such a distinguished audience.

I do not pretend to be the strongest light in the debate but I am happy to bring to it my humble contribution.

I know that my hon. colleagues on both sides of the house are making very well documented speeches which will help to better explore that very controversial question.

I heard from all corners of the house excellent speeches dealing objectively with that matter, trying to find a solution as well as to exchange ideas to get light which we hope will be strong and brilliant.

However, someone, on the side of the party to which I belong, particularly impressed me this afternoon, and that is the Minister of Citizenship and Immigration (Mr. Marchand), whose speech was very intelligent, clear, to the point, truly magnificent.

I am pleased to add, in passing, that this man represents not only an asset for our party, but for politics in general which I consider to be the science of the common good.

We noticed that the minister advanced convincing arguments which will probably influence several of us who did not have any definite opinion. We saw that, as in the past, our colleague stands out again with his intelligence, his effectiveness, his honesty and his greatness.

On the combined harmony of those three factors depends the emotional and mental equilibrium of individuals.

Like many others, I believed that it was necessary to punish, that it was necessary to apply the death penalty. I was emotionally sensitive to crimes of all kinds which were committed. I also wanted that the method of punishment be adopted. But after thinking it over a little, after studying the human being instead of the human soul, I could not help but reconsider my decision because, as someone said earlier, to ask for punishment, members of society at large and those in charge of the administration of justice should feel above reproach. It is extremely difficult to

judge, especially when there is no appeal, because it is impossible to say: "Whoever has never sinned shall cast the first stone."

My social science studies have enabled me to understand, to a certain extent, mass behaviour. Later on, I turned to psychology in my personal studies, with a view to acquiring a deeper understanding—up to a point, of course, since everything is relative—of human feelings and the importance of emotions in individual behaviour.

All human beings act, consciously or unconsciously, in order to love or to be loved. Individual behaviour differs, but in its outward form only.

All human beings are influenced directly by three important factors:

1. Family.
2. Sexuality.
3. Religion.

Mr. Speaker, we are reaching the climax of the debate. If you will allow me, I shall go back to the positive arguments, which are the most conclusive, in favour of abolition of the death penalty.

Abolition or suspension of capital punishment does not immediately lead to a much greater number of crimes. Statistics may be quoted in favour of both alternatives, but they should be based on the human plane, where two criteria motivate human beings—not generally, but always—namely, the wish to acquire and the fear of losing. as I wish to progress with my learned colleagues of the house, I too say, to put it mildly, that the effectiveness of capital punishment as a deterrent has yet to be proved.

• (6:00 p.m.)

Even certain countries such as Spain, Greece, Turkey, particularly the United Kingdom and, with certain reservations, Japan, which retain the death penalty, have doubts as to its value as a deterrent.

All available information seem to confirm that the removal of an offence from the list of offences punishable by death never gave rise to any substantial outbreak of that offence.

Certain crimes, including petty larceny, larceny, counterfeit and rape were even reduced after the abolition of capital punishment for such crimes in the 19th century.

The experience was the same with murders which are no longer considered as capital murders, and the same general observation usually applies total abolition of capital punishment.

In Canada, from 1951 to 1958, there was an average of six executions; but there were 12 in 1952, and 11 in 1953. However, throughout this period, the criminality rate remained about the same. In western and southern Australia, there had been an average of two executions per year since 1935 but in the last five years there was none and criminality seems to remain substantially at the same level.

I say that perhaps the best deterrent to crime is primary education given in concrete form the example set by adults. I do not believe any criminal became one as an adult. He was predestinated in his younger years. He suffered traumatisms which had serious consequences. I do not think there are basically bad people. I would rather think there are unfortunate people. That is what we must see through, Mr. Speaker, there is a real risk of executing an innocent or of improperly carrying out an execution.

It does not always take the same time to die.

The state should set the example by recognizing that human life is sacred and that it is wrong to kill.

For the state, an execution is a "voluntary mutilation". By doing away with a citizen, the state does not remove the crime: it only commits another.

The health penalty can only be justified as a collective revenge, an atonement or a supreme punishment.

It is considered nowadays that penalties have no other purpose than to serve as a deterrent or as a punishment. Now, this end may be achieved otherwise than by taking a life.

The law of retaliation is obsolete. An execution is a kind of judicial or legal murder. And the existence of the death penalty degrades justice.

The inclusion of the death penalty among the punishments provided for distorts the meaning of trials for murder which turn into a sinister tragi-comedy. Such punishment makes criminal justice dubious.

The death penalty is based on a metaphysical concept of human freedom, whereas according to social science, an offender usually does not enjoy complete freedom. Absolute justice is then an illusion and integral atonement, a fiction. Human justice cannot assess individual responsibility positively. In fact,

the condemned pays for others or suffers as a warning to others; therefore, his execution is not morally justified.

The death penalty is not the deterrent it is credited to be and statistics prove that its abolition will not result in an increase in crime. Therefore, capital punishment loses its basic traditional justification.

Capital punishment is a form of cruelty and inhumanity unworthy of a civilization purporting to be humanitarian. Physicians state that even the most efficient methods cannot bring about instant and painless death.

The major drawback to capital punishment is that it is past recall. Notwithstanding all official statements, a miscarriage of justice always remains possible. There have been some and this is why capital punishment is society's unforgiveable crime.

Society can protect itself by means other than capital punishment which is just an easy way out. It saves looking for efficient methods of fighting crime and for a rational prevention plan.

Capital punishment is unjust because it strikes not only the criminal but his relatives, and his whole family is branded with shame.

To claim that capital punishment is the only way to full repentance is a paradox. One thing sure, with it, rehabilitation of the human being involved becomes impossible.

Due to its absolute nature, capital punishment cannot be measured to the degree of guilt and the grievousness of the crime and all the differences that were sought between capital murder and other kinds of homicide have been shown to be arbitrary.

It is a contradiction to claim that capital punishment is a deterrent while it is being meted out in secret.

Curiosity aroused by an execution is morbid, it is a well-known fact, and more and more it is being realized that capital punishment in itself may lead to crime, especially in the case of mental defectives who, in spite of all legal and judicial precautions, are often executed.

From a racial and social point of view, the death penalty is not applied on an equal footing. Some people cannot afford legal counsel, others are morally incapable of securing such counsel. This punishment which should be the expression of justice for all often ends up, in practice, an injustice for the individual.

[Mr. Neveu.]

Mr. Speaker, if we sincerely want a better society that we can be proud of and when we cast our vote, on this most important question, we should do so according to our own conscience.

If prisoner rehabilitation is to truly be achieved I think prisoners should be classified so as to make a distinction between categories of criminals.

Another equally important step would be to improve our security systems so as to protect the people in general and the guards in particular.

Christians should be guided by the scriptural message in their daily and earthly tasks. I say this because, at the beginning of each sitting of the house we, as members of parliament, representatives of the people and legislators, always ask to be guided by our faith in God and his divine providence. And we ask him now to enlighten us in this regard.

The Holy Scriptures are clear in this matter. Moses' law prescribed that "Thou shall not kill", and Christ, without changing this law, came to abolish the law of retaliation known as "an eye for an eye and a tooth for a tooth".

The originality of Christianity was in advocating absolute love. A Christian must not only love, but forgive his enemies. Like Peter, therefore, justice must be told "Put up thy sword into the sheath."

I can hear you say: Will society then allow everything? Not at all, to forgive has never meant to abandon everything. It means to forget the wrong, not the offender who should be taken care of, helped and put back on the right path.

But there is the terrible danger of recurrence. I know, Mr. Speaker, that statistics plainly show that no one who was hanged ever relapsed into crime. Others, unfortunately... have done so. This means that a pardon cannot be granted without useful and necessary precautions. What we need is adequate maximum security penitentiaries. It is not the Dion trial that should be reopened, but that of the jails and the guards, of those who set him free or let him escape.

Besides it is becoming increasingly evident that our judiciary feels guilty in inflicting capital punishment.

Why not replace insecurity and guilt by feelings born of pride and greatness?

It has become very important to establish definitely in the sight of everybody a truly better society, a humane society that knows

how to forgive. We must humanize our justice. Capital punishment is a product of hate. If we stop to think, we see that love and hate are bound together like two sides of a coin.

Love is positive, hate engenders a negative attitude.

It may be noticed that man and beast are most alike in hate. It must therefore be concluded that reason is mostly absent from hate.

• (6:10 p.m.)

Then, I hear voices saying: We will pay to give food and lodging to useless and evil-minded beings who killed, and still kill and who pollute society? Mr. Speaker, you can say that this is one of the prices we have to pay to live in society. Otherwise, if we eliminate all the useless members of society, all the hideous, all the dunces, we decide in favour of selective euthanasia.

And who will decide between those to be eliminated and the others? Why, then, would we keep the mentally deficient? And who will be considered as mentally ill? No, decidedly, the point concerning the price to pay does not have much value. When will Christians accept the mystery of suffering which is distributed in society and contribute to its redemption?

You may tell me that God acts through secondary causes. It is strange to note that Catholics and pagans, in France, in Spain and in Latin America, have in common this anachronism which is the death penalty.

It seems that we are still in the Constantine era. We have to act as absolute masters; we need a temporal strength to defend God and his love, to propose God and his forgiveness. And if this had proved useful? At any rate, all the murders which took place in Canada occurred despite the death penalty.

It is thus that we condone violence. I am aware of the point often made by the retentionists. They say: Murderers, be the first to stop. It is as if one asked children to be teachers in their classes and sick people to be doctors. The murder is made with passion, often the meanest, that of filthy lucre or sexual madness; but death administered by the hangman is carried out with calm, control and lucidity. Who then should be the first to stop?

Mr. Speaker, everything on this earth is made by inference of a gesture to another. To abolish the death penalty is to act for life in many other fields where the murderers are numerous. There are murders of abortion, murders when inebriated drivers persist in driving, murders during the war, and for which decorations are awarded, murders committed by rich people who refuse to give food to starving people.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order. I regret to interrupt the hon. member but the time allotted for his speech has expired.

Some hon. Members: Carry on.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Does the house give unanimous consent to the hon. member continuing?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Mr. Neveu: I am grateful to the hon. gentleman and to my colleagues in the house for their generosity.

In the Middle Ages, noblemen believed in torture, the Church resorted to implacable inquisitions, teachers used whips to educate young people . . . Thanks to God, this is no more. Man gains in refinement and in spiritual values, and every day the meaning of love is gaining. Hon. friends, we have to help the human race along in this direction.

Let us suppose that, aware of the true facts, we are before the accused. A major crime has been committed and a guilty verdict is to be rendered. The first question that should be asked is this: Is this person guilty? And why? This is when the problem can become terribly agonizing for those who have to face the problem in all its significance.

We blush with shame over the behaviour of human beings on economic matters, prime source of deliquency.

Crowds of people under social services at 16 cents a meal; others with meager salaries half-living, in want of everything, buried under debts from birth to their dying day, living a life of toil, with too many hours under bad working conditions and as a result, father, mother, youngsters, all living socially unbalanced lives.

Mr. Speaker, we must give our suffering humiliated and thirsting humanity a normal life.

A humane justice, civilized and loved.

A justice that will burn the whips instead of human flesh.

A justice that will transform our prisons into hospitals according to classified cases.

A justice that will give to the organization of justice what it needs for its new and magnificent rehabilitation, work, not only consideration but also the support of all of

those who have not erred as well as of those who have erred.

Finally a justice that will no longer kill.

In closing, the horrible murders quoted by my retentionist colleagues were committed while capital punishment was in force.

When capital punishment is inflicted, the guilty one is not the most punished it is the following generations, and this is important.

I should like to give you an example and appeal not only to your heart but also to your intelligence, because your decision will be very significant in the future. When I was at school in my riding, I remember with emotion two young men whose father was hanged. Those two fellow-students attending the same college were bright and had a fine future before them. They lived in the beautiful riding of Shefford I represent, and after dropping out of school because of this horrible situation, they left for an unknown destination. I feel that even though they might still be living today, a truly deep feeling was extinguished in them, that is, the hope for a better world, for a better society.

That is why, and for all the other reasons given as well, I am in favour of the abolition of the death penalty.

In conclusion, I remember the most famous condemned to death, Christ made man. Even though he was mistried, he accepted to ascend Calvary and to be crucified in spite of his power to appeal to his father to reduce to silence those who had insulted him. He was deeply hurt. Naturally, he could have put his enemies to confusion, but in his agony, when he addressed himself to his father, he did not say: Lord, kill them, but rather: Father, forgive them, they know not what they do.

That is why I shall vote for the abolition of the death penalty.

PROCEEDINGS ON ADJOURNMENT MOTION

SUBJECT MATTER OF QUESTIONS TO BE DEBATED UNDER ADJOURNMENT MOTION

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Rinfret): Order. Before giving the floor to the hon. member for Halifax (Mr. McCleave), it is my duty, pursuant to provisional standing order 39A, to inform the house that the questions to be debated at the time of adjournment tonight are as follows: the hon. member for Kootenay-West (Mr. Herridge): Finance—Reported discrimination against women requesting bank loans; the hon. member for Okanagan-Revelstoke (Mr. Johnston): Increase in pulmonary tuberculosis; the hon. member for Notre-Dame-de-Grâce (Mr. Allmand): Penitentiaries—St. Vincent-de-Paul—Suicide of a prisoner.

[Mr. Neveu.]

[*English*]

CRIMINAL CODE

PROPOSED AMENDMENT REGARDING CAPITAL PUNISHMENT

The house resumed consideration of the motion of Messrs. Byrne, Nugent, Scott (Danforth) and Stanbury:

Resolved, that it is expedient to introduce a measure to amend the Criminal Code for the purposes of

(a) abolishing the death penalty in respect of all offences under that act;

(b) substituting a mandatory sentence of life imprisonment in those cases where the death penalty is now mandatory; and

(c) providing that no person upon whom a mandatory sentence of life imprisonment is imposed shall be released from imprisonment without the prior approval of the governor in council.

Mr. Robert McCleave (Halifax): Mr. Speaker, in taking part in this intellectual and stimulating debate, surely one of the most interesting this house has had in recent years, I first of all want to take issue with what I regard to be a serious mistake in the very foundation of the arguments of those in the abolitionist camp. The argument goes something like this: The philosophy of an eye for an eye and a tooth for a tooth is set forth in the Hammurabic and Mosaic codes. Therefore, building on this foundation, society is pictured as becoming an avenger and as seeking vengeance. I think this a mistaken view. I think that the philosophy of an eye for an eye and a tooth for a tooth in the Hammurabic and Mosaic codes was not an incentive to vengeance; it was not a request that society go out of its way to become brutal.

It has been suggested that society ought to be modern. In the codes I have referred to it is held that an eye ought to be taken for an eye and that two eyes ought not to be taken in return, that one tooth should be taken for a tooth and not that a whole mouthful of teeth should be knocked out in reprisal. I think that the Hammurabic and Mosaic codes, which stand at the dawn of our civilization, were a deliberate and intelligent attempt to bring some order to society. Hammurabi and Moses were telling the gangs and clans of those days that if a member of one of their clans was killed other members of other clans ought not to go forth and exact two lives

where one life had been taken. In short, sir, Hammurabi and Moses as ancient law givers had the very sensible objective of the protection of society in mind. That is the same objective we must have in mind today.

• (6:20 p.m.)

In this debate I do not intend to make a complete speech. After three days we are hearing arguments over and over again. Many speakers have gone beyond the 20 minute mark. I think the practice adopted some time ago at UNESCO might be a good one, limiting speeches to ten minutes for a while to see how that works out and then cutting them down to five. I have heard many fine debates where speakers were limited to one minute apiece and could give expression only to novel ideas.

Applying these remarks as an injunction to myself I will make a few random points before reaching my conclusion. We have heard much about deterrence as a basis for arguments favouring hanging or abolition. My view is that it is a purely utilitarian concept and that we should divest ourselves of this concept when deciding whether or not capital punishment should be retained.

We have been inundated with statistics. I am impressed by the large number of murders, 40 per cent, I believe, which are committed within family or domestic circles. I do not believe deterrence is a factor in such cases but I believe it is in other cases when one is dealing with criminals.

I make the point that to retain capital punishment is to afford protection for the criminal himself. I say this having talked with policemen about this question. I know something of the police attitude. Two points were made to me by a veteran inspector of the Halifax police department. They show how much the policeman feels he is protected by the presence of capital punishment as part of our legal system. Frequently when on duty this inspector has to go into dark buildings at night which have either been broken into by criminals or left unlocked. He does not know. He has to go in with other officers and make a search.

If by mischance a criminal were to kill one of the police the other policemen might take the attitude that if the criminal were not going to be hanged, they themselves might very quickly become judge, jury and executioner. The second point he makes is that in a similar situation, faced with the possibility that he might meet an armed criminal in a building or elsewhere, it might well be a matter of his life or the criminal's, depending on who shot first. So I say, knowing the attitude of the police on this question, that there is a strong case for retaining capital punishment in order to protect criminals themselves as well as the police.

I should like to make my second point very briefly because it was dealt with most ably in my view by my hon. friend the hon. member for Kamloops (Mr. Fulton). It concerns syndicated crime. There is fear of the growth of syndicated crime in this country. When I hear hon. members talking about the reform and rehabilitation which can be brought about in a criminal I ask, when does this reform and rehabilitation set in?

Does it set in after the second victim has been killed? It does not. Do any of the gang go to the police to advise them that a third victim has been chosen? No. Do reform and rehabilitation set in after the fourth victim is killed, or is any potential victim warned or are the police consulted so as to prevent all the misery which the sudden removal of a human being brings with it? No. When does rehabilitation set in? I suggest it sets in when the long arm of the law has reached down and put these people behind bars. I reject the notion of reform and rehabilitation in these very tough cases.

We talk about deterrence, but the penitentiaries are filled with thieves who go to prison over and over again. Obviously imprisonment does not deter these people. But it does have the effect of protecting society from their mischievous presence.

My attitude on the issue of hanging is what it was during the discussions culminating in the debate of 1961. We must have some form of awesome punishment which shows some appreciation for the value of human life, an appreciation which I suggest has become softened and diluted in our time.

What should we do about this problem? One suggestion is that we should hold a referendum to determine the views of the Canadian people. I know that each one of us did not go before the electorate on November 8 spelling out our views for or against the retention of capital punishment. Yet this is a subject on which the Canadian people could easily express their views. Most people have views on this subject.

I share the abhorrence expressed by my hon. friend from Kamloops for life imprisonment which, it seems to me, is worse than death. However, if there were to be an alternative to capital punishment I would

suggest a term certain of 25 years or 30 years, about double the sentence given to those who now take part in armed hold-ups.

Like the hon. member for Vancouver East (Mr. Winch), I have seen a hanging. It took place in Winnipeg in 1948. It was a clean hanging, if one can use that expression about such a brutal event. The memory of it clings to me to this day. It seems to me that the hanging process is capable of being bungled. It is capable of causing torture. It is capable of miscarriage. The graphic description which the hon. member for Vancouver East gave us of the hangman having to jump in to clutch the legs of the person being hanged is one which will stay with a good many of us.

I think we should have some alternative to hanging. In 1961 after considerable debate a formula was achieved which was, I think, a fair one. Murder was divided into capital and non-capital categories. As a matter of fact, the debate could be said to have extended over the previous decade during which a committee of both houses sat to consider this whole matter.

I believe that the formula reached in 1961 should have been given a fair chance to work, say for a period of five years. I still think it should be given a fair chance to work and that is why I intend to vote against the resolution.

• (6:30 p.m.)

[*Translation*]

Mr. C. A. Gauthier (Roberval): Mr. Speaker, we will probably be called to vote on capital punishment tonight. This question has produced differences of opinion among the hon. members of this house in the last few days and will continue to do so. It is not a subject to be treated lightly and a discussion of several days cannot produce a solution.

Thus it was an excellent idea to present a resolution before bringing in the bill itself.

I wish to congratulate the sponsors of this resolution who have helped us to go beyond the framework of ordinary politics and given everyone an opportunity to express his opinion according to his beliefs and principles.

Although the matter under consideration is looked at in many different ways, a uniform dignity in dealing with the subject marks its importance. The most varied opinions have been voiced, including sometimes legitimate feelings, and a real effort has been made to adduce sound arguments. Some members even quoted from the Bible in support of retention of capital punishment, while others quoted different excerpts of the Good Book in support of abolition.

All Christian religions were mentioned, and we found that the great majority of the united and Protestant churches seem to favour the abolition of capital punishment. For what reasons? I shall not venture to discuss them.

Besides, this is not the place nor the time for such discussions. I respect their view, without accepting that the argument advanced by the hon. member for Broadview (Mr. Gilbert), as reported in the right-hand column of page 3148 of the official report for March 24 when he said

> Roman Catholics in the main agree with abolition.

It would have been more correct for him to say: A minority of them agree with abolition.

In fact, the supreme authority of the Roman Catholic church, since we have only one Roman Catholic church, under one authority, did not yet make its position clear and definite on this issue.

Perhaps it is because they wait for the government to take a decision first in this field which belongs to it.

The sole letter of Father Kelly, in favour of abolition, is exactly the exception which confirms the general rule of the status quo for the time being. Besides, Father Kelly himself admits that it is generally the voice of laymen that was heard.

I also listened with great interest to the remarks of the hon. member for Prince (Mr. MacDonald). As a theologian, with an experience as chaplain of certain prisoners, he spoke about difficulties in backing our allegations and our negations in this connection by a single excerpt from the Bible.

Therefore, without repeating quotations from the Holy Scriptures, which were referred to by those who spoke before me, I will admit that I have studied theology myself and that I have yet to come upon a single text which would definitely determine my judgement for or against the abolition of capital punishment.

In fact, religion is not a question of punishment, but rather of love which calls for charity.

Does not the first commandment read as follows: And thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thine heart? And the second, just as important: And thou shalt love thy neighbour like thyself.

Coming back to human law, we can infer that, following the divine commandment, the constituted civil authority must take all the necessary means to protect the neighbour which is society.

And, among those means, the death penalty is precisely the final one given by God to Moses in the judaic law which provided for death as a punishment for certain crimes.

But also, I am not afraid to admit that the application of the death penalty is so dependent on the conditions of people, places and times, that today not one of us can legislate without fear of making a mistake.

The major difficulty is not to find the guilty one but to determine his degree of guilt among the intricate extenuating or aggravating circumstances and, therefore, to unable the established authority to act for the greatest good of our modern society.

I am not a man of law but I have, so to speak, lived the law.

Indeed, in the last 30 years, having been constantly involved in all kinds of judicial inquiries, having been called upon to help medical experts with several autopsies in order to detect the mobile of a crime or the cause of death, to establish the degree of guilt of the alleged criminal, I have come to the point that today I ask myself if the condemned was really the guilty one and to what extent?

In our so-called civilized society, full of contradictions and hypocrisy, I wonder if those who made certain laws were more serious than some others who apply them today?

After having lived, so to speak, so many tragic events, I come to the conclusion that the two main things that lead to crime are: money and sex.

It is in the light of those causes, when one goes down to the bottom of the extenuating circumstances, that it is difficult to give a name to the guilty one. To such an extent that when one hears some sentences, an inner voice shouts other names. Who? A partner, a friend, a police officer, a lawyer, a judge, finance, society itself, what?

So, I pity certain policemen, investigators, solicitors, counsel and judges, especially when they hold functions for which they are totally unsuited.

Therefore, I shall always be opposed to purely political or financial appointments in the field of justice.

Tell me who you serve, tell me who pays you and I might show you who is the guilty one.

Shake up your personal memories when you are alone in your room tonight and you will agree with me that society is far from having the protection it should have.

Instead of making speeches on whether or not we should abolish capital punishment, it would be much more beneficial to study means to free society from those financiers without conscience and their parasites who find supporters at every level of our cocial structure.

The one and only thing I am interested in tonight is last degree capital murder, thereby casting aside all the others.

I also wish to look at things from the standpoint of our democratic society, on the political plane since we are no longer dealing with economic and financial matters where the opinion of the majority of responsible people becomes law.

Therefore, I will pay no attention to the opinion of socialists or communists pleading for the abolition of capital punishment in our democracies, while every day their leaders abroad are placing those who oppose their will before the firing squad.

Shall we find a disciple of Lenin or Karl Marx crying over Canadians sent to the gallows when their own master himself boasted that, as far as he was concerned, human life was not worth more than that of a guinea pig? Is that what you call respect for the human person?

Or, perhaps, these goods disciples, putting forward the absolute certainty of guilt? When after having crushed a revolution they will execute out of hand all their opponents.

At this stage, Mr. Speaker, I want to call the attention of the house on an article written by Renaude Lapointe, entitled "Tears over a murderer" ("Pleurons sur l'assassin") which reads as follows:

> For several months the abolitionists in Canada, have been carrying out a well organized campaign in favour of their cause. A long article published Monday in the *Globe and Mail* of Toronto, had this tear-jerking headline.: "He was alone, defenceless and was killed". Whom were they talking about? Not about the innocent victim of the murderer (who also was alone, defenceless and murdered), but about the murderer himself when he had to pay for his crime.

Mr. Speaker, I believe this should be a cause for reflexion for many people and members of this house, especially when we

look back and find what has happened following the socialist revolutions, what happened to great jurists and scientists, executed out of hand; today, the same people travel all over democratic countries to promote the abolition of capital punishment.

I admit that since the opening of this debate on capital punishment, I have assiduously been collecting information, both pro and con, to be certain to reflect the opinion of the majority in my riding, while keeping a happy medium.

Several persons, as a matter of fact, contended that in abolitionist countries murders have not increased, and others have proved that the retention of capital punishment provided security to their country.

There are contradictory statements such as these I have read on the first page of a document dealing with capital punishment and I quote:

> It appears from these figures that the abolition of capital punishment was followed by a considerable increase in the number of murders known to the police during the years 1941-48. But this does not necessarily imply a causal connection, there were increases during that decade also in Queensland, where capital punishment was discontinued many years ago, and in New South Wales, where executions were carried out up to 1939 but have been stopped since.

• (6:40 p.m.)

Finally, other countries found it necessary to re-establish capital punishment. Even England is considering re-establishment of capital punishment today.

This is the dilemma we will face when we vote.

Our society can best be guaranteed protection by the deterrent effect of the death penalty. After all, this punishment should not be considered from the point of view of the murderer himself, but from the point of view of the whole society requiring the fullest protection from such individuals.

If the punishment must fit the crime as far as the guilty person is concerned, it must above all be a deterrent factor as far as society is concerned.

Laws are primarily made for the protection of society in general and, second, for the protection of the individual. And, I soon realized that this was borne in mind by the thousands of people I have questioned right across my riding on this matter.

As a matter of fact, Mr. Speaker, 90 per cent of the people, nearly 2,000, to whom I put the question: are you for or against capital punishment? answered they were in favour of maintaining the death penalty, while only 10 per cent were against.

Can this be explained by the many murders of all sorts committed in our regions these last few years? Murders as foul as that of Dion and others and all the murders involved in criminal fires and fraudulent bankruptcies? Are honest people terrified by all these sentences commuted to life imprisonment? I think that this sight alone and the resurgence of organized crime and theft should incite the government to return to full capital punishment instead of asking questions. It is often said that the voice of the people is the voice of God, or that in a true democracy the voice of the majority should rule.

Therefore, it would be very difficult for me to vote against the wish of 90 per cent of my constituents. For that reason, I will vote for the retention of capital punishment.

At this point, Mr. Speaker, I wish to move an amendment, in order to make clearer the motion now before the house, for I find it too categorical—

Mr. Caouette: Unacceptable.

Mr. Gauthier: —and unacceptable in its present form.

Consequently, I move, seconded by the hon. member for Villeneuve (Mr. Caouette):

> That the motion be amended as follows:
>
> First, by adding after paragraph (a), the following words: "except for capital murders, as currently defined, committed while a sentence of life imprisonment is served".
>
> Second, by adding, after paragraph (b), the following words: "except in the case of a capital murder committed while a person is serving a sentence of life imprisonment".
>
> Third, by inserting in paragraph (c) immediately after the word "imposed" the words "or with regard to whom a death sentence was commuted".

Mr. Speaker, as I said a while ago, I respect the opinion of the 10 per cent who believe that capital punishment should be abolished, for various reasons.

On the basis of the answers of all those who favour retention, human nature being what it is, I think fear remains the strongest argument to invite men to abide by the law. Mr. Speaker, the member who spoke before me stated that the prisoners were fear-ridden.

Well, let me tell you that some prisoners have so little fear of prisons that, especially during the winter, they get into mischief in order to spend the winter there . . .

Mr. Caouette: Where they are secure.

Mr. Gauthier: Call it security or what you will, but I say prison is not a deterrent to murder. Far from it, to some people, prisons are boarding schools. I heard it from no other source than the prisoners themselves.

In fact, if you discuss at all with these people, you will see to what extent they have grown perfect. Which means that, so long as man has not reached that degree of spirituality where the senses no longer influence the spirit, laws will be needed to protect society from certain individuals, in whom the beast dominates the spirit.

I believe we still have a long way to go before we reach that level of idealist perfection.

Let us keep both feet on the ground, and listen to those individuals or groups who want to retain the death penalty in certain specific cases.

At this point, Mr. Speaker, I take the liberty of referring to literature gleaned out of some 2,000 letters I have received, of which I shall quote only a few.

At a meeting of the Normandin Local of the Catholic Farmers' Union in my riding, the following resolution was adopted unanimously:

> Whereas criminal deaths and armed robberies are constantly increasing, even with the death penalty in Canada, the C.F.U. local of this parish, in general assembly, through this resolution, protests strongly against the eventuality of the abolition of said penalty, in the sincere belief that even now, capital punishment instills fear into criminals.

Mr. Speaker, it is precisely this resolution which confirms the arguments I expressed a moment ago to the effect that fear is the beginning of wisdom, for prisoners as well as others.

I received today, as other members probably—

• (6:50 p.m.)

[*English*]

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order. I must advise the hon. member that the time allotted to him has expired.

Some hon. Members: Carry on.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Does the house give unanimous consent to the hon. member to continue?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Gauthier: Mr. Speaker, I only have for two or three minutes more, just to say that the hon. members have probably received the same telegram which reads as follows:

> During the general assembly of the Federation of municipal policemen of the province of Quebec representing more than 6,000 municipal policemen, which took place on March 26, 1966, it was decided unanimously:
>
> (A) To object to the abolition of the death penalty.
>
> (B) To promote the creation of a national compensation fund to assist dependants of murder victims.
>
> The Federation of municipal policemen of the province of Quebec.
>
> Paul-Emile Blain, secretary.

I have also a letter from the party of the National Unity of Canada, whose members are strongly opposed to the abolition of the death penalty. It is too long to be read in the house.

I have another letter from the UCC of La Doré, who are also against the abolition of the death penalty.

Moreover, I have before me a letter from the Federation of retail business and services of the province of Quebec, of which hon. members have probably received a copy. The members of this association are also against the abolition of the death penalty.

Mr. Speaker, I could go on and on quoting the many documents I received, pointing out the reasons why the various associations are against the abolition of the death penalty.

As a matter of fact, in most cases, those reasons have already been put forward by members who required that the house should not vote in favour of the resolution now before us, or at least that the death penalty should be maintained until society had reached, as I said earlier, a degree of perfection that will only be attained in the angelic state, because we must tell ourselves over and over again that what gives a man food for thought today is fear. I believe that by removing this fear, the murderer will commit more murders.

If a murderer gets a life sentence, he must say to himself: It is not worse to be in jail for murdering one person than for killing two, three or even ten more. This amounts to saying: I shall spend my life in jail just the same.

Can you imagine such reasoning, Mr. Speaker? You realize what might happen. That is why some people even ask that the law should be made more severe and strict,

and provide for the execution of a sentenced man. In order to prevent any backtracking, let us start by giving a life sentence to a murderer and if he ever commits another murder, he should be hanged unremittingly.

Mr. Speaker, I feel that my amendment is in accordance with the wishes of the people, because I am convinced that they are not ready to accept the resolution in its present form. That is impossible. As a matter of fact, as I said earlier, some socialist or socialist-minded people would want us to pass the resolution in its present form. It is absolutely necessary to come to an agreement on this matter, because there is no agreement at all.

In fact, I am almost certain that the house is actually split in the middle. As we must pass a most important law for the nation, I feel we should reach an agreement, so that this house may be unanimous and I hope that through the members, good will will make an understanding possible.

[*English*]

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order. Before I put the amendment moved by the hon. member for Roberval, perhaps the hon. member would allow me to point out that it might be more in conformity with our regular procedure if the hon. member were to find as his seconder a member who has not already spoken in this debate.

Mr. Gauthier: I propose the hon. member for Portneuf (Mr. Godin) as the seconder, Mr. Speaker.

• (7:00 p.m.)

Mr. Deputy Speaker: It is the opinion of the Chair that the amendment is in order.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Ovide Laflamme (Québec-Montmorency): Mr. Speaker, in accepting to take part in this important debate, I tried to stay away from emotionalism which it is so easy to fall into.

In my view, to state the debate by calling on leniency for the convicted criminal, or to quote eloquently words from the Bible or to reduce the issue to a personal experience, gives an unrealistic picture to the mind, creates confusion and does not meet the requirements of reason.

For my part, it is regrettable to use expressions such as: "The killer state", "evolution of society", "civilized society", "barbaric deed", and so on.

It is the bounden duty for a state to provide security for its citizens and to curb crime by appropriate means. This responsibility weighs heavily when it is necessary to protect innocent lives, and there is no room for slackness, candour and pity.

To dream of a society where the rights of each citizen are respected by everyone is the final hope of every reasonable being. It is even unthinkable that human beings should kill without pity, take the life of others, of those they do not even know, or kill for money. Unfortunately, this is sadly true.

We shall not have a civilized society as long as we have organized crime, the underworld, paid killers, armed robbery experts, indiscriminately gunning down policemen and people in the street.

This picture is degrading, disgraceful, but it is real and true, and it does not call for hypothetical uncertainty nor poetry.

Compassion toward these traitors is premature. Let us consider together the means of eliminating potential murderers at the outset. Let us get our youth interested in useful occupations, particularly those subjected to the evil example of parents of broken homes. Let us eliminate hate literature; let us remove from children's eyes films of violence, showing ways to steal and commit murder; let us ensure respect and dignity of those in authority, of civil and judiciary power. When the sense of values will have meaning for the whole of our society, such as debate will have long since lost its usefulness.

In 1961, as the hon. member for Kamloops (Mr. Fulton) observed, this house approved important amendments to the Criminal Code establishing categories of murder and reducing death sentences considerably and giving the provincial departments of justice certain discretion in the framing of charges.

In fact, this legislation was well inspired and brought about a significant change in government thinking on the punishment of the crime of murder.

It should nevertheless be admitted that the implementation was considerably altered by the number of commutations passed since so that it is most difficult to gauge the benefits of those amendments. Abuse of commutation has disrupted the results.

The concept of abolition is generous, idealistic and also emotional. I should like to emphasize to the house the numerous speeches heard this afternoon in support of the abolition of capital punishment. These

speeches are easy. They stem from good nature and sentiments. But, Mr. Speaker, so far as I am concerned, I shall not tolerate the implication in this house that those who rise against the abolition of capital punishment are not up to date, are still deprived of charitable feelings which the abolitionists naturally bear in their hearts.

This principle is based sometimes on the Bible, sometimes on the sacred right to life, but too much optimism is shown when one relies on the services which a convicted person could eventually render to society.

I was amazed that in the course of the present debate, not four, not even three abolitionists said a few words about the murderers' victims. They commiserated, and this went on again today, with the convicted offender, but forgot the unfortunate victims of those who went as far as to commit the terrible crime of murder.

The abolition concept is completely out of context in our present day society. The death penalty argument for capital, passionate or non premeditated murders has been defeated ever since 1961 because the law itself provides otherwise.

Abolitionists point out to possible miscarriage of justice. Although they cannot dig up one serious example in the past decades in support of their argument, they question the country's judicial system, the good faith of our police forces and the established principle that the innocent shouts his innocence, that innocence always creates a reasonable doubt permitting acquittal. One has to be quite imaginative to presume that a crime was committed and that, under the circumstances, an innocent person could be convicted without a doubt being cast if he explains those circumstances, and one would be rather naive to think a person charged with murder would refuse to testify at his own trial when he is innocent and when there are only circumstantial evidence against him.

It is also said that capital punishment will in no way influence the criminal as he does not think of it when committing a crime. Who can tell? This is an important factor. Who really knows? I wonder whether there is in this house an abolitionist who would agree to support the abolition of capital punishment for twenty years if he knew that the murder of an innocent man would have been avoided had capital punishment been retained? What would be his attitude? It is possible that the criminal does not think of capital punishment when committing his crime. This may very well be true for the unpremeditated crime, for which the law provides punishment other than death.

I also find weak the argument of religious scruples; I think it shows a false conception of virtue and, although it stems from natural goodness, it is totally removed from the basic subject matter of this debate which is the fundamental obligation of society to protect itself against dangerous individuals, organized crime, contract crime and traitors to the state.

One of the basic methods of society to ensure the protection of life and property is the police. Can a police officer do his duty properly if he is not morally convinced that whoever makes an attempt on his life while he is on duty will pay with his own?

Nowadays the policeman on duty is on a battlefield. If you want to abolish capital punishment, you have to disarm him. At least, the criminal will know then that he does not have to shoot him down to avoid being captured and so the policeman will not use his weapon unduly.

Have you ever stopped to think that, if capital punishment is abolished, the policeman on duty will use his weapon at the first sign of danger in the discharge of his difficult duties?

Now what about the prison guard—I am aware, Mr. Speaker, that those arguments have already been used—who has to keep an eye on murderers sentenced to life imprisonment? The prisoner will be continually tempted to kill him in order to escape. In any case, he would have nothing to lose.

The reply given to that is that nearly all the guards killed were killed by convicts other than murderers. Does it not rather mean that, having already had his sentence commuted once, the murderer is sure that this would never be repeated?

Our country, Mr. Speaker, is not without subversive elements. In this world of ours, sedition is always possible. I am willing to close my eyes and believe that never again will anybody be evil enough to plan to murder his neighbour. But then I would be dreaming and forgetting that I am living in a country where, more than elsewhere, people are killed in cold blood.

• (7:10 p.m.)

The death penalty is a deterrent. Even if that provision of the act only protected the life of a single innocent victim in 20 years, who would dare remove it?

It is neither humiliating nor degrading for a society to retain the death penalty in its statute books when that same society has to recognize that organized or syndicated crimes exists in its midst and that gang killings are numerous.

I am ready to open the Bible and read one of God's commandments: "Thou shalt not kill". It applies to all. And in spite of what the hon. member for Stanstead (Mr. Forest) said this afternoon, I would like the criminals to start respecting it. Abolitionists talk at length about the murderers' right to live; but what about the right of the innocent victims sacrificed or who would be sacrificed in the future?

What the potential murderer is most afraid of is having to pay with his life for the life he will have taken.

There is talk about possible judicial errors but not a single case was quoted to make us feel sorry.

The real known judicial errors are those where our judiciary, through compassion, allowed criminals to regain their freedom and later commit odious murders.

Leopold Dion enjoyed the mercy of the state. If justice had been allowed to take its course, four more young men would be alive today. If fear is the beginning of wisdom, fear of the death penalty will surely influence anyone who has premeditated or is premeditating a crime.

Whoever is premeditating a crime must be made to fear that he will pay with his life for that of the innocent he is trying to sacrifice; he must not feel that if he does it, he can also have his sentence commuted.

Commutations in themselves destroy the deterrent factor of the death penalty. There was a time in Quebec when Leopold Dion would have been killed on sight by the people because of their deep resentment against such odious criminals.

That man took young lives, he cowardly killed four children, one after the other, and in so doing, he killed the courage, morale and strength of the families concerned. And people will say that it is society that corrupted him; I would rather say that he laughed at society, he was granted all the remissions he begged for.

Commutation by the crown goes back to ancient times when kings, more concerned with their magnanimity and renown, reprieved criminals in special circumstances. In my opinion, this concept distorts the judicial power and weakens the efficiency of our courts.

Without raising air-tight barriers between the public powers, let us say that it does not rest with legislators to downgrade their own laws. They have the power to amend, to repeal or to strengthen them.

Nowadays, when a man is sentenced, people say: he will not serve his sentence.

When reference is made to miscarriages of justice,—and I shall return to it—I say: To refrain from carrying out a death sentence through fear of a miscarriage of justice is not worth maintaining capital punishment through fear that otherwise there will be further innocent victims. At least, I for one am not ready to run this risk.

Instead of being beneficial to society, murder trials become soap operas. Instead of showing murder in all its ugliness, the accused becomes the leading actor, if not the hero of a story in which minor details and excitement exceed or obliterate the atrocity committed.

How many opportunities are lost to educate society usefully. The horror of the crime committed gives way to the behaviour of the accused; the innocent victim and the grief of the survivors are replaced by the emotions of the crowd, the attitude of the jury. Emotion takes precedence over reason, and the society which would have agreed before to do away with the accused, weeps the next day over the sad plight of the poor man being condemned to death.

Instead of being confronted with all his unforgivable failures and his unconcern for others, our society, in short, has lived through a marvelous thriller. And as all emotions are of a fleeting nature, everything will be forgotten the next day, pending the next instalment.

Before dreaming of an ideal society, let us first consider the following problems:

Slum removal; social disparities; the urgent need for social organizations for young people ranging from 12 to 20 years of age; the social integration of young people; the elimination of hate literature, especially that which undermines authority; the elimination of murder movies and crime gadgets; respect for civic and judiciary powers.

Being convinced that there is direct link between crime and the corresponding forms of punishment, I am against the abolition of capital punishment, thus reflecting the opinion of nearly all my constituents.

And on that point, Mr. Speaker, I shall not allow any supporter of abolition to try and point out that those who take into account the opinion of their constituents are only voting against abolition for a partisan purpose. I merely wish to say that, if it were put forward, such a theory would render our debate unadvisable at this time.

So, Mr. Speaker, I would suggest that the proposed amendment be replaced by the following subamendment.

I move, seconded by the hon. member for Matapédia-Matane (Mr. Tremblay), that after paragraph (a) of the motion now before us, paragraphs (b) and (c) be replaced by the following:

(a) With the exception of murders committed in the following circumstances:

1. The murder of any person exercising public, civil or judicial authority.

2. The murder of a peace officer in the discharge of his duties.

3. The murder of a jail guard.

4. A murder committed by a person already sentenced to life imprisonment.

5. A murder committed while committing another crime in order to escape from the law.

Mr. Speaker, in proposing—

Some hon. Members: Wait.

Mr. Laflamme: I am proposing that subamendment not because I am against the amendment already moved by the hon. member for Roberval (Mr. Gauthier), but I feel that his amendment does not clearly refer to all the essential elements that must be laid down to provide for what all members of the house wish to ensure: the protection of society. If society is to be protected, it is at least necessary that those who maintain power, a right or a public obligation and protect public property and individuals, have the moral guarantee that whoever would dare take their life while they are discharging their duties, will atone with his own.

• (7:20 p.m.)

I feel that any offender who commits a second crime to elude the arm of justice is every bit as heinous; I am thinking of murders committed during robberies, of sexual crimes or others.

I respectfully submit, Mr. Speaker, that accepting the principle of abolition, while remaining aware of the necessity to protect our society, as it is today, but not an imaginary, idealized society which unfortunately does not exist at home, it is the duty of all members of the house to guarantee the safety of human lives and of public property.

Indeed, as I have already said, we harbour unfortunately underworld gangdom and syndicated crime, perhaps more than any other country in the world; those are people who will do anything to rob or to attain other ends.

I respectfully submit that this amendment should deserve the approval of the house.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: The hon. member submitted an amendment. I think it would be preferable that the decision on the value of the amendment as well as its form, concerning procedure, be given later, so that we have time to consider the subject matter and the form of this amendment.

[*English*]

Mr. R. E. Régimbal (Argenteuil-Deux-Montagnes): Mr. Speaker, after discussing and reading on this subject of capital punishment for several months, and after analysing contents of letters and petitions for and against, and listening very closely to arguments presented in this house during the past few days, I have been, as I suspect most members have been, shuttling back and forth from one set of convictions to the other. This only bears witness to the fact that a good many reasons exist to justify this hesitancy. The sad part of the situation is that all we have been able to produce, until now, besides this constant switching of positions, is a number of apologetic retentionists on the one hand and a number of apologetic abolitionists on the other. In other words, there are still many reservations in everyone's mind. No one can forecast the result of the forthcoming vote, unless political considerations are interjected somewhere along the line, which we all agree would be a most objectionable and a revolting development.

Therefore, working on the assumption that this will remain a free issue, I wonder if the remaining and prevailing doubts are not due to the fact that the motion itself and the orientations of opinions with regard to it have confused the one and only real issue involved, which is that of capital punishment.

Each and every speech to date almost inevitably has presented a close and tight weave of a number of different notions and ideas which are often in conflict and often in contradiction with one another. They have dealt with notions of life, death, punishment, vengence, retribution, charity, humanity, rehabilitation, conditional release, deferment, deterrence, common good, protection, aggression, barbarism, humanism, rights, obligations

and so on. In the debate we have answered passages from scripture with passages from scripture, quotations with quotations, statistics with statistics and authorities with authorities.

I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that we take a few minutes to dissect the fabric, separate the warp from the weft and clearly re-establish the various problems involved. These are, first, the abolition of capital punishment; second, the proper and adequate substitution for capital punishment; third, conditional release and fourth, rehabilitation and reform.

These are different problems and they must be dealt with separately and severally, otherwise no decent progress can be made toward their solution. In this regard my first grievance is that the motion before us does not make these distinctions, does not enumerate the various problems which have to be faced, does not establish any priority in the importance of those problems, and does not indicate any solutions. In the matter of a few lines the motion tries to define a question which has bothered and beleaguered jurists, criminologists, scientists, moralists and sociologists for centuries.

Finally, what the specialists I have enumerated have been unable to settle throughout the years we, as relative amateurs, are expected to solve in three or four days with a free and peaceful conscience.

I should like to return to this later, Mr. Speaker. In the meantime, I am left in the ridiculous position of being against capital punishment but of being forced to vote against the motion to abolish it.

In expounding my views on that one most important issue of capital punishment, and in trying to remain strictly within the boundaries of that subject, may I touch briefly on four main considerations having to do with it. The first one is the right of the individual to life. The second is the problem of civilization. The third is death as an example, or as a deterrent to murder. The fourth one is death as a divine prerogative.

In developing these points my main source of inspiration, after months of resistance to it on my own part, has been my own brother, Father Jean-Paul Régimbal—mentioned by the hon. member for York South (Mr. Lewis)—who, besides being a priest is also the holder of a master's degree in criminology. He has served some four years as chaplain at Bordeaux jail, and as such has had to prepare seven persons for the gallows. I have had to resist some emotional arguments from time to time, but I have never been able to deny his knowledgeability on the subject. In developing the three following points, I take pride and pleasure in quoting him almost verbatim:

• (7:30 p.m.)

[*Translation*]

With your permission, Mr. Speaker, I will speak of the right of life. Any citizen living in society does it for two purposes: to fully insure his human and indefeasible rights, and to pursue his human development and full achievement of his personality, in a manner consistent with the common weal. If this common weal compels a person to sacrifice certain individual interest to the benefit of the community, other indefeasible rights can not be surrendered: the rights of life, of religious freedom, of education, etc.

The right of life is a priority right and the state cannot use its authority to deprive any of its citizens of it. Thus, resorting to death penalty, for the purpose of protecting society and eliminating the wrong-doer, is evidently a misuse of authority and a direct violation of the priority right of the human being.

If it is true that the criminal himself by committing a deliberate murder, has violated this same right, this is not a sufficient reason why in its turn the state should apply death penalty against a convicted citizen.

The state can resort to other means, more compatible with its dignity and the nobleness of its purpose to achieve this dual aim: protection of society and elimination of the dangerous criminal: this means can be found in life imprisonment in specialized institutions where the convict would be confined until death, in conditions which are yet deferent to the sacred nature of his person.

This is not false pity or maudlin philanthropy: this is a logical conclusion which has been reached through a fair philosophy of the human being, of right, and of society. Every human being, by essence, is a value in himself whose life and fate rest in the hands of God and whose spiritual and immortal nature calls for the most complete respect.

Every human being has some priority rights which prevail at all times over those of the state.

Human society should make sure that primary rights of men are respected by all its citizens.

It is a precisely defined duty for the state to protect all citizens even the criminal against vindication of society. Despite his

crime, despite even his indignity, the criminal still remains a human being and deserves the protection of the state.

To maintain the principle of capital punishment merely because we do not know exactly yet what to do with the criminal, this is to pervert the whole problem; this is to deny a duly based principle, for purely pragmatic considerations. On the contrary to accept the final demands of a principle in spite of the serious hindrances involved, is to show maturity and sense of responsibility.

On the other hand, if this house votes by a majority for capital punishment, it would admit publicly its helplessness and incompetence because it would reflect, in its decision, its deep conviction that there is nothing to do with a criminal or a human being or one of our own citizens.

Furthermore, it is a question of civilization. The level of progress of a civilization can be measured by the fundamental attitude of a society toward its crippled members. In primitive societies one never had scruples about merely eliminating the useless members: crippled, old men, insane persons, criminals, offenders all used to share the same fate: death. It was the era of private vengeance. Followed the era of private justice where society managed to guide and limit the carrying out of private vengeance. In so doing, civilization took a giant step toward some form of social justice.

The death penalty was as rigorous and as vigorous, but at least, its application was partially limited to voluntary crimes, and still only in extreme cases where agreement between the parties was impossible to reach.

Nevertheless, that was implanting a prolific principle of evolution in society. Prolific and irreversible indeed for, from that time onward, society progressed toward public justice. Followed the progressive organization of justice: various codifications, systems of judgments and repressive measures and multiple forms of execution.

Without going into all the historical details of that evolution of the law, it might be well to point out here how society grew to claim as its own exclusively, the right to judge and condemn its citizens, removing them completely from the personal or popular vindication of private vengeance. And so, in its own name and for its own benefit, society decided to systematically organize the fight against crime, the administration of justice and the execution of its penalties.

About this last point, it is to be noted that the evolution of civilization is reflected through the humanizing of the law and, consequently of the legal punishments. The old mosaic law listed over 650 crimes as punishable by death. In the 13th century, there were over 350. In the 15th century, only 17 remained, while early in the 19th century, 15 major crimes were still punishable by death.

Under the impetus of numerous social, judicial and penal reforms occurring during the 19th century, all countries of the world have reconsidered and revised their penal system and their criminal laws. As a concrete result, 58 countries to date have abolished capital punishment and more than one hundred countries have introduced major reforms in their penal code.

It is then becoming obvious that the position of a civilization or a society on capital punishment is in direct ratio to its degree of social progress. As the laws become more humane, capital punishment loses ground.

How can we stick to capital punishment as the ultimate method to preserve justice and maintain order? It might as well be said that progress stops there.

Deterrent effect of capital punishment: many hon. members have already touched upon this point, Mr. Speaker, and I shall briefly go over the main conclusions.

First of all, capital punishment has not deterred criminals from their crimes since crime and murders are constantly on the increase.

Then, even if capital punishment is a protection for society, no one can claim it is the only protection, nor the best, since it does not produce the desired results; crime is not eliminated when the criminal is eliminated, any more than tuberculosis is eliminated when the tubercular patient is eliminated. Solution is not at that level but at the level of scientific research, of penal philosophy and judicial reform.

Finally, to act as a deterrent, capital punishment should be carried out in public, a method abolished long ago.

Since these facts prove beyond any doubt that the death penalty serves none of the three purposes it is designed to serve, that is to deter criminals, to give complete protection to society and to act as a warning to all citizens, there remains but one logical choice—the abolition of capital punishment.

Death or the taking of life is a divine right.

We all agree with this, but supporters of capital punishment argue that it is in the name of God that the state exercises this right.

It is true that authority comes from God and that exercises its power in the name of God, but nowhere has it ever been said that the state should put murderers to death. After the expostulations of my colleague to my right, the hon. member for Prince (Mr. David MacDonald), in his brilliant speech of last Thursday, I shall steer clear from the Holy Scriptures, but my recollection is that the Lord did not sentence to death Cain, murderer of his brother and the very model of heinous criminals (Genesis 4, 9-15). On the contrary, the Lord set a mark upon him, lest any finding him should kill him and said: "Whosoever slayeth Cain, vengeance shall be taken on him sevenfold."

Considering these four points, Mr. Speaker, we may then conclude, first, that capital punishment is not essential and necessary to the protection of society against murder and above all that it is not the only means to that end; second, that the retention of the death penalty is a step backwards in the march of civilization and social progress; however, I make haste to add: provided that an alternate punishment is found.

This is precisely where the difficulty lies. I followed closely the argument of the hon. member for Hochelaga (Mr. Pelletier) and I agree with him, save when he suggests that any change involves some risk. If the risk is too certain and too great, I shall not follow him at all.

If we are deciding on change for the sake of change, as I feel we are now doing, the risk is too great. What is the alternative to the motion we have before us?

If paragraph (a) suggests a definite move on which agreement could be reached, paragraphs (b) and (c) are vague, indefinite, without specifications, without the least suggestion or indication of the means to be taken to implement this substitution for capital punishment or even a definition of the words used.

Is this not the weakness of this procedure? Up to now, the government has taken no responsibility whatever, has no alternative to suggest and it is significant that only two members of the Cabinet have spoken to date. Personally, I cannot accept proposal (a) without knowing in advance the provisions which will be made under (b) and (c), the judicial reforms which will influence these provisions and the institutions to which the condemned will be sent.

But in fact, why the hurry? I feel, Mr. Speaker, that it is advisable to refer this whole question to a parliamentary committee which could secure experts in all areas concerned and present the house with an informed opinion on the appropriate alternative to capital punishment. Therefore, I suggest that debate on this motion be adjourned and that items (b) and (c) be further seriously studied after which the government can introduce a public bill properly drafted with all the necessary shadings.

Unless this is done, I believe that many honourable members will find themselves, as I am, forced to vote against the present motion which is unacceptable in its present form and incomplete in substance.

• (7:40 p.m.)

[*English*]

Mr. Speaker, I must confess my inability and incompetence to propose an amendment to the motion, and I am sorry for it because it seeems to me that if we could so arrange the motion that paragraph (a) could be accepted in principle, we would have accomplished a great step forward in progress. And if we could amend paragraphs (b) and (c) to give us the assurance that no implementation shall be carried out until a majority of members are satisfied, through expert counsel, that adequate and complete substitution as well as judicial and penal reforms are completed, we might then allay the legitimate fears and premonitions of retentionists.

Mr. Raymond Rock (Jacques-Cartier-Lasalle): Mr. Speaker, in speaking on the resolution which refers to "abolishing the death penalty in respect of all offences under that act," there have been many speeches made for and against the abolition of capital punishment, all made conscientiously by hon. members after seriously studying all information available.

During the last session of parliament members received an abundance of literature from various religious groups and other associations, together with many publications on the pros and cons of capital punishment. We have all read and carefully studied this literature. In most of this literature on capital punishment it has been found that, although the impression made is that the authors were looking at both sides, the statistics shown were assembled by abolitionists to support their conclusion that the death penalty be

abolished, rather than to help reach an unbiased conclusion. The statistics they have given were chosen to show that capital punishment has no deterrent effect; but these people have not given any statistics on crime in general.

In my opinion crime statistics do not offer proof either for or against, and it is easy to assemble statistics in such a fashion as to prove capital punishment is or is not a deterrent. For example, it can be shown by statistics that five states which have the death penalty have a lower ratio of murder per 100,000 population than the state of Michigan, which does not have the death penalty. For example, Massachusetts, including the large city of Boston, had a ratio of only 1.3 per 100,000 population compared to the state of Michigan, in which is included the city of Detroit, and which had a ratio of 4.5.

It can also be shown that the state of Ohio, which has capital punishment, has a ratio in total crime offences of 838.9 per 100,000 population, compared to the neighbouring state of Michigan, which has no death penalty, but has a ratio in total crime of 1,348.6, and is close to 40 per cent higher; while the state of New York which has a ratio of 1,289.7 per 100,000 population is lower than the ratio of Michigan, and New York state has capital punishment in force. Therefore statistics could be used to prove that it has a deterrent effect on murder and crime in general.

Statistics are unreliable and misleading, and cannot be compared from state to state, country to country, or continent to continent because of differences in nationality, religion, politics, and their social and economic make-up. Literature which we have received from many of the religious authorities has included a great many quotations from the Bible to support abolition and also to support retention, and thus there is confusion.

In Great Britain since the abolition of capital punishment, crime in general, and murder in particular, are at an all-time high. British Bobbies who traditionally never carry a revolver are now taking marksmanship courses and may be obliged to carry arms in order to protect themselves. At present a petition is being signed by thousands of British citizens demanding that parliament restore capital punishment.

In 1961 the Canadian Criminal Code was amended to classify murder as capital or non-capital. In Canada murder is capital when it is planned and deliberate, when it is committed in the course of certain crimes of violence, and when committed upon a police officer, a prison warden, etc. . . .Otherwise murder is non-capital in Canada.

It is strange that whenever there is a bloody murder the names of the victims and the problems of their widows, families, children, mothers, fathers, sisters and brothers are completely forgotten. But the murderers' names like Marcotte, Mathew Kerry Smith, Leopold Dion, Phileas Oscar Letourneau, Fournel, Jack Graham, etc., are publicized and remembered by all. But society completely forgets the names of the victims and their relatives who have suffered so much.

Many hon. members have argued in favour of the abolition of capital punishment because of their fright at a possible error in judgment resulting in an innocent persons' being hanged unjustly. They say it is better to let 50 guilty murderers live than let one innocent man die, but the abolition of the death penalty may still send an innocent man to prison for life, and there is the other argument that only the rich can afford a proper defence while the poor usually hang. They also make no attempt whatsoever to correct this machinery which is supposed to make errors.

I submit, Mr. Speaker, that since the state provides public prosecutors and a police force to solve and investigate crimes of murder, it should also provide for the accused a public defender who would have a staff of investigators, so that no stone be left unturned. I also submit that before any sentence of death be decided by a judge, the Department of Justice, with a specialized staff, could scrutinize all evidence in order to submit to the judge that, to their knowledge, and opinion, there is no doubt, or that there may be a possible doubt. Further, when there is a death sentence there should be an automatic appeal whether requested or not.

I cannot comprehend the attitude of so many who have so quickly forgotten the victims and their families and have so readily gone to bat for the murderers, the persons who have coldbloodedly killed innocent storekeepers, taxi drivers, police officers, bank managers and little children. These abolitionists are ready to say to a murderer, "You have been a bad person; now stay in that corner for life"—whatever that means—"and we will provide you with a life pension, with food, bed and clothing, and recreational facilities and, who knows, maybe after 20 years we will be able to rehabilitate

you to be a useful citizen at the expense of the state."

• (7:50 p.m.)

Some hon. members are ready to compromise by moving amendments to provide that the murder of a police officer or prison guard be considered capital murder. In other words, if a gangster robs a bank and kills the teller and manager of the bank he does not hang, but if he kills a police officer during that robbery in the bank, he would hang. This would be an infantile compromise which cannot be accepted. Our duty is to protect society in general, not the criminal.

I should now like to read a few paragraphs in favour of capital punishment to be found in a book published by the Department of Justice entitled "Capital Punishment, Material Relating to its Purpose and Value". Paragraph 9 reads:

> Law enforcement authorities entertain the view that the death penalty is an effective deterrent to murder and that it is particularly effective in deterring professional criminals from carrying weapons and committing crimes of violence.

Paragraph 10 reads:

> The death penalty safeguards police because a criminal seeking to avoid arrest would have much less fear of the consequences of the use of firearms or of violence if there were no death penalty.

Paragraph 23 reads:

> The whole experience of mankind is to the effect that the threat of instant death is the most effective deterrent of all; death is death and its terrors cannot be described more forcibly.

Paragraph 25 reads:

> The fact that capital punishment has obviously failed as a deterent when a murder is committed does not mean that it may not have deterred many other people from committing murder.

And finally, paragraph 26 reads:

> It is reasonable to suppose that the deterrent force of capital punishment operates not only by affecting the conscious thoughts of individuals tempted to commit murder, but also by building up in the community, over a long period of time, a deep feeling of peculiar abhorrence for the crime of murder.

I believe that if we abolish the death penalty we will be putting into the hands of the criminal, murderers and crime syndicates an extra strong weapon; that is, the right and licence to kill—to murder without being punished by death when convicted and, if convicted, the right to a pension of care for life by the state.

If we abolish the death penalty we will be depriving our citizens—the police officers, taxi drivers, storekeepers, bank managers, operators of garages, pay clerks, tellers and jewellers—of their greatest weapon, the knowledge that "if you kill us you will be hanged when convicted". The abolition of the death penalty will put police officers, watchmen, guards, wardens, detectives, witnesses and prosecutors in a strait-jacket. They will be reluctant to do their duty as before. They will not take the chances they took before to protect our citizens. On the other hand, the abolition of the death penalty will give an added weapon to the criminal because criminals would use violence, especially those who had been in and out of jails many times and following conviction, may face a long sentence, possibly equal to life. They would not hesitate to kill and take the chance of not being apprehended.

I am not prepared to vote for the abolition of the death penalty until parliament makes drastic changes in the administration of justice and adopts proper penal reforms. At this time my conscience guides me in voting to retain the death penalty, without a compromise, for the protection of society. I take my stand on the side of the victims, on the side of the mounted police, provincial police, municipal police and other law officers, guards, wardens, bank managers, storekeepers, paymasters, garage owners, taxi drivers, watchmen and children, as well as all other victims of this horrible crime of murder. I will not take away from them and society the most important invisible protective weapon they have in their favour, the death penalty.

I will vote against the motion, without compromise.

Mr. L. R. Sherman (Winnipeg South): Mr. Speaker, I rise at this point in the debate neither as an abolitionist nor as a retentionist in the generally accepted sense of those terms. I am opposed to the death penalty, but not for the same reasons as many classical abolitionists. I am opposed to the death penalty because it brutalizes me and brutalizes society. It forces me to descend to the same level as the murderer I am hanging. It is sanctioned murder and I resent having to participate in it or have any part in it because it drags me down to the level of the person who is sentenced to death.

Many of the classical abolitionists buttress their opposition to the death penalty by insisting that it is no deterrent. In this regard I emphatically disagree. My colleague, the

member for Prince (Mr. MacDonald), delivered a distinguished dissertation last Thursday evening in this chamber on behalf of abolition. He made many interesting references to the fact that he had spent a considerable time in penal institutions working with criminals and law breakers.

Although I am paraphrasing his remarks, I have a copy of *Hansard* in front of me in the event someone wishes me to quote him verbatim. He said in effect that he never, during the time he worked in penal institutions, talked to anyone who thought he was going to be caught. I would ask that hon. gentleman, whom I respect, why he never encountered any who thought they might be caught. I suggest that he did not because they are not in prison. With all due respect to my hon. friend and colleague, I suggest he talked to people whose intelligence leaves something to be desired. They did not think they were going to get caught, but the fact that they are in prison indicates the degree of intelligence they possess.

I suggest there are people who have contemplated committing a crime but have been deterred from doing so as a result of having thought out the consequences of their act, confronting themselves, at a mental and psychological level, with the possible punishment they would face. I suggest many of them have chosen not to commit those crimes they contemplated for this very reason.

I find it extremely difficult to understand how the classical abolitionist can argue so omnisciently that the death penalty is no deterrent to murder, and that people think they are never going to be caught. I wonder how these abolitionists know that, sir. Just because those in prison did not stop to think before committing their crimes does not prove that somewhere in our free society there are no men who would have committed a crime except for the fact that they stopped to think about the consequences.

I would ask whether these abolitionists really believe that no one has been deterred from doing wrong because of the threat of punishment. It seems to me that it is logical and reasonable to assume that there are men and women in our society who covet money, possessions, power, estates and other's spouses, but have not done murder because they knew what the consequence of such an act would be. It seems to me to be obviously illogical and unreasonable to suggest that punishment is no deterrent to crime. It strikes at the very heart of our institution of law and order.

I think of youngsters in school who conform to discipline and regulations in their classes because of the threat of punishment. That threat acts as a deterrent. I think of myself when driving through speed zones, if you like. I conform to certain regulations and rules because of the punishment which would confront me if I broke those laws. Punishment acts as a deterrent. Perhaps I drive carefully because I do not want to kill some child, and that acts as a deterrent, and ensures that I conform to the law and order of the particular milieu in which I am involved at the time.

• (8:00 p.m.)

I think of teenage boys who would not steal a car or rob a store at the encouragement of their friends because they had considered the fact that they would go to prison if they were caught and were probably gambling against odds stacked too heavily against them if they undertook such nefarious adventures. So it is with some people who have been tempted to commit the ultimate crime, I suggest. It is naturally impossible to measure this number, so the classical abolitionist never has to face scientific refutation of his argument that the death penalty is no deterrent. Naturally those who have ever contemplated murder and have decided against it do not go around talking about it, but in my view the death penalty is demonstrably a deterrent to murder.

I am convinced that certain murders have not been committed in this society, in this continent and throughout the world because of the existence of the death penalty. The fact that other murderers have not been deterred is no counter-argument. I think you cannot escape this view if you think the matter through. Therefore I start with the conviction that the death penalty is a deterrent and thus, while I am an abolitionist, I differ from the classical one. I cannot say, like the classical abolitionist, that we should abolish the death penalty and let it go at that, because it is no deterrent. I do not want to let the murderer reduce me to his level and turn me into a murderer too, but I require a deterrent as powerful as the death penalty, and this is my dilemma.

My solution to the death penalty is the life penalty. I believe it is our responsibility—and I am not talking merely as a member of this house but as a citizen—to protect society. Many people who advocate the abolition of

the death penalty, and others, talk about revenge and retribution and the fact that the death penalty is invoked for those reasons. In my opinion it is not revenge or retribution but it is punishment, and it is punishment not for its sake after the fact but for its sake before the fact, its sake as a deterrent to protect society.

A distinguished Queen's Counsel in Winnipeg, Mr. Maurice J. Arpin was outlining the case for the retention of the death penalty in a Winnipeg newspaper last week end and quoted a statement by a Lord Halifax speaking in the reign of King Charles II, who said:

Men are not hanged for stealing horses but that horses may not be stolen.

This is my view, sir, of the ultimate penalty, the death penalty or my choice as an alternative, the life penalty. The hon. member for York South (Mr. Lewis) in a distinguished address earlier today said that the abolition of the death penalty for non-capital murder has not affected the number of non-capital murders since 1961. With all respect I would ask, what sort of ammunition is that for abolishing the death penalty for capital murder—and this is what we are talking about.

It seems to me self-evident that the incidence of non-capital murder is not going to increase or decrease no matter what the law is, because under our judicial system non-capital murder is by definition unpremeditated and therefore unpredictable. What we are talking about here is capital murder, premeditated murder, plotted murder, syndicated murder, for which we still have the death penalty; and what we are asking ourselves is whether we should perhaps abolish the death penalty for it, too.

We are not debating this issue as something calculated to lift Canada out of the Dark Ages. We left the Dark Ages long ago in regard to the subject of capital punishment. We have come a long way in Canada on this question. I do not think enough debaters and participants in this debate have given the country and our society credit for this. There is a very enlightened law on our statute books today distinguishing and differentiating between capital and non-capital murder. Only a certain type of killer can be executed in Canada today, the adult killer over 18 years of age who chooses to take another person's life in cold blood. So when we talk about abolition of the death penalty we must not confuse the issue. We are talking about abolition of the death penalty for this type of killer; not for our Steven Truscotts, not for our mentally ill, not for our killers by accident, not for our killers by passion. We have already abolished the death penalty for all of them and substituted a prison sentence from which they can be freed, conceivably, in something less than 10 years.

[Mr. Sherman.]

We are talking about abolition of the death penalty for the community's arch-foe, the deliberate killer who chooses to take another person's life in cold blood. I want abolition of the death penalty for him, too, sir—not for his sake but for my sake, and only if an equally strong deterrent is substituted in its place, something like the death penalty, that stops certain would-be murderers right now from carrying out their deeds of death.

I submit, Mr. Speaker, that the only alternative is the life penalty; not the type of life sentence our non-capital murderers get, because the deterrent must be as strong as the death penalty. I refer again to the Lord Halifax of the reign of Charles II, who said:

Men are not hanged for stealing horses but that horses may not be stolen.

Some hon. members, such as the hon. member for Kamloops (Mr. Fulton) insist that you cannot send a man to prison for life. This logic bothers me somewhat, sir. The hon. member says that you can send a man to the gallows, you can string him up like an animal and take his life by violence, but you cannot send him to prison for life. Certainly the life penalty is harsh, but then so is the death penalty. I say that the latter act brutalizes me and all society, and I do not want to do it. But it has its deterrent effect. It helps protect society. It is the extreme punishment for the extreme crime and I suggest it has stopped many men committing murder.

The substitute, then, while avoiding the brutalizing aspect, must be an equally powerful deterrent. I do not mind paying taxes to feed, clothe and maintain that foe of society for the rest of his life. For our protection he must forfeit his freedom. I will maintain him in an institution for the rest of his life.

What is so hideous about the life penalty, the life sentence, when it is only going to be meted out to a cold-blooded, deliberate, premeditated murderer? It is not something that is going to be sprung upon our capital murderers without warning. Once it goes into the statute books, the warning goes out to everyone: If you plot and carry out deliberate murder, if you choose to murder someone, then you forfeit your freedom, your life as a

free man or woman—not your flesh and blood, not your breath and your beating heart, but your freedom, your right to live as a free citizen.

If, in the teeth of that warning, a man still chooses to kill another, he must be prepared to suffer the consequences. Certainly life imprisonment is harsh, but the deliberate killer, after all, would have had the choice and would have chosen. If it were not harsh, it would be no deterrent; society would not have the protection that a harsh deterrent provides. Perhaps in fact some killer living out a sentence of imprisonment for life might some day be paroled. I am not prepared to say that no single such killer ever would be paroled: But the possibility of parole should not be admitted or included in the life penalty, as I see it.

My strongest objection to the resolution as it appears on the order paper at the present time is in regard to paragraph (c). I would be in favour of a resolution that did not contain paragraph (c), because once the possibility of parole is admitted, even though in a humane heart and charitable spirit it must be there, once it is committed to print, the effect of the deterrent value of a sentence for life loses a great deal of its strength and a great deal of its sinew. As I have suggested, I see the life penalty as a means of abolishing the death penalty. Once you admit the possibility of parole, you take the teeth out of the life penalty as an effective deterrent.

• (8:10 p.m.)

So, I stand for a life penalty which contains, to all intents and purposes, no hope of parole. Before the classical abolitionists throw up their hands in horror, Mr. Speaker, let me remind them once again that we are talking here about killers who have chosen to kill knowing the penalty. We are talking also about law abiding men, women and children who have a right to be protected.

Mr. Max Saltsman (Waterloo South): I join those who have spoken in this debate and wish to add my support for the abolition of capital punishment. I am convinced that capital punishment is not a proven deterrent or protection to society. On the contrary, through our reliance on this method, our view is distracted from the only real protection society can have, that is the prevention of crime itself. Like other members, I have not taken this position lightly. It is a grave responsibility that we all carry, and this decision has not been reached without a struggle.

Like all members, I have received many letters regarding both abolition and retention. This morning, before entering the house, I received a letter which I should like to read. It is a letter in favour of retention, but I should like to read it because it strikes at the heart of the problem every abolitionist must consider. I quote:

Dear Mr. Saltsman:

Before you vote on the capital punishment question, I urge you to think long and hard about the little children who are innocent victims of sex murderers. Just try to imagine what these poor children have to endure before they are finally put to death—and they don't even have a fighting chance. So far, there has been only one member who mentioned the child victims. These are the most defenceless members of our society. How is it that so many men can dig up so many arguments in favour of prolonging the lives of these offenders, the lowest of the low?

As you know, after the initial wave of public revulsion, the case and circumstances are forgotten; then months later when a conviction is obtained, what a hue and cry for mercy is heard for these evil men. Have you ever studied their pictures? But it is barbaric to think that they should receive the ultimate punishment for the crimes they have committed. No, they must be rehabilitated and returned to society. And at what cost! As a taxpayer, I am infuriated that one cent of my tax money should be used to house and feed these most despicable creatures.

In recent speeches in the house, there was great concern for policemen and pen guards. Rightly so. But what about society at large . . . Those M.P.'s who abhor the rope might hold a very different opinion were they ever to witness the work of these monsters. The police have seen the victims. No wonder they are in favour of retaining capital punishment.

So much talk about the deterrent factor! Let us have justice. Spell it out plainly. If you take a life then you forfeit your own. Even the most stupid criminal should be able to understand those terms.

This letter, Mr. Speaker, has special significance for me, not only because it comes on the eve of a potential vote but it comes from a lady I admire greatly and who has been the teacher of my children. It is written, I am certain, with the sincerest motivation and concern. She poses a question that must be answered not only to her but to every child in this country. She asks, what protection do we afford the children of this nation?

If I thought that I could save lives by maintaining the death penalty, anybody's life, I would have to vote for the retention of capital punishment. There are many of us in this house who are not strangers to death. There are many in this house who have served in wars or served in other capacities

where death was not a stranger. They learned to live with it, they learned to abide with it. If we thought the maintenance of the death penalty for crime in this country could save lives, I do not believe there would be any squeamishness on anybody's part about retaining the death penalty.

However, I am convinced from the evidence I have seen that the death penalty does not serve this purpose, the death penalty does not preserve the victim from those who would attack. If I thought that the justice for which this lady asks could be accomplished by the maintenance of the death penalty, I would maintain that penalty. But we have to ask if the taking of the lives of those who would murder really constitutes justice, whether the drunk who kills with a car is guilty, whether the child is less dead, whether that crime is less premeditated.

I am sure that if I, and other members who are in favour of abolition, thought that the stupid criminal described in this letter would understand the death penalty, was in some position to make a reasonable, rational judgment before he committed his crime, and that the death penalty acted as a deterrent on him at that moment, then I would say the death penalty would have to be maintained. Apparently this is not so. We have heard from people who have talked with criminals in prisons who have indicated that at the moment they were about to commit a crime they were not thinking about being caught or paying the penalty. I am not in favour of society taking vengeance, but even if society had to take vengeance to recall a life or to save another, I think it would be incumbent upon society to do that. I believe there may have been a time in our civilization when society had to do that sort of thing in order to preserve the peace. Under present circumstances I do not know that the carrying out of capital punishment saves any lives in our civilization.

I feel that capital punishment not only fails to accomplish the purpose it is supposed to accomplish, but its very presence may contribute to further murder because society, out of shock and abhorrence, makes a ritual of murder and pretends justice has been done, society has been protected. No such thing has happened. We cannot shirk the real task which must be carried out, that is to seek out the sick and potentially deadly before they commit their crime. This is the only way to cut down on death and murder and deviationist attacks. We have to rehabilitate those we release from prisons who are serving terms as dope addicts and as haters of the world. We must be certain, regardless of the crime for which they were incarcerated, that when they are released they are ready to face the world. Many of these people come out of prisons unreformed, not ready to serve some purpose in society, but as a potential menace to everyone they encounter.

[Mr. Saltsman.]

• (8:20 p.m.)

Our society and our prisons are frequently the spawning grounds for further violence and for murder. Unless we tackle this problem at the source children will continue to die despite all the people we may hang. It is expensive to prevent crime and to cure the sick. Perhaps this is one of the reasons we have never done it. Perhaps this is one of the reasons we have taken the easy and the cheap way out and simply hanged a few people to assuage our consciences that justice has been done or that we have accomplished something in our society.

The hon. member who preceded me gave us the reason horse thieves were hanged. The reason was so that horses would be protected, so people would not steal horses, or something along that line. We do not hang people any more for stealing horses; and not too many horses are stolen, not even in the west where there are still a fair number. This is because times have changed and do not require this kind of penalty for that kind of crime.

In times when there was no bread for the people, when society could not provide it, a 12-year old boy was hanged for stealing a loaf of bread. We no longer have to do this because there is bread for the people. The cure was not hanging the 12-year old boy; the cure was making bread available.

When society could not tolerate its weak it exposed them as an ancient Spartan on the mountain, and that was the solution. But we have become too humanitarian for this. We can tolerate them nowadays; we do not expose them any more. Society has undertaken this task.

As mentioned by former speakers, when society could not support its old it left them to die at the roadside. They were left there, not out of some perverse form of cruelty; society left them there because it was one means of preserving that kind of society. We have now gone beyond that stage. We no longer leave our old to die. Today we look after our old, and we have taken this upon ourselves as the cost of being civilized.

However, Mr. Speaker, we are still unwilling today to face up to the problem posed by the sick minds and twisted brains in our society. Instead of trying to help such unfortunates prevent the ravages they will inflict upon others, we say that when we catch them we will kill them. It is really no different from hanging somebody for stealing a loaf of bread.

I think, Mr. Speaker, we have progressed to the stage where we must accept the responsibility of protecting life in our society. I certainly feel that the only protection we can give our society is to deter the kind of conditions in our civilization which encourage potential criminals. I suggest that hanging a man after the fact does not change anything at all.

Mr. Steven Otto (York East): Mr. Speaker, I did not think I would have to define the two terms "retentionist" and "abolitionist", but I now find we have another differentiation in the form of the "classical abolitionist", and I dare say there is also the "classical retentionist".

It has been said that on this issue it will be impossible for members to speak unemotionally or as logically or rationally as they are able. I deny that. I think most of the speeches made in this house have been very logical, showing little emotion. I also deny the statement that has been made that most members have already made up their minds. I do not believe they have. I believe, like myself, that they have listened to the arguments and read the debates. I have tried to dissect some of the very able arguments presented and to carry others a little further; and I believe, as in my own case, that many hon. members have considerably changed their minds.

With great respect, Mr. Speaker, I do not believe that the Truscott case has much to do with the issue of capital punishment, so I feel the abolitionists, who depend on this case, stand on weak ground. If this was a debate concerning reform in our administration of justice, I would say that the Truscott case was a very pertinent one. If this were a debate on doing away with this antiquated jury system of trusting 12 amateurs to decide the truth or falsehood of a statement, I would say that the Truscott case had a great deal to do with it. If this were a question of why in this day and age we do not accept scientific and very sophisticated methods of deciding between truth and falsehood, then this case would apply. If it were being argued that it is nonsensical in this day and age that promotions in police departments or in the administration of justice should depend on prosecutions and convictions, I would say that that case had something to do with the matter. It is not fair today that justice should depend on the size of the purse.

We are dealing with the question of capital punishment, something to which, I believe, the Truscott case is not applicable.

I also do not believe that the retentionists who plead deterrence are on much stronger ground. I am not going to repeat what has been said so many times in the arguments which have been presented so well, namely that retention and deterrence are one and the same thing. I believe the retentionists have not made a strong case for retaining capital punishment as a deterrent to future murderers. Indeed, I am inclined to think that a lot of people in this house and elsewhere who argue deterrence are really arguing vengeance.

Looking at the matter coldly, it seems vengeance is not alien to human nature or to man. We are the only creatures on earth with the capacity to do good or to do evil—which includes vengeance. If we were to go back thousands of years we would find that society accepted unlimited vengeance. That is to say, if somebody took your possessions or your family's possessions you were perfectly free and justified in not only taking the thief's possessions, but of killing, and exercising unlimited vengeance. It was not until our inheritance of Samarian culture that the idea of an eye for an eye and a tooth for a tooth was introduced.

This debate then comes down to the issue whether we are yet ready to do away with vengeance entirely. So it is a question of philosophy. We are debating a philosophical issue. I have heard members talk of the sanctity of life, the right to live, and so on. Probing deeper in an effort to try to simplify it there seems to be a conviction on the part of all of us, a haunting conviction, sometimes uncertain and vague but a conviction nevertheless, that we are more than animals, that man has a destiny.

• (8:30 p.m.)

With that it becomes a question of philosophy. Unfortunately, in this century we have had difficulty in adjusting our philosophy to our technology. In some phases of our society, such as in science for example, we have advanced technologically far beyond our philosophy. We have been able to split the

atom. We have gained tremendous power, but we do not know what to do with it. We are afraid of it. We have been able to prolong life, but we do not know how to deal with the problem of overpopulation and the problem of the aged. We have advanced scientifically in many fields where our philosophy has failed to keep up.

In this case, in considering what is now before us, we are advancing philosophically, knowing full well that our technology is faulty. Indeed, we do not have technology. In the field of rehabilitation, criminology and criminal reform we recognize that we are almost stupid. We have not paid attention to these fields. We have hidden preserves in penitentiaries, away from life. We have adopted an ostrich attitude, and now, when we want to move society forward we find that we know almost nothing about rehabilitation.

Is that surprising, considering that we have spent more money on shoes and boots for convicts than we have in the whole field of rehabilitation? This, then, presents a problem. What is the solution to it? Having expressed a desire to abolish capital punishment we are faced with trying to find solutions to our past negligence—negligence that we have accepted over a period of decades.

We have had recommendations such as that put forward by the hon. gentleman for Leeds (Mr. Matheson), to establish a subarctic devil's island where prisoners could be put away. Those committed there would get life sentences which could not be voided; in other words, prisoners going there should be put away for life.

In the very idea of putting them away for life sentences, from which they have no hope of freedom, we have denied that man is more than an animal, because we shall have made him an animal. A human being must have a destiny; he must have hope. Without hope he is no longer man. Otherwise, he is an animal. Therefore the abolitionists, or the quasi-abolitionists who desire to abolish the death sentence, and in its place substitute this idea of life imprisonment, substitute an idea which indeed may be worse than death.

If this resolution passes and this house indeed does abolish the death sentence, there are many alive who will rue the day that that has been done. Many who have to administer the law, such as police departments, attorneys, wardens, guards, will rue the day the death penalty is abolished. We have not convinced them any more than we have convinced ourselves that the introduction of the abolition of the death penalty is plausible. They are the ones we must convince that it is plausible, and they are the administrators of the law we are trying to introduce. Consequently they will take every precaution they think necessary to protect their lives. Within a short time we shall hear of barbaric cruelties toward inmates of prisons the like of which have not been heard of for centuries. This will happen because we are not prepared as yet to abolish the death penalty.

Having said what I have said, Mr. Speaker, I am going to vote for the abolition of the death penalty, because if it is not abolished nothing will be done in the whole field of research and criminology. With the abolition of the death penalty these problems will live with us, and the news media will remind us from time to time that we are away behind the times in this regard. They will remind us that we must put more time, more effort and more money into research with respect to criminology. We must find out why criminals become criminals. We must find out what to do about them.

I am quite sincere in my beliefs, Mr. Speaker, I have more than a haunting conviction that man is more than an animal. I must express my belief that we have reached the time when we must change our philosophy of life, and in changing develop new ideas in the whole sphere of rehabilitation so that we shall do away with this whole question of capital punishment once and for all.

Mr. Speaker, I urge hon. members to vote for the abolition, without a false sense of security or pride that this will do away with all the problems. It will not do away with them. We shall have the problems of criminals; we shall have the problems of what to do with the lifers. We shall have to spend more time, more energy and more money in doing that which we have not done. We shall have to devote more energies to research, to bringing about new ideas in the sphere of rehabilitation and criminal reform.

Hon. J. A. MacLean (Queens): Mr. Speaker, while I think all hon. members have given a lot of thought to this very important question of capital punishment, I have done some soul searching in an attempt to come to a decision that I can in conscience live with. Having done that, I have come to the conclusion that I cannot, in conscience, support the resolution that has been proposed.

I am unlike the last speaker. I rise to take part in this debate, not to try to change anyone else to my own way of thinking, but simply to report to the people I represent in my constituency, and to Canadians generally, why I feel that I have no other choice in conscience but to vote against this resolution.

I know that many hon. members sincerely hold the opposite point of view, and I have no quarrel with them. However, I recognize that in common with others who will wish to vote against this resolution, I shall be branded by some as being opposed to progress, as being reactionary, and perhaps being even less civilized than they are. I accept these unjust and unjustifiable charges as one of the burdens of conscientious public service, in an age when the majority of people may not yet have realized that haphazard change is infinitely more likely to be retrogression than it is to be progress.

• (8:40 p.m.)

Progress is not so easily attained. Progress is achieved only by a carefully judged assessment of the possible courses open to us and by rejection of those which cannot reasonably be demonstrated to be expected to lead to an improvement on the course we are already steering. The theory that because progress is change, therefore change is progress is so outrageously illogical that it is a mystery to me why so many seemingly rational people reason in this way. It is as illogical as saying that because people who live in London live in England, therefore the people who live in England live in London. It is even less logical than that, because the chance of an Englishman being a Londoner is much greater than the chance of change for the sake of change being progress.

A great philosopher once said that when it is not necessary to change, it is necessary not to change. We shall be accused of being reactionary. I do not accept this charge. I stand where I do on this question because I believe that those who favour the abolition of capital punishment have not been able to establish that what they propose would likely be an improvement over the law as it now stands.

Third, I wish to deal with the implication that nations which retain capital punishment are in some way less civilized than those which have abolished it—stemming from which, I suppose, is the inference that those of us who support the retention of capital punishment are in some way less civilized than those who wish to abolish it. This is nonsense and I reject it categorically as being wholly unproven. As a matter of fact I could cite cases which would seem to support the opposite view. Three hundred years ago my own ancestors in the western isles of Scotland feuded among themselves, and with the ancestors of many other hon. members here. In those days it was not considered a capital offence to knock off some of your neighbours during these feuds. There were other penalties. You might be fined or outlawed or something of that sort, but capital punishment was not the usual thing. I should like to think we are more civilized in this respect in this day and age than my ancestors were 300 years ago.

Capital punishment is, of course, not a pleasant thing. It is a gruesome thing, no doubt. But there are many things in life which are necessary and which are unpleasant. Today, especially, when contract murder is being carried out as part of organized crime throughout North America we must be very careful where we go. The fact that capital punishment is not a pleasant thing is no reason for rejecting it. It is hard to find a suitable comparison to make, but the abolition of capital punishment would, in the thinking of many people, be similar to our passing a law prohibiting surgeons from carrying out extensive and gruesome operations on persons suffering from particularly bad diseases. It is the only choice. It is not a pleasant one, but in my judgment it is the least of a number of evils in a given situation.

Capital punishment has been referred to by some as just legalized murder. To me this is a shamefully irresponsible statement. I think the main difference between capital punishment and murder, legalized or otherwise, is the effect on the citizens of this country. No citizen who has even a minimum of respect for the law or for the rights of his fellow men need have any fear that he will be the victim of capital punishment. A citizen can even commit murder—as a crime of passion—and not suffer capital punishment. Yet what about the victims of murderers? The most upright citizen in the land may be slaughtered in cold blood, or his children may be abducted and murdered on their way from Sunday school, as has happened many times in the past. To call capital punishment legalized murder is a complete distortion of anything which is logical. It is, I suppose, an attempt to play on the emotions of those who must deal with the

fact that we do have murderers in our society.

What we are all interested in, I believe, in the fairly enlightened society in which we live, is the achievement of a net saving of human life, because we respect human life and recognize that the right to live is the primary right of all individuals. However, I think there has been a great deal of misplaced sympathy for the murderer. I suppose this is understandable. The murderer is fairly tried in public in a court of law. He is the subject of news broadcasts and newspaper stories. He is probably photographed daily and his story is given on television every day.

But what about his victim? Nobody hears anything about the victim, though he, or she, may have been killed in cold blood. The public achieves some affinity with the murderer but none with the victim, because the victim is already dead and buried before the trial takes place. There is no word said about the orphans and widows. There is no concern about them, because their story has not been publicized.

I think, too, that insufficient attention has been given to the fact that we in the Canadian parliament in 1962 made extensive amendments to the Criminal Code with regard to capital punishment.

• (8:50 p.m.)

We are not dealing with a law that is 100 years old. We are dealing with a law in respect to capital punishment that is very new, and that has not even been tried out properly as yet. Under it, in order to be liable for capital punishment, murder must be deliberate, or it must be the murder of a peace officer or jailer. There are many types of murder to which capital punishment no longer applies.

I have great sympathy for the position of law enforcement officers. After all, society depends a great deal on law enforcement officers so that we can walk in safety on our streets, and sleep at night knowing that our houses will not be broken into. Only today I received a telegram, as I am sure did most hon. members, from the annual meeting of the Federation of Quebec Municipal Policemen, representing more than 6,000 municipal policemen, conveying the text of a resolution saying it had been unanimously resolved (a) to oppose the abolition of the death penalty, and (b) to establish a national fund of indemnification concerning dependants of murder victims. I cannot help but support their point of view.

There has been a great deal of argument about whether the death penalty is a deterrent, how much of a deterrent, and whether it is a greater or lesser deterrent than life imprisonment. This is an argument that cannot be proven on either side but I would not like to have to try to convince anyone that capital punishment is not a deterrent. Statistically this cannot be proven because the deterrent effect of both capital punishment and life imprisonment is obscured by the fact that most criminals plan a crime on the basis that they are going to avoid any penalty, and that is the basis on which cold-blooded murders are committed.

To say that you can judge the deterrent effect of capital punishment or life imprisonment by interviewing the criminals who have been caught, tried and convicted, is not logical, because there you are dealing with cases where the deterrent did not work. I say the deterrent value is with respect to people who did not commit crimes, who were deterred from becoming murderers by the fact that capital punishment or some other heavy penalty would be meted out to them if caught.

In this connection it is interesting to note that within recent years in Canada one murderer was condemned to death and it was only after all his appeals were exhausted that he confessed the crime for which he was sentenced was not the only murder he had committed, that he had murdered four or five other persons. It was possible to prove his statement because the bodies were found where he said he buried them, and their location had been unknown to anyone else prior to that time. This was a case where the criminal carried on murdering when he had not been apprehended. He got away scot free on the first occasion, and that encouraged him to murder five other persons.

Generally speaking murders are less frequent than they were 100 years ago, but this is not due so much to the type of penalty as to improvements in methods of detection and improvements in forensic medicine. It is now possible to prove a murderer guilty in many cases where it would have been entirely impossible a century ago. As a matter of fact, in the days before a reliable chemical test had been developed to discover small quantities of arsenic, murder by arsenic poisoning

was so common in Europe that arsenic powder was known as inheritance powder. It was only after this development, and after a few murderers had been convicted, that the practice of murder by arsenic poisoning dropped to almost zero in Europe.

I do not know what the deterrent effect of life imprisonment is, but I am told that in criminal society in some cases there is a kind of inverted status, where the bigger the crime one is convicted of, then the more of a big shot one is. Indeed it frequently happens that criminals convicted for minor crimes, after serving their time return to society and commit more serious ones, and are then returned to prison for longer periods. I do not know how valid this is, but if there is any validity to it, then the person who is put away for his entire natural life is going to become the dean of the house in a very short time. I doubt if this would have the deterrent effect that so many anticipate.

Far more important than the question of capital punishment is the question of the root cause of crime. In the United States this is a matter which is receiving careful consideration. In today's *Christian Science Monitor* there is a report about a special United States Senate committee which has been set up to explore this problem, which states that Senator McClellan, in his opening remarks as committee chairman, pointed out that major crimes in the United States are increasing six times faster than the population growth.

This is the problem we should be considering in Canada. We should be doing research into the root cause of crime.

Mr. Speaker: Order. I regret to interrupt the hon. member but his time has expired, unless he has leave of the house to continue. Is that agreed?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Some hon. Members: No.

Mr. MacLean: Have I unanimous consent, Mr. Speaker?

Mr. Speaker: I regret very much there is not unanimous consent.

[*Translation*]

During the debate, earlier tonight the member for Quebec-Montmorency (Mr. Laflamme), seconded by the hon. member for Matapédia-Matane (Mr. Tremblay) moved the following amendment: I move, seconded by the hon. member for Matapédia-Matane, that paragraphs (a), (b) and (c) be replaced by the following—I shall not read the amendment then moved by the member for Quebec-Montmorency.

But I shall now consider briefly whether this amendment is in order. The hon. member for Montréal-Saint-Jacques (Mr. Rinfret), who was then in the chair, expressed very grave doubts as to whether the amendment was in order. He indicated that the amendment would be considered by the Chair at the earliest opportunity.

Since then, I had the opportunity to examine the proposal of the member for Quebec-Montmorency.

I refer the hon. member to citation 203(1) of Beauchesne's fourth edition which reads as follows:

> It is an imperative rule, that every amendment must be relevant to the question on which the amendment is proposed. Every amendment proposed to be made either to a question or to a proposed amendment should be so framed that if agreed to by the house the question or amendment as amended would be intelligible and consistent with itself.

It seems to me that the proposal of the member for Quebec-Montmorency is under the form of an amendment to the main motion rather than a subamendment.

That is why the Chair does not think the amendment can be accepted and suggests to the mover and the seconder that the proposal should rather form the subject of an amendment to the main motion.

• (9:00 p.m.)

[*English*]

Mr. B. S. Mackasey (Verdun): Mr. Speaker, most members who have participated in this debate have reflected their deep interest in this subject, and it has been obvious from the calibre of the debate that they have done a lot of research and a lot of soul-searching. I should like to think that I am not an exception in this regard.

My position in this house is unique in that I represent the city of Verdun which, in the provincial legislature, is represented by the Minister of Justice, Hon. Claude Wagner. That minister is a very close friend of mine. We share the same political views, or at least we belong to a certain degree to the same political party. We both claim to represent the thinking of the 90,000 people of the city of Verdun, but he is an avowed retentionist and I will vote for abolition.

That minister, perhaps in one of his weaker moments,—and he does not have many—referred to me as one who had the courage of his convictions. I hope that if he has time to read *Hansard* tomorrow he will realize that I voted for abolition. In spite of his convictions, I will do what every member of this House of Commons has done and will continue to do on many occasions, that is, vote with the courage of my convictions for what I think is in the best interests of myself, the country and the people I represent.

Hanging to me is a symbol of the imperfections and hypocrisy of our affluent society. I say this because I know too many people who find security and salve for their conscience in the mistaken belief that hanging produces for them at least a degree of protection against what they seem to think is a segment of society with which they have nothing in common, and will never come into contact.

I suggest that the conscience of this country must be awakened to the fact that no one is born to be a murderer. Murderers, with very few exceptions, are victims of certain circumstances such as mental illness or, to our shame, are the products of man's inhumanity to man. I hope when hanging is abolished public opinion will demand that the pockets of poverty in this country be eradicated, that the slum areas in our big cities be demolished, because society will then realize, in their search for some other form of protection, that the areas of poverty and slums in big cities create strong forces that breed crime and criminals. I fully believe that as long as we resort to periodic hangings to convince ourselves that law and order reigns and that crime is under control, people will continue to resist providing moneys that are needed for new penal institutions, new forms of rehabilitation and new universities to train the psychiatrists and psychologists that are needed in such vast numbers if rehabilitation is to have any effect.

A few weeks ago during our consideration of the Department of Justice estimates I traced very briefly the story of a young man in my riding. Unfortunately that sorry story is far from over. This young boy at age 12 was arrested for breaking a window in a back lane. He was arrested again at age 14 for damage to property. At 15 he was arrested for breaking into a school and throwing school books around. He was arrested just recently, at age 17, on a charge of arson. It does not stretch our imagination to presume that at age 18, 19 or 20 that boy might be arrested and charged with murder. I wonder, if by chance he is arrested on a charge of capital murder, and hanged, will it not be on the conscience of all of us, that our great affluent Canadian society was unable to put that young man back on the track when he was 12, 13 or 14 when society first came to grips with him.

I am an avowed abolitionist and I approached this debate expecting that some speakers would speak in a clinical manner while others would approach it emotionally. That has been the case, but frankly I am surprised to find that in general it is the retentionists who fall back on emotional arguments, and those who support abolition who have attempted to bring a certain degree of science to their arguments.

One of the characteristics of this debate is the respect we all have for each other's opinion. Whether my remarks are appreciated or not I hope that I will be given the same courtesy.

There are many who have advanced the argument that murderers must be hanged as a protection to society. Not so many years ago a dictator advanced the same reason as an excuse for the mass extermination of what he considered to be insane people, so that society could be protected by the killing of mentally ill people before they had the opportunity of murdering their fellow men. It is ironic that violence breeds violence, and that in the mass extermination of so many hundreds of thousands of Jewish people in Europe the exterminators were able to find many willing hands to carry out that plan.

• (9:10 p.m.)

There has been a lot said before about the fact that the commission of theft of over five shillings was a crime punishable by death in England, and now the death penalty has now been abolished there. Nothing has been said of the fact that in those days certain prosecutors and juries tempered justice with mercy in evaluating what was stolen as four shillings or four shillings and sixpence in order to avoid the penalty of hanging being imposed. I wonder whether that has not been done in this country and whether there are not times when juries are tempted to free, and indeed do free a guilty man rather than face the possibility of being the indirect cause of his being hanged.

I do not intend to be emotional in this connection, Mr. Speaker. I should like to do what others more learned than I have done,

and try to apply statistics to the problem at hand. There is an old saying that there are liars and statistics. But of course I believe all of us realize that statistics do play a very important part in Canadian life. Statistics are the basis of much of the legislation on Canada's statute books; statistics provide information figures on unemployment in this country; statistics are the basis of the insurance industry. There is nothing wrong with statistics—unless there are those who, including myself, would use them without a thorough knowledge—because this is a science. But that does not prevent me or anyone else in this house relying upon the findings of those who are trained in the use of statistics. There are statisticians, social scientists, criminologists, men capable and trained to interpret figures accurately and objectively. Such a man is Professor Sellin, a professor of sociology, President of the International Society of Criminology and a pioneer in the field of criminology and the prevention of crime. Statistics coming from him would be those of a man trained for a very long time in the field of criminology and should carry some weight in a debate such as this, particularly among people who are trying to be objective in forming a conclusion.

Time does not permit a review of all the remarks of this learned professor, but some statistics are very relevant and I think should be read into the record. I do this because a subject of some misgivings in this debate has been the danger or so-called danger to prison guards and policemen from a man convicted of murder and serving time. In this instance the figures relate to American penitentiaries. Professor Sellin in reviewing the incidence of murder in United States penitentiaries in the year 1964 found that in 30 states there were 26 murders. But significantly, of the 26 murders all but two took place in states which have the death penalty, and those two took place in the state of Michigan which is an abolition state.

The policemen in this country have my sympathy but, as the hon. member for York South (Mr. Lewis) mentioned today, there are occupational hazards in all lines of endeavour. In reviewing statistics concerning the danger of policemen being murdered, Professor Sellin considered the statistics made available to him by the Federal Bureau of Investigation in the years 1961, 1962 and 1963. The professor found that 140 policemen were killed by suspects or offenders in that period, or an average of 47 policemen a year. Of these 47 policemen killed, nine were killed in abolition states, two in Michigan, four in Wisconsin, 2 in Minnesota and one in North Dakota. In the nine states bordering these nine abolition states, 21 were killed, four in Massachusetts, four in Indiana, four in Illinois, five in Ohio, one in Iowa and one in Montana; there were two killed in Michigan, an abolition state, but five killed in Ohio and four in Indiana which border Michigan and are retention states.

I should like to refer to statistics a little closer to home. One of the arguments advanced by the Minister of Justice of the province of Quebec is that since it has become the policy of this government, and was that of the previous government, to hand out commutations on a rather generous basis, this has had a tremendous effect on the crime rate, particularly in the case of capital murder, in the province of Quebec. I went to what I thought was the most reliable source of statistics in this regard, namely the Dominion Bureau of Statistics. I had hoped to draw a pattern or draft of the incidence of murder in my province. I found that before 1960 murders were not reported to Ottawa by the province of Quebec, at least not through the provincial police department, although they were gathered haphazardly from different communities.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, much as I would have liked to take in the period 1960 to 1964 and compare it with 1956 to 1960, those figures were not available from the Dominion Bureau of Statistics. They are available, of course, from 1961 to 1964. In the year 1961 there were 39 incidents of murder in the province of Quebec; in 1962 there were 42; in 1963 it jumped to 50, giving some credence to the theory that criminals were taking advantage of the policy of commutation. Then in 1964, the last year for which statistics are available, the number of murders decreased from 50 to 45. The number of victims follows a similar pattern. In 1961 there were 42; in 1962, 44; in 1963, 57. But in 1964 it dropped to 46.

Whether we are abolitionists or retentionists, all of us, I am happy to say, realize that relatively few murderers fall into the category of cold, callous killers. Most people in justifying their argument for retention, and I respect this argument, emphasize the role that syndicated crime takes right now. I agree with them to the extent that I would

not particularly care if one of these particular murderers was captured and hanged, because I suppose they must be called the dregs of society.

That is the emotional answer I would give; but the cold, clinical answer is that statistically, at least on the information available in the United States, where some states are abolition and some retention, this type of professional killer does not expect to be captured. They are so cynical of the death penalty that they continue to operate in the main from those states that retain the death penalty when they could quite easily have their base of operations in what is known as an abolition state. I believe that the greatest deterrent the Canadian people can put at the disposal of law and order is not a continuation of the death penalty but an increase in the number of people captured.

• (9:20 p.m.)

The greatest deterrent, I suggest, is the fear of capture, not the fear of penalty in so far as hardened criminals are concerned. If we want to do something about murder, and I presume that is what this debate is all about, we have to hire more policemen. Most of the police forces of the large cities are badly understaffed, as the police chiefs will tell you.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, most of the retentionists have advanced but two good arguments. The first one has been that the death penalty is a deterrent. I hope I have proven to someone's satisfaction, as I have proven to my own, that according to statistics retention does not prevent crime. Second, of course, there are those who, like the hon. member for Red Deer (Mr. Thompson), quote the Bible so profusely. I can appreciate and understand those who want to retain the death penalty as a form of punishment. A man is entitled to his religious convictions, but quoting the Bible almost indiscriminately as justification for retention of capital punishment does not hold water when one realizes that the state of Israel has abolished the death penalty.

I imagine the Hebrew people have much stronger religious convictions than most people in this room. The Hebrew religion has been the basis of just about every religion. If anyone would respect the letter of the law and interpret the Bible accurately, it should be the people of the state of Israel. Well, they saw fit to abolish the death penalty many years ago. I have promised the whip I would be brief, and I know there are many people who would like to participate in this debate. I thank you.

[Mr. Mackasey.]

Mr. S. J. Enns (Portage-Neepawa): Mr. Speaker, as a result of the many good arguments which have been advanced on both sides of this question of capital punishment, I find I am more and more persuaded that sincere differences exist between us. After having heard 40 or more members speak to the motion, I find myself in a position of having no really new argument to justify my intervention in the debate at this time. This fact, together with the lateness of the hour, invites me to refrain from delivering what I thought was a well prepared speech. I should like to see the question put tonight and I, for one, am ready for the question.

I rise merely to indicate that when the question is put I will vote in support of the abolition of capital punishment.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Yves Forest (Stanstead): Mr. Speaker, the abolition or retention of capital punishment is an important and most controversial matter; opinions are divided and both sides have valid and serious arguments in support of their views.

It is a very emotional subject if one pictures a hanged man or if one thinks of the parents of the victim, so one gets carried away by ones feelings and it becomes difficult to discuss the real issue reasonably and logically. This has too often led to controversy while it should have been discussed coolly and reasonably. We have a heavy responsibility, for human lives are at stake now and in the future.

In view of the situation prevailing these past few years, when capital punishment was abolished in fact if not in theory, it has become imperative for the only competent authority, parliament of the country, finally to take a decision in order to determine whether the government is acting according to the wishes of the majority of the members or whether it is making undue use of its discretionary powers which, in fact, no longer exist when all death sentences are all commuted automatically and indiscriminately. The government was right to put this question to the representatives of the people as soon as possible at this session, because if capital punishment is to be abolished it should be done by appropriate legislation voted by the majority of members of parliament.

I entirely disagree with those who hold that this question should be put to the electorate by means of a national referendum. The representatives of the people can and must come to a decision on this matter in the light of studies and information made available to all hon. members.

Since the 1961 amendment of the criminal code, capital punishment is applicable only in cases of capital murder, that is one which has been committed deliberately and with premeditation, a crime with violence, the murder of a police officer or a jail guard. Providing for compulsory review by a court of appeal, the right of appeal to the supreme court and the recommendation of the jury for or against clemency in that category of murders, those were logical amendments restricting capital punishment to the most horrible crimes, those where the criminal was in full possession of his faculties and the charge was proved beyond all doubt, crimes committed in such circumstances that the criminal deserves no sympathy, there being no extenuating circumstances. I do not think there has been since sufficient motivation to change the law again and abolish capital punishment, which is now only applied in very specific cases.

It is unfortunately true that the crime wave now sweeping the country, as elsewhere, is growing yearly. Not a day goes by without newspapers reporting details of murders, thefts with violence, serious attacks, rapes and all sorts of other crimes. I read recently that in the United States a major crime is committed every 12 seconds and a murder, an attack with intent to kill or a rape, every two and a half minutes. In 1964, one policeman out of 10 was the victim of a deliberate attack; 57 were killed. It is remarkable that adolescents between the ages of 10 and 17 were responsible for almost half of all crimes against property. Three quarters of the individuals involved had already been up before the law. The percentage is comparable in Canada. It is obvious that this avalanche of different crimes has frightened the public which does not feel safe and well enough protected.

We must not be surprised at that and blame it considering the methods used and the daring of certain bandits who fear nothing. This is not the time, in my opinion, to reduce the protection given to society by abolishing the death penalty for the most hateful crime of all.

An outstanding justice of the Ontario appeal court said a few years ago, and I quote:

> The irrevocable character of the death penalty is a reason why all possible measures should be taken against injustice—not for its abolition. Nowadays, with the advent of armed criminals and the substantial increase in armed robberies, criminals of long standing if arrested, must expect long sentences. However, if they run no risk of hanging, when found guilty of murder, they will kill policemen and witnesses with the prospect of a future no more unhappy, as of one of them put it, than being fed, lodged and clothed for the rest of their lives. In addition, once in prison, such people who are capable of anything could kill their guards and their fellow inmates with relative impunity.

It is clear that those words are as timely as ever. Nobody will deny that the execution of a murderer and everything that surrounds it is a terrible thing but the murder itself is even more so.

Capital punishment must be retained to prove the sanctity of that most precious thing which is the gift of life; it embodies the repulsion and horror that we feel for the greatest of crimes.

Society has the right to protect the integrity of the human being and the life of its members against what threatens them. That is why it exists. Because the government of a country has the duty to protect and defend the common good, it has the right to take the necessary legal steps to protect the physical, moral, emotional and intellectual welfare of the community as a whole.

If the state has the right and the duty to defend the community against outside aggression, such as in time of war, and within the country, for instance, in case of treason, crimes against the state, etc., and that to the extent of taking the life of the aggressors and guilty parties, if the citizen wants to protect his own life by killing whoever attacks him without any reason, the state can do the same when a criminal attacks and endangers the life of the community by deciding to eliminate summarily another human being. I think that society represented by the government can use capital punishment to eliminate a person who, willfully, does not follow the laws of society and endangers the life of a member of the community, if it is proven that such a punishment, by its nature, is a good protection for that same society, particularly against the repetition of this odious crime by protecting people who otherwise would be future victims.

Would life imprisonment, which often is nothing of the kind, advocated by the abolitionists, have that effect to the same extent as capital punishment?

Personally, I am morally convinced that the death penalty alone constitutes a measure with enough deterrent power to prevent such crimes and that is the main reason why I intend to vote for retaining the death penalty. That does not mean that I am in favour of retaining hanging as the only method of execution; I would like to see it replaced by the electric chair or even the gas chamber.

I am convinced that, in this day and age, to spare hardened murderers, who are beyond rehabilitation, is to condemn other people to pay for this with their lives.

How many of them will there be? How will it happen? Who will be killed? Will it be the policeman, the peaceful citizen or perchance, another criminal, for they make no bones about killing each other off in the underworld. On the other hand, society must protect them until such time as they are found guilty.

Mr. Speaker, if retaining capital punishment means that murders are prevented, certainly an incalculable number of them, then is it not imperative to keep that law in our statutes, for the protection of society?

Capital punishment certainly acts as a deterrent.

For most people, life is priceless and they will do anything and suffer the worst privations to preserve it, even when life itself does not hold many consolations or bright prospects for the future.

Acccording to an old proverb, fear is the beginning of wisdom, and undoubtedly capital punishment is an effective deterrent. This fear protects criminal organizations against indiscretions and blunders of their accomplices. What holds back professional criminals should all the more hold back potential criminals.

A prison chaplain said that often people found guilty of serious assaults would have killed their victim were it not for the innate and very real fear of hanging. Those who maintain that a severe sentence does not influence the behaviour of criminals and that life imprisonment would have the same effect should be asked why then those sentenced to death try by all available means and make every representation to obtain a commutation and escape hanging. For only death is final in this world and where there is life there is hope.

[Mr. Forest.]

As a deterrent, the death penalty is playing its part for which there is no substitute. To this, abolitionists answer mainly that statistics, in countries and states where the death penalty was abolished, compared with those where it was retained or reestablished, would show that the homicide rates do not increase in the first case. I suggest that statistics do not prove much, either on one side or the other, as far as the efficiency or non-efficiency of capital punishment is concerned. There are too many variations, too many changes as regards circumstances, conditions, between one period and the other, to enable us to make worthy comparisons. To those who rely upon statistics, we could say that according to the press, in Great Britain, during the first year of abolition of capital punishment, namely in 1965, the number of murders is reported to have increased by one third, from 182 in 1964 to 249 in 1965.

• (9:30 p.m.)

Thousands of persons are alleged to have signed petitions asking that the death penalty be brought back. It will never be possible to appreciate adequately the deterrent effect of capital punishment, but I am sure it exists and to a greater extent perhaps in our society than in others. Prison guards and other people have referred to the beneficial effect a hanging has on inmates of a jail where it takes place. You can feel then an atmosphere of meditation which reflects a general feeling of disapproval for this most odious of all crimes.

One of the chief arguments used by those who advocate abolition is the possibility of a miscarriage of justice taking place where an innocent person would be executed instead of the actual murderer.

First, I believe no case can be quoted where, in Canada, it has been found that an innocent person has been executed. Under our judiciary system, the accused is deemed to be innocent, and the Crown has to prove beyond every doubt that he is guilty. Theoretically, there is room for an error, but in practice it is almost impossible. The accused is judged by 12 jurors whose verdict must be unanimous; if he is found guilty, the decision is reviewed by the Court of appeal and, normally, it is then brought before the Supreme Court. Finally, the case is submitted to the Cabinet with a view to commutation. The execution of an innocent person is almost impossible, and the chances of a miscarriage of justice are reduced to a minimum.

So, one has to choose between the protection of society and this very remote possibility of miscarriage of justice.

According to our law, it is obvious that murderers escape their just sentence because of the principle that it is better to acquit a criminal than to run the risk of condemning an innocent.

Mr. Speaker, I have neither the time nor the inclination to answer all the arguments advanced against capital punishment, but I should like to point out that almost all who, as members of the police force or penitentiary staff have come into contact with criminals for several years, are opposed to the abolition of capital punishment, and it seems that this is also the opinion of the Canadian people.

I believe that this is a realistic and practical view of the problem.

Before closing my remarks, Mr. Speaker, I should like to point out that the general regulations or principles concerning crime punishment, have been carried out by our courts time and again for generations, and have had for effect to castigate or to punish a crime, but not to seek revenge. Their aims were, namely, to stop the criminal from committing a second crime, to prevent other people from committing similar offences, and in a wider sense, to make the court itself feel that crime is really an offence against the state that should be punished by the state for the common good of society. If an individual has shown through his conduct that he is antisocial, or is a threat to the community, he should then be temporarily or permanently excluded from it.

This is the expression of reproof, on the part of the state, of the harm done to society as a whole. However, punishment must always fit the crime. It is in that light that a penalty or a sentence must be considered and not as revenge or retribution.

Arguments brought up by abolitionists did not convince me of the need for further amendments to the legislation and for the elimination of the ultimate protection that society has against criminals of that kind, which will be the only ones to be executed, namely those who deliberately and wilfully take the life of other people.

[*English:*]

Hon. D. S. Harkness (Calgary North): Mr. Speaker, I believe that the basic question we must consider when deciding whether to retain or to abolish capital punishment is the protection of the general public. All other matters are secondary and subservient to this. Every organized society has, as a matter of necessity, provided sanctions for this purpose. The fundamental reason for these sanctions is to prevent or to deter those actions which would take the lives, injure the bodies or impair the property rights of the members of the society to which they belong.

• (9:40 p.m.)

I do not think there is anybody in this chamber, Mr. Speaker, who would argue that there should be no deterrent to crime, or that there should be no police forces or prisons or nothing to prevent anybody doing just as he likes. I do not think that there are any in this chamber who argue that way.

Therefore, the argument in connection with this matter really comes down to this: Is capital punishment an effective deterrent to capital murder and treason, is it necessary as a deterrent, or are there other deterrents which would serve the purpose as well.

I firmly believe, Mr. Speaker, that no other deterrent is as effective, and I firmly believe that for the general protection of society we cannot afford to do without this final sanction of capital punishment for those people who have committed the crime of capital murder, or of treason. Statistics have been very much used, particularly by the abolitionists in this debate and to some extent by the retentionists, and in the great mass of literature which has come to my office. I submit, Mr. Speaker, that nothing can be proved one way or another from statistics. You an take the same statistics provided in a book put out by the government, and issued to all of us, in order to prove either side of this question to your own satisfaction. Hon. members can take the statistics to prove one position, and others may use them in a different way, to prove the opposite. As an example, turning to page 118 of this book and looking at the statistics for the state of Vermont, we see that the murder rate for that state from 1958 to 1963 was 3.2 per hundred thousand; .5, .3, 1.5, .3 and .5. Vermont is a state which has capital punishment. The abolitionists will take the year 1958 and say that the murder rate was 3.2, and they will compare that rate for the same year with the one in the state of Maine, for example, which happened to have a murder rate of 2.5, where they have not got the death penalty.

However, if you compare all the other years, you will find that the rate in Vermont

is very much less than it is in the state of Maine. The only reason I quote from statistics is to give examples, because I want to show how the same figures exactly can be taken, and for the uninformed person who is listening, those figures will prove either side of the case.

My colleague from Royal (Mr. Fairweather) mentioned the situation in Maine and in New Brunswick. The only reason I mention it is because I heard this subject mentioned on the radio on Sunday. The commentators on the radio said that what the hon. member for Royal had pointed out constituted a great argument in favour of abolition; that the murder rates in these two areas next door to each other with similar types of population, and so on, were practically the same, although in Maine there is no death penalty and in New Brunswick there is.

However, look at the statistics provided about the states of South Dakota and North Dakota. These two states are more alike than are Maine and New Brunswick. The populations are very similar in their ethnic origins. They are the same in their general means of getting a livelihood, and so on. It is just an accident that the states of South Dakota and North Dakota are not one state. If you look at the murder rate of these states, you will see a considerable difference, which illustrates once again how impossible it is to take statistics for two areas next door to each other and try to prove anything from them. In many cases there is just no relationship between statistics. The figures may be found on pages 116 and 117 of the book on capital punishment. The same sort of thing holds true, if you go right through the figures.

If you look at the rates for different countries on page 86, you will find El Salvador with the highest rate, with 44.3 murders per hundred thousand. It has the death penalty. The next two countries, in order of murder rate are Colombia, with 15.9 and Puerto Rico with 14.1. Both these countries are without the death penalty.

What do these kinds of statistics prove? I think they simply prove that this is not a means by which you can determine whether the death penalty is a deterrent or whether it is not.

I submit, Mr. Speaker, that the best way to determine this, and the best way for any hon. member to determine this is to examine what his own reactions are to different situations, and then to observe what other people's reactions are, and to apply common sense. I submit when you begin to apply that type of test to the particular question which we are debating that you will realize right away how you, yourself, are very subject to deterrents because of the fear of punishment of some sort or other. Is there any single person here who throughout his school days was not prevented practically, every day during the whole period he went to school from committing some offence against the regulations because of fear of punishment? This problem that we discuss is just as simple. I think there is no question at all but that everybody is deterred from actions of all kinds throughout his life because of the fear of consequences.

I submit, Mr. Speaker, that the greatest fear of any, and therefore the greatest deterrent of any is the fear of death. Anyone who has crouched in a ditch or shallow trench with a lot of shell and machine-gun fire going on around him realizes how strong the fear of death is. Anyone who tries to persuade me, and who tries to persuade the majority of people that the fear of death is not much greater than the fear of life imprisonment, is not going to get very far with his argument.

We have the argument that life imprisonment is a great deterrent.

Mr. Lewis: Would the hon. member answer a question?

Mr. Harkness: I will answer it when I have finished.

It is argued that life imprisonment is as great a deterrent as hanging, that the fear of life imprisonment is just as great, and will therefore serve as just as effective a deterrent as capital punishment. I submit that fear of life imprisonment is nothing like as great a deterrent as is the fear of death, because a man sentenced to life imprisonment knows that in most cases he is going to be paroled; in other words, he still has hope. First of all, he has the hope of parole and in most cases people who have been sentenced to life imprisonment have been paroled. Second, he has the hope of escape. With these twin hopes of parole and escape, the fear of life imprisonment, and thus the deterrent effect of life imprisonment, is nothing like as great as the fear of death.

An hon. Member: Let us take the vote.

Mr. Harkness: I should like to point out also, and I will not dwell on this very long because it has been pointed out many times before, that capital punishment is used at the

present time only for a limited number of the homicides which take place. First of all you have all the manslaughter cases, secondly you have all the non-capital murder cases, and then, it is only for capital murder and treason that the punishment of death takes place.

Capital murder means cold-blooded murder. It means murder which takes place in the commission of a planned crime, or it is the murder of a policeman who is attempting to apprehend a criminal, or who is attempting to prevent an escape, or something along that line. Under these circumstances, the concern of the abolitionists, as far as I can gather it, is that a very large number of people are going to have their lives taken from them. But, as far as the death penalty is concerned, we generally are not talking about too many people.

• (9:50 p.m.)

One of the great arguments put forward by the abolitionists involves the possibility of hanging an innocent man. I will not say that this is impossible but I will assert that it is close to being impossible, bearing in mind the way in which justice is administered at this time and considering the number of commutations which have taken place.

The other night the hon. member for Greenwood (Mr. Brewin) brought up the Truscott case. I was sorry to see this case introduced into the discussion because it has nothing to do with the question of the abolition or retention of capital punishment. This is the case of a minor whose sentence was automatically commuted. At the present time the sentence of hanging could not be imposed upon him. However, after going into this case at considerable length, evidently with the idea of stirring up horror and making converts to the abolitionists cause, the hon. member for Greenwood said as reported at page 3077:

> Had Truscott been an older man, he would have been hanged by the neck until he was dead and there would be no way of reversing this irreversible verdict.

That statement was just not correct. I can state, without impinging on my oath of cabinet secrecy, I think, that the sentence would have been commuted in a case of this sort. There is every reason to think so. I say the case would have been commuted in any event, had the man been 20 or 25 years of age, on the basis of the evidence presented in the book which Mrs. LeBourdais has written. This is the sort of thing I deplore in the present debate—statements which are made as though they were completely truthful whereas in fact they will not stand up to examination at all.

I do not wish to delay the vote on the resolution. I merely state in conclusion that I intend to vote against it and I trust that a majority of the members of this house will do likewise.

I think the hon. member for York South (Mr. Lewis) wished to ask a question. I would be happy to answer it now.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Henri Latulippe (Compton-Frontenac): Mr. Speaker, well and good to shout "question, question", but I think we did not give enough thought yet to this question and that is more serious than any of us seems to believe. In fact, it is a fundamental question.

We must give due reflection to this question of abolishing the death penalty. It has been given a great deal of consideration and much approbation. Several members declared themselves in favour and others against, so much so that I think wide differences of opinion prevail among the members.

Before reaching a decision on such a question, it behooves us to analyse the matter of criminality and its consequences, to consider the solutions we should bring in to various problems, because there are several reasons for this crime wave in Canada.

Well, Mr. Speaker, there are causes for crimes. All the crimes committed are not all premeditated crimes.

[*English*]

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order. I apologize for interrupting the hon. member for Compton-Frontenac but there does appear to be more noise in the chamber than usual and it is hard to hear what the hon. member is saying.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Latulippe: Mr. Speaker, we are faced with several decisions in our discussions on capital punishment, because it is a question of life or death. And the issue, as I have mentioned a moment ago, is very serious, and the responsibility which bears over the shoulders of every member of the house is fraught with consequences.

We must struggle until the end to maintain life, as it is due to a supreme power. We must consider this problem with a great deal of calm and impartiality.

We must accept the evidence that man and society should be protected; both are related

since society creates man and man creates society. Man has needs and a conscience; he wants the first to be satisfied and the second to be respected and protected.

Society's first responsibility is to see to it that this is achieved.

If society does not stand in the way of man's self-accomplishment, if he finds in the state which represents him a conscience that understands his own, man will integrate in that state; if not, he will rise against society. The fault is not in man, but in society itself, because in society there are human beings and it is inhuman for society not to meet its basic responsibility.

Man has rights, but without the strength to enforce them, how can he defend them? When man and society face each other, the state always wins, since it is stronger; even in case of a revolution, where, of biological necessity, the state rises again from its ashes, the discrepancy in strength is so great between the two, that the very concept of rights is always ridiculous and inadequate.

Mr. Speaker, many people have become human wrecks, hardened sinners, criminals or gangsters. Whose fault is it? Let me analyse the situation.

How did it come about? If such disorder exists in our society and our country, it is above all because our economy, in several respects, does not play a proper part.

It is mainly because it is antisocial, inhuman, deceitful, depriving people from their needs and of their sacred right to the necessaries of life—

May I point out to you, Mr. Speaker, that it is ten o'clock.

Mr. Speaker: Order please.

Mr. Grégoire: Mr. Speaker, in order to reply to that question, if the member for Compton-Frontenac is to speak at greater length and the vote is taken afterwards, if there are any others who wish to talk, perhaps he could go on with his remarks tomorrow.

[*English*]

Some hon. Members: Question.

Mr. Cowan: Ten o'clock.

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE

Mr. Speaker: Does the Minister of Public Works desire to make a statement at this time?

[Mr. Latulippe.]

• (10:00 p.m.)

Mr. McIlraith: Yes, Mr. Speaker. I should like to confirm the announcement made earlier, that the budget will be delivered tomorrow night at eight o'clock. In that connection I would ask that the house agree to suspend the sitting tomorrow night from seven until eight o'clock, bearing in mind that the budget must be delivered at eight o'clock.

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Mr. McIlraith: Then I would like to ask the house to consider extending the special order on the order paper to make government time available for the capital punishment debate, until seven o'clock tomorrow night. If I have unanimous consent I would put that motion.

Some hon. Members: Six o'clock.

Mr. Speaker: The Chair heard an objection.

Mr. Caouette: When the budget is presented tomorrow night, are we going to debate it right afterwards?

Mr. McIlraith: Mr. Speaker, in an effort to be helpful I was going to go on to give some indication of the business ahead for the next few days. I had asked, as hon. members will have noticed, that we continue with the capital punishment debate tomorrow, then have the budget at eight o'clock. Our plans for Wednesday had been the supplementary estimates, and the two judges bills which I thought would take very little time. When these were completed we would resume the capital punishment debate on Wednesday, and if necessary continue on Thursday.

I was giving this outline in the hope that the resolution could come to a vote after all hon. members who wish to speak had made their speeches, perhaps tomorrow, or on Wednesday, or Thursday. Then we would like to resume the budget debate on Friday and have four continuous days of budget debate. That is the plan of business we had in mind; but in view of the inability to get consent to continue with the capital punishment debate tomorrow, the house should be ready for the government to call any item of business on the order paper.

Mr. Churchill: Give us some advance notice of what it will be.

Mr. McIlraith: I have sought to give advance notice, and I have given notice of what we plan right from now until April 6. I really think the interests of the house would be

better served if we could go on with the capital punishment debate but, not being able to do that, the government will have to revise its plans and do what we can with other business.

Mr. Churchill: I estimate that only 20 per cent of the members of the house have participated in the debate on capital punishment. Does the house leader consider it possible to provide an opportunity for the remaining 80 per cent to make speeches, if they so desire, tomorrow or on Thursday, and complete the debate?

Mr. McIlraith: The fundamental difference between myself and the hon. member for Winnipeg South Centre on this point is that I find myself completely unable to accept the figures he has given in his estimate. That is the difficulty on a matter like this, which is a private members measure. It is difficult to be sure of how many members wish to speak. According to the best information I could get by consulting members of the different parties, and having other people do so, the resolution could probably come to a vote by tomorrow night, or certainly on Wednesday, or failing that, sometime on Thursday at the latest. That was what was in my mind in announcing the business for the house.

Mr. Knowles: I wonder I if I may put a question to the government house leader. It is based on the government's commitment in the Speech from the Throne to make arrangements for a decision to be reached concerning capital punishment. If a way can be found within the rules, and I believe it can, for government time to be given to this debate tomorrow, is the government willing to make that arrangement?

Mr. McIlraith: That was the point I was considering. I think we can do this without unanimous consent. But since I did have the courtesy to ask the house for unanimous consent and was refused, I may be forced into the position of using other methods which I heartily dislike.

Mr. Fairweather: Mr. Speaker, I think the house is entitled to know which hon. member did have the discourtesy to refuse unanimous consent to a very reasonable request.

Mr. Lambert: I do not think it was discourteous.

Mr. Fairweather: Perhaps you do not, Edmonton, but I do.

Mr. Douglas: Mr. Speaker, it would be extremely useful to the house if the government house leader could either now or tomorrow give some assurance that the government will allow sufficient time for this debate on abolition of capital punishment to go on until there is a determination by the house, rather than facing the prospect that the motion may be talked out.

Mr. McIlraith: We are caught in a difficult situation here. It would be an act of irresponsibility to say that the government will continue this debate until there is a vote. If there is no will in the house to reach a decision there could be one amendment after another, with debate, for the sake of preventing a decision. That would mean that all other legislation would have to be put aside. There is a responsibility for parliament to provide an opportunity for consideration of government business and its acceptance or rejection, as hon. members see fit, after proper debate.

Our problem is really to find a technique that will provide private members with a full and proper opportunity to discuss this matter. Having done that, and having made that government time available by taking it away from government matters, I think we are entitled to have a decision made by parliament. I am prepared to be as reasonable as one can properly be, with any sense of responsibility, in order that this matter can be completely debated and a vote taken.

Mr. Douglas: May I just say to the minister that I was not suggesting that the debate go beyond Thursday. I realize that the budget debate has to begin and that government legislation must be proceeded with, but if there can be some agreement that if the vote is not reached by Thursday time will be allowed later in the session so that this matter can be considered, it would be helpful.

Mr. McIlraith: I think we are getting involved in another question as to how much government time should responsibly be taken away from government business in order to make it available for this debate, because such an order would simply mean there would be no vote on Thursday. Surely that is not what is desired by the vast majority of members on all sides of the house.

Mr. Grégoire: Mr. Speaker, I should like to ask the minister one question. What will be the first item on orders of the day tomorrow?

Proceedings on Adjournment Motion

Mr. McIlraith: For the reasons I have given earlier this evening, I regret that I am not able to say with precision at the moment. I hope we can return to the debate on capital punishment. If we cannot I think hon. members should be ready for any item of government business on the order paper.

Mr. Fulton: Mr. Speaker, may I remind the government house leader of the suggestion I made earlier, and ask him to keep it in mind as a possible way out of an impasse which would serve us all well. If the mood of the house permits, at some time unanimous consent should be sought for a motion to refer the subject matter of this motion to a special committee of the house.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. There is now before the house a motion to adjourn.

PROCEEDINGS ON ADJOURNMENT MOTION

A motion to adjourn the house under provisional standing order 39A deemed to have been moved.

• (10:10 p.m.)

FINANCE—REPORTED DISCRIMINATION BY BANKS IN GRANTING LOANS TO WOMEN

Mr. H. W. Herridge (Kootenay West): Mr. Speaker, as one who has always been a firm supporter of the principle of human rights, and as one who is intellectually opposed to discrimination on the basis of sex, I have always been interested in equal rights for all people. Some years ago I was approached by a lady who informed me she had been refused a loan by one of the banks, strictly because she was a woman. At that time I thought this was a passing phase in our evolution toward a complete democracy and that the situation would soon be changed. However, two or three years ago several ladies informed me that they had been refused loans by various banks, although they had some limited security, on the grounds that they were women and were therefore not considered capable of carrying on a business profitably, thereby assuring repayment of the loans in question.

I asked them to give me their names and the facts surrounding the refusal of these loans, but with the usual modesty displayed by the fair sex on such occasions, they did not wish any publicity in the matter. However quite recently my attention was drawn

[Mr. Grégoire.]

to an article in the South Edmonton *Sun* of Saturday, March 19, this year, entitled "Sex Discrimination in Canadian Banking". I wish to quote from this article:

By secret agreement the eight chartered banks of Canada have banned the transfer of loan accounts from one bank to another. They are also accused of discrimination against their employees because if a member of the staff of one bank quits his job none of the other seven banks will hire him.

All this by secret agreement. Now we have evidence that the banks also (apparently by secret agreement) refuse to loan money to Canadian women—simply because of their sex.

I hope the parliamentary secretary is listening carefully.

In response to our current series on Canada's banking system, Miss Audrey Tyndall of Provost, Alta., agreed to be interviewed by one of our reporters. And here is the interview:

Reporter: Miss Tyndall, how did you become involved in farming?

Miss Tyndall: For 14 years I was an unpaid worker on my father's farm. During this time I bought a quarter-section, adjacent to my father's land, for $200 annually. I worked as a school bus driver and used the money I earned to buy several calves. I raised the calves and eventually paid for the quarter-section. By working at Wainwright during the summer I earned enough money to buy additional calves.

Reporter: Were you in the cattle business long?

Miss Tyndall: No. Because 1955 was a hard year for raising cattle, I decided to raise horses because they are easier to care for during the winter. Having decided to raise horses, I obtained grazing leases from the Lands and Forests Branch for 11 quarter-sections. I bought and paid for another half-section; all this land has been fenced. Now I have 39 horses and I wish to buy my father's farm. It has the proper buildings and good soil for raising feed. The farm is worth $12,000 and I require $1,000 for operating expenses.

Reporter: What financial arrangements have you made to buy the farm?

Miss Tyndall: None. I tried several times to negotiate a loan, but everywhere I went I was refused a loan because I am a woman.

I see hon. gentlemen laughing over there, but they did always see me standing up for the women. This article continues:

The people at the Industrial Development Bank suggested that I turn my money or land over to one Cecil Fleming—who does not own his land—for security, and that he would get the loan on my behalf. An application made with the Farm Purchase Board passes at the municipal level, but was rejected by Ken Taylor of the Department of Agriculture. They just say, "It's too bad you are not a man!" The Farm Credit Bureau adopted the same attitude. Various banks and our treasury branches have also refused to lend me money.

Reporter: Why must you buy the farm now?

Miss Tyndall: Because my father is anxious to sell and there are many other prospective buyers for a good farm.

Reporter: Thank you, Miss Tyndall.

Well, when Ottawa gets through with the Spencer case and the sex-security trials maybe parliament will have time to deal with Canada's banking system.

Down in the deep south they discriminate against human beings because of their colour. In Canada our banking institutions discriminate against women because of their sex. Should the people of Canada tolerate this sort of thing?

Because of my experience on two occasions of women bringing their complaints to my attention, and having read this very interesting article in the South Edmonton *Sun*, I asked the minister this question in the house on March 24:

Has the minister's attention been drawn to press reports to the effect that loans to women have been refused by the Industrial Development Bank and other banks, simply on the grounds that they were women? Would the minister make inquiries of the Industrial Development Bank and other banks . . . in this respect?

I look forward to an answer from the parliamentary secretary.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Jean Chrétien (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Finance): Mr. Speaker, we are all happy to see that the hon. member for Kootenay West (Mr. Herridge) stands up again to fight for the rights of minorities, and particularly the rights of women in the business world. I wish to make the following reply:—

[*English*]

I have not seen the press reports to which my hon. friend referred. I should say, however, I am advised by the Industrial Development Bank that it does not discriminate, and would not dream of discriminating, amongst loan applicants on the basis of sex, if I may use that word. We know of no reason why women should not be regarded as creditworthy. The Industrial Development Bank does in fact make loans to women applicants. The fact that these are relatively few in number simply reflects I suggest the relatively small number of women who are in business. Personally, Mr. Speaker, I think we should follow the suggestion of my hon. friend and give every consideration to women in business.

HEALTH AND WELFARE—REPORTED INCREASE IN THE INCIDENCE OF TUBERCULOSIS

Mr. Howard Johnston (Okanagan-Revelstoke): I asked a question on Thursday, Mr. Speaker, of the Minister of National Health and Welfare (Mr. MacEachen) which grew out of an article in the *Globe and Mail* in which it was reported that Dr. Grégoire, when speaking to the College of General Practitioners, had indicated a rather surprising increase in the incidence of tuberculosis. The number of new, active cases in 1965 had increased by 5 per cent over those reported in the previous year. He further stated that more than $50 million was spent annually in Canada for the diagnosis, treatment and follow-up of tuberculosis. He said that people over 50 were more prone to develop tuberculosis today.

I was concerned at the time because of the national significance. Then this morning, in the mail, I received the most recent edition of the Vernon *News*. I discovered that the medical director of the North Okanagan Health Unit, Dr. M. R. Smart, had reported there had been an increase in the incidence of tuberculosis in that health district. The increase is small, namely five new cases within the last year as opposed to two in the previous year. However, if you consider the percentage increase, it is rather dramatic in this local constituency situation.

He also gave some figures that were rather revealing on the ages of the people involved. The number who are known to have had tuberculosis in the past and are now considered inactive cases totalled 289. There were 121 of those in the 20 to 49 age group, and 167 in the 50 and over bracket. This seems to bear out the statement made in the *Globe and Mail*.

I do not really know whether Dr. Grégoire made a proper statement when he said people over 50 are more prone to develop tuberculosis. I think he should have said that people 60 and 70 are less able to resist tuberculosis. One of the reasons they are less able to resist this disease is that the old age pension is extremely low. I was interested in knowing what steps the Department of National Health and Welfare was contemplating in order to bring this very dreaded disease under greater control.

• (10:20 p.m.)

I was hoping that one of the measures, one which I think would do most in this regard, would be dramatically to increase the size of the old age security pension. If $50 million—I realize this is not federal funds by any means but is a sum which will be divided up among many levels of government—is spent annually in Canada on diagnosis, treatment and following up cases of tuberculosis, it must be somewhat disheartening to people conducting that program to realize that there are many

who would have very little resistance to tuberculosis. Because such things as vitamin pills, fresh fruit and a balanced diet would really become something of a luxury in view of the size of the old age security pension at the present time.

The Minister of Trade and Commerce (Mr. Winters) can say what he likes about its being difficult for him to vote against an increase in the old age security pension, but we in this party did not vote against an increase in the old age security pension: We voted an opportunity for this government to take some action in this regard.

The question I raise of the increased incidence of tuberculosis is quite closely related to the difficult time that many older people are having. Dr. Grégoire quoted a study made in California in which every known case of tuberculosis was followed up. The study showed that 5 per cent of 100,000 arrested cases were actually still positive—and that in California, where the climate is much more salubrious than anywhere in Canada. I would wonder what sort of figures would be produced by the same sort of study among Canadians who are cases of arrested tuberculosis, particularly those in the elderly age group.

Mrs. Margaret Rideout (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of National Health and Welfare): Mr. Speaker, I listened with a great deal of interest to the remarks made by the hon. member and I should like to tell him that the department is reviewing continuously the indications of any increase in the number of tuberculosis cases in the country.

I am glad to inform the hon. member that a conference was held recently involving organizations and persons interested in this problem, as a result of the interest taken by the federal Department of National Health and Welfare, the Canadian Tuberculosis Association and the provincial ministers of health.

The Department of National Health and Welfare officials stated on behalf of the government at that conference that we are prepared to offer every assistance to the provincial departments of health, including the continuation of the federal tuberculosis grant, in efforts to combat the disease.

PENITENTIARIES—ST. VINCENT DE PAUL—SUICIDE OF PRISONER

Mr. Warren Allmand (Notre-Dame-de-Grâce): Mr. Speaker, on Thursday, March 24, Conrad Brunelle, a prisoner at St. Vincent de Paul penitentiary, committed suicide by hanging himself with a belt. Mr. Brunelle was serving a three-year term for a series of armed robberies. He was also believed to be implicated in certain undertakings with Lucien Rivard and was considered a possible witness to other crimes.

This suicide has attracted special attention because Mr. Brunelle had attempted to cut his throat three months earlier but was stopped before he could complete the damage. That is why on Friday, March 25, I asked the Solicitor General whether he intended to undertake any investigation in this case.

It seems to me and to many others that something must be wrong with the administration of penitentiaries when a prisoner is left in a situation to commit suicide, having already survived a previous attempt made three months earlier. It seems strange that he should have access to materials that could be used for violent purposes either against himself or against others. One would have thought that a prisoner such as Brunelle would have been placed under special care and given special medical and psychiatric care.

We are presently debating the abolition of capital punishment. Some hon. members have suggested that if we abolish capital punishment society will be left unprotected. But I maintain, Mr. Speaker, we shall be left unprotected if we do not attack the real causes of crime and violence. It seems to me that one of those causes is the inadequacy of our prison reform and of our criminal rehabilitation systems. If we are going to prevent murder, we must get at the core of the problem.

Several radio stations and newspapers, including the Montreal *Gazette*, have raised the issue of this particular suicide. The Montreal *Gazette* on Saturday had an editorial with respect to it. Many of us believe that the government ought to conduct an investigation into this suicide, to find out how it could have taken place. Once this is done, we should see to it that those responsible are disciplined and that reforms are introduced.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Paul Beaulieu (Saint-Jean-Iberville-Napierville): Mr. Speaker, I would like to point out that the house should adjourn, because we do not have a quorum.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Rinfret): Order, please. I regret to interrupt the hon. member, but only the member who has put the question can state his case and the minister concerned or his representative can answer.

[*English*]

Hon. L. T. Pennell (Solicitor General): Mr. Speaker, the death referred to by the hon. member will be the subject of a coroner's inquest. All the facts will be laid before the coroner. As a result of the inquest I hope that this question will be clarified to the satisfaction of the hon. member.

[*Translation*]

Motion agreed to and the house adjourned at 10.29 p.m.

END OF VOLUME III